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PREFACE

Welfare programs usually have limited autonomy and are highly dependent in terms of their resources. As a result, welfare programs and services can reflect the demands imposed by external elements, far more than the needs of the clients.

Within the Department, the welfare service to inmates, their families and communities, has grown in response to multiple expectations and often conflicting demands. The result being ambiguity around the role and boundaries of the welfare service and a lack of control over the workload.

This is the first attempt in the Department, to document the tasks and activities undertaken by Departmental Welfare Officers and to differentiate workload from caseload, caseload numbers having been considered inadequate to a real understanding of workload. The workload patterns of welfare staff in Correctional Centres and the differences in workload patterns between Correctional Centres, has also been examined.

The Study has short and long term aims; it is evaluative of the present welfare service, it provides data to substantiate the need for more resources or at the very least, a reorganisation of resources, it provides direction for change, it provides a benchmark for workload and it affirms the immense contribution currently made by welfare staff in all Correctional Centres.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study examined a number of issues affecting the current workload of Welfare Officers within the NSW Correctional System. The aims and objectives of the study were to evaluate current service provision and develop a number of strategies which addressed workload levels, training needs, resource levels and professional supervision. The study also sought to develop responsive benchmark levels for welfare service delivery. In addition, the study comprehensively catalogued the current tasks performed by Welfare Officers and the skills necessary to perform these tasks.

The study utilised a variety of research skills including interviews, the analysis of the biannual Welfare Officers' statistical data collection, the Workload Evaluation Survey and interviews across a selected number of Correctional Centres within NSW. The interviewed participants consisted of a cross section of people within the correctional system including Governors, Program Managers, Welfare Services staff and inmates.

The major findings of the study indicate that although the provision of welfare services within Correctional Centres in NSW remains prolific, this current level of demand and service delivery is hampered by limited resources, insufficient training strategies and restricted access to professional supervision. The study indicates that planned strategies are required to further develop the policies and procedures of Welfare Services.

The study briefly examined a variety of correctional welfare services across Australia. The study found that although demand levels for welfare services remain generally high across Australia, the delivery of these services is approached via a number of difference delivery models.

The study recommends a number of changes in the current delivery and development of Welfare Services. The study focuses on the need for development strategies within Welfare Services. The facilitation of these strategies will require committed funding. These recommendations are intended to function as tools for future planning initiatives undertaken by Welfare Services. These initiatives are necessary if this service is to remain a responsive arm of the NSW Department of Corrective Services.
WELFARE OFFICERS’ WORKLOAD EVALUATION

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

TO ESTABLISH APPROPRIATE AND RESPONSIVE BENCHMARKS FOR WELFARE OFFICER STAFFING LEVELS IN RESPONSE TO SPECIALISED NEEDS OF CORRECTIONAL CENTRES WITHIN NEW SOUTH WALES.

TO IDENTIFY THE GENERIC AND SPECIALISED TRAINING NEEDS FOR WELFARE OFFICERS IN DIFFERENT CATEGORY CORRECTIONAL CENTRES.

TO DEVELOP STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING THE WORKLOAD OF WELFARE OFFICERS.

TO PROVIDE A BASIS FOR THE PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISION OF WELFARE OFFICERS BY THE REGIONAL SENIOR WELFARE OFFICERS AND CHIEF WELFARE OFFICER.
METHODOLOGY

This section details the various social research methods utilised to complete the aims and objectives of this study. Due to time constraints, it was not possible to research every correctional centre in NSW, therefore 11 correctional centres were selected for participation. These correctional centres were selected to reflect classification and specialisation requirements of the NSW correctional system. The following centres participated in the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correctional Centre</th>
<th>Category/Specialised Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td>‘C’ Classification - long and short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>‘A’ Classification - long term and remand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithgow</td>
<td>‘A’ Classification - long and short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bay Complex</td>
<td>Regional Aboriginal Welfare Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bay Hospital</td>
<td>Mental Health, Intellectually Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bay Remand</td>
<td>Remand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Bay R.I.C</td>
<td>Screening and Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulawa</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parklea</td>
<td>Young Offenders Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Heliers</td>
<td>‘C2’ classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater</td>
<td>Works Release Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of social research methods were utilised throughout this study. These included:

- interviews
- Welfare Officer Workload Evaluation Survey May 1997
- Welfare Officer Statistical Data Nov 1996 and May 1997
- policy and procedure analysis

(Please refer to Appendix 1 for details of the design of survey and statistical data collection.)

The following section details the research methods used:

Interviews

Throughout the study, 81 individuals were interviewed. These individuals represented a cross section of the NSW Correctional System, as well as representatives of other Australian State Correctional Services. The following list details the diversity of individuals interviewed:
## Representative Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Officers</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Welfare Officers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Welfare Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Managers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>20 (randomly selected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Victoria</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South Aust.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- West Aust.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Queensland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tasmania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Northern T.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL 81**

Each interview focused on any of the following issues:

* Identification of Welfare workload through operational referral system.
* Identification of range and diversity of Welfare tasks.
* Identification of resources made available to Welfare Officers.
* Examination of the extent of control by Welfare Officers of their workload.
* Examination on whether the perception of Welfare tasks by IDS and custodial staff differ.
* Identification of 'gaps' in skills which effect work practice.
* The extent of Welfare Officers' role and participation in case management.
* Examination of any impediments to full participation in case management.
* Any tasks currently undertaken by Welfare Officers that could be performed by other categories of staff.
* Examination of the extent of Welfare Officers’ participation in community/government organisations directly effecting inmates and their families.
* Examination of any impediments to Welfare Officers’ role in relation to families and community/government organisations.

### Workload Evaluation Survey

Every Welfare Officer attached to a correctional centre participating in this study, was asked to complete the Workload Evaluation Survey. (Please see Appendix 1 for details)
The focus of the Survey was to compare and contrast differences in service provision in the correctional centres participating in the study. The following list represents the variable used in measuring the differences:

- percentage of time spent in crisis work (weekly)
- percentage of time spent in counselling and follow up work (weekly)
- percentage of time spent in group work (weekly)
- number of inappropriate referrals to Welfare Services (weekly)
- contribution to Case Management
- number of contact with clients/inmates/agencies (daily)
- number of phone contact
- resources available for Welfare Officers’ use.

Welfare Officer Statistical Data Collection

The Study utilised data collected from all Welfare Officers in all correctional centres across NSW. This data is collected by Welfare Services bi-annually, in May and November of each year. The data analysed, for the purposes of this study, were November 1996 and May 1997.

Process of Research

• Analysis of the most recent statistical information gathered from all Welfare Officers across NSW in November 1996 and May 1997.

• Data from the interviews was used to analyse existing workloads and to make recommendations for workload “bench marking”.

• Information gathered from the Workload Evaluation Survey was analysed and utilised to measure resource levels, workload levels and work expectations for Welfare Officers in specialised correctional centres across NSW.

• Information gathered from the November 1996 statistics was used as the basis of a number of interviews with inmates from each of the identified Centres.

• Governors’ and Program Managers’ advice was obtained wherever possible, regarding role and function of Welfare Officers.
PART TWO
The following section will explore some of the myths and facts surrounding the work practice of Welfare Officers within NSW Correctional Centres. These Myths and Facts have been compiled from interviews conducted throughout the study. The Myths represented below, are direct quotes from interviewees of this study and reflect some of the general and accepted perceptions of Welfare Services, while the Facts have been derived from a number of sources utilised throughout this study including: interviews, survey questionnaire and statistical feedback of data gathering across Welfare Services in November 1996 and May 1997. The individuals interviewed for this study represent a cross section of stakeholders found within correctional centres. These include:

- Governors
- Senior Welfare Officers
- Program Managers
- Welfare Officers
- Chief Welfare Officer
- Inmates

**MYTH**

"Welfare Officers are not qualified professionals".

**FACT**

Of the Welfare Officers interviewed for this study, approximately 80% had tertiary qualifications in one or more of the following areas:
- Social Science
- Psychology
- Criminology
- Social Welfare Services

Of this 80%, approx 15-20% of Welfare Officers have, or are completing, Master or Doctorate degrees in one or more of the following areas:
- Counselling
- Social Sciences
- Science
- Psychology
- Policy Studies
MYTH

"Welfare Officers’ caseloads range between 120-200 inmates per officer”.

FACT

It is generally envisioned that on top of the caseload expectation of 120-200 inmates per Welfare Officer, these Officers are responsible for any ongoing work with families and friends of inmates which is estimated to be approximately four times the acknowledged caseload expectation. For example, a Welfare Officer with a caseload of 180 inmates may have an estimated total potential caseload (inmate and families) of 640. Up until the completion of this study, these figures were never comprehensively estimated for use within the parameters of Welfare Services planning strategies.

MYTH

"Welfare Services has a defined and structured role in the correctional system”.

FACT

Throughout the interviews conducted, it became apparent that there is no consensus on ‘structured’ or generic models in operation for welfare service provision across the NSW Correctional System. Each Correctional Centre Management Team has specific aims and objectives for the provision of welfare services within their correctional centre. These aims and objectives differed across the State, usually reflecting the needs of an individual correctional centre, rather than adhering to any accepted theoretical ethos and work practice of social service professionals. Although this correctional strategy may allow structural flexibility and increase abilities to react to presented problems more efficiently, the undefined parameters often lead to over usage of Welfare Services for inappropriate reasons. For example, many Welfare Officers stated that they felt they are excepted to perform tasks that lie outside their own perceptions of their professional role. Please refer to Part Two, Section D for details of the comprehensive Task List currently performed by Welfare Services across the correctional system.

MYTH

"The completion of welfare work does not require computer resources or access to electronic data bases developed and utilised by Corrective Services”.

FACT

Of the 29 Welfare Officers interviewed for this study, only 4 Welfare Officers had open access to computer resources. Another six Welfare Officers had computer resources but these computers were non functioning and no allocated funding had been resourced for repairing these machines.
All other Welfare Officers had to either share one computer between 6-8 IDS staff, or had no practical access to computers at all. This situation exists despite the fact that Welfare Officers are required to produce and manage PRC reports, Case Management reports and Case Load files for between 120 - 200 inmates each.

Only 2 Welfare Officers interviewed had feasible or immediate access to ORS/OMS data base despite the fact that most of their casework required access to the resources of this database. General welfare enquires to this database include:

- existing Apprehended Violence Orders
- existing Domestic Violence Orders
- visiting record of inmate’s families.
- active discipline orders which affect access to family visits.
- history of program participation.
- classification issues.
- Probation and Parole issues.
- inmate movements and whereabouts

**MYTH**

“Welfare work is not stress inducing work, therefore debriefing procedures are not required for Welfare Officers when dealing with crisis work”.

**FACT**

All Welfare Officers interviewed for this study stated that stress management was an ever-present challenge to the efficiency and effectiveness of their work practice. This identified stress fell into two areas:

1. Workload levels
2. Nature of welfare work

Although over 55% of interviewed Welfare Officers stated that their workload involved 50 - 100% crisis work, only 3 Welfare Officers were offered professional debriefing by the Department as a consequence of intervention in an identified critical incident within their correctional centre. All other Welfare Officers stated that they were obliged to seek ‘debriefing’ from their fellow Welfare colleagues or their own family. Examples of critical incidents may include: death of inmate, death of family member of inmate, serious accident of family or inmate, self harm incident etc.

A minority of the Welfare Officers stated that on some occasions, after being instrumental in dealing with a critical incident, they were then expected to supply ‘debriefing’ to inmates rather than have their own needs met. Although stress is generally acknowledged as an occupational hazard, few Welfare Officers are given assistance in managing stress related to their work.
MYTH

"Welfare work is generic across the correctional system".

FACT

Over the past five to ten years, the Department has been moving towards the specialisation of the inmate population. For example: Young Offenders, D.D Units, Sex Offender Programs etc. This streamlining has necessitated a change in welfare service provision to reflect the needs of inmates in specialised centres. Now, more than ever, Welfare Services need to respond to the reflected need identified within a particular correctional centre in order to provide the services which are most effective, time efficient and constructive in the management of the inmate.

Although the interviewed Welfare Officers agreed that there are a number of generic welfare tasks which were performed across the correctional system, they did confirm that the majority of tasks they performed generally reflected the needs of the specialised inmate population of their particular correctional centre.

MYTH

"Welfare Officers are contributing directly to case management processes".

FACT

The large majority of Welfare Officers stated that they do believe they are given direct opportunities to contribute to Case Management processes. Reasons for this perception were given as follows:

- Welfare Services are not perceived to be of great importance or significance to the Program Review Committees procedure.

- Pressure of workload often negated participation in Case Management meetings and participation.

- Welfare Officers were rarely asked, or expected to participate, in Case Management Teams.

- Welfare Officers are perceived by custodial Case Officers to be responsible for all minor inmate welfare requests, rather than the case Officers dealing with the problems themselves.

- Welfare Officers are not perceived to have any authority in determining appropriateness of welfare referrals, therefore cannot question relevancy in case management process.
SECTION B

INTERVIEWS

As part of the study, 81 individuals were interviewed. Please refer to Part One - Methodology for details. These interviews raised a number of crucial issues directly related to the aims and objectives of this workload evaluation of Welfare Officers within NSW Correctional Centres. This section also contains a number of quotes from Welfare Officers and inmates which reflect some of the perceptions of operational systems within the correctional system. The most pertinent and relevant issues have been divided into three main areas: Work Related Issues, Role of Welfare in Correctional Centres and The Future of Welfare in NSW Correctional Centres.

WORK RELATED ISSUES

Workload Levels of Welfare Officers

All interviewees were asked to comment on their perceptions of Welfare Officers’ current workload within Correctional Centres. Opinions were diverse, depending on the individual’s position within the correctional system and their particular Correctional Centre. Although all of the interviewees perceived the workload expectations to be high and demanding, some interviewees did not perceive the tasks performed by Welfare Officers to be stressful, nor did they believe that environmental conditions contributed to stress levels. Some interviewees expressed the belief that Welfare Officers performed basic tasks that required very little training and did not believe that these tasks could induce a ‘stressed’ work environment. On the other hand, many interviewees perceived that Welfare Officers were affected by impossibly high workload demands. This issue of workload levels manifests a number of problems. An inmate described how she felt about why and how the demands are placed on Welfare Services:

“Most girls know how busy Welfare are (sic), but it doesn’t stop them demanding to see them and then coming back and slagging them off because they’re too busy to see them there and then, you know, the girls will try this every day until they get what they want... they’re bored too and the officers don’t help very much”.

Female Inmate May 1997

A number of interviewees explained that in the past, there was a general assumption that the need for intensive welfare services were found predominately within remand and reception centres and some specialised facilities. Ideally, as inmates were identified or progressed through classification requirements, they were placed in minimum security facilities. It was envisaged
that in these minimum security facilities, welfare services were no longer a priority. The assumption was that 'reactive' welfare services were prioritised within remand and reception centres and 'proactive' welfare service provision was prioritised in minimum security facilities. Along with this assumption, was the belief that 'reactive' welfare services resulted in high workload demands and 'proactive' welfare services resulted in lower workload demands.

A number of the interviews indicated that throughout the 1990s, the NSW Correctional System has been extending the use of more specialised correctional centres. This can be observed through the use of young offender facilities, works release facilities etc. Of the 11 Correctional Centres participating in this study, all play specialised roles within the whole structure of the NSW Correctional System. This has fundamentally affected the workload expectations of welfare services within correctional centres. A majority of interviewees expressed a belief that both 'reactive' and 'proactive' welfare service provision are utilised throughout the whole system although the 'ratio demand level' for these different forms of welfare service is dependent on the specialised needs of each Correctional Centre. It is also important to note, that Welfare Officers believe that both 'reactive' and 'proactive' welfare services are stress inducing, time consuming and on many occasions complex in nature. For example, Welfare Officers working in remand centres stated that they spend over 80% of their work time initiating 'reactive' welfare services and that their workload is very demanding. Welfare Officers in minimum security facilities stated that they initiate both 'reactive'(50% of work time) and 'proactive'(50% of work time) welfare services and believe their workload expectations were just as demanding.

"It's common to give away hours... sometimes you can't go home until a crisis has been dealt with and all the follow up work that is necessary... you never make up these hours. It's also common practice to work through our lunch break because the workload demands are too heavy".

Welfare Officer May 1997

One interviewee explained that the workload expectations placed on Welfare Services are due to a number of factors:

- generic work practice of welfare based services.
- over reliance on 'problem solving' by Welfare Services by other stakeholders in centre such as: inmates, IDS staff, custodial staff.
- propensity for 'dependent or manipulative' behaviour of inmate population.
- personal expectations of role by individual Welfare Officers.
It was also explained that there were a number of other factors that impinged on the efficient execution of their workload:

- ‘Unreal’ expectations of client contact. (97% of Welfare Officers deal with 10 - 20+ clients/inmates per day - please refer to Part Two, Section C for details)

- Case Officers and other IDS staff are too reliant on referral mechanisms to Welfare Services, rather than dealing with minor welfare issues themselves. (According to the latest Welfare Officers Statistical Information for May 1997, 1715 referrals were received by Welfare Services in this month. Welfare Services also received 342 inappropriate referrals in this month. Please refer to Appendix 7 for examples of inappropriate referrals to Welfare Services)

- Unclear parameters defining the tasks performed by Welfare Officers in Correctional Centres. (Please refer to Part Two, Section D for comprehensive task list)

- Inadequate resources available to Welfare Officers, impinge on efficient workload execution. Of the Welfare Officers interviewed for this study, only 14% had open access to computer facilities including word processing, data base, OMS system, network facilities. Only 30% of Welfare Officers had answer machine facilities, although 83% receive between 10 and 40 phone calls a day. (Please refer to Part Two, Section C for details)

- Lack of adequate supervision and debriefing. The majority of Welfare Officers complained about the current level of supervision and debriefing available to them. Many stated that the nature of their workload necessitated increased supervision and organised ‘debriefing’ and ‘preventative stress’ programs.

Current Welfare Officer Workload Levels

Please refer to Appendices 4 & 5 for details of the biannual Welfare Officer Statistics.

Inmate Interviews


It is estimated that throughout any given year, Welfare Services can expect to conduct approximately 100,000 welfare related interviews with inmates.
Family Interviews


It is estimated that throughout any given year, Welfare Services can expect to conduct approximately 50,000 welfare related interviews with families of inmates. It is important to note that only a small minority of these interviews are conducted within the correctional centre. The large majority of the interviews are conducted over the telephone due to a number of reasons including family location, inmate location, legal reasons etc.

Referral Rate to Welfare Services


It is estimated that throughout any given year, Welfare Services can expect to receive approximately 20,500 welfare related referrals.

Critical Incident Interviews

In May 1997, Welfare Officers conducted 177 welfare related critical incident interviews with inmates.

It is estimated that throughout any given year, Welfare Services can expect to conduct approximately 2,100 welfare related critical incident interviews with inmates.

These examples of Welfare Officers' workload levels have been utilised to illustrate the volume of work expected of this position within the correctional system. For detailed information concerning the diversity of client contact etc, please refer to Part Two, Section D.

Welfare Officers and Stress

The majority of Welfare Officers interviewed, agreed that the stress related problems of their work can be categorised in two ways: the demand level of their workload and the nature of their workload.

The Demand Level of Workload

As discussed above, the workload demands were acknowledged as being very high and bring about major concerns surrounding stress management. One interviewee commented that strategies of stress management in this area, is a two fold issue: personal responsibility and system responsibility. Most interviewees concurred with this assertion and believed that the
individual has as much responsibility to manage the effects of stress as the Department has to minimising the effects of working in a stress inducing system. For example, one Welfare Officer commented that stress is as much related to individual work practice as systemic management strategies:

“You have to make your own boundaries, you reach a point when you have done all you can and decide, it's not my responsibility anymore and let it go... it's hard to do, but if you don’t you’ll go nuts...it's hard because you know, that no one else in this system will do anything, but you have to cut off, you can’t do anymore... I am not responsible for their position”.

Welfare Officer May 1997

Another Welfare Officer explained that inmates’ needs and systemic management within Correctional Centres often leads to stress for service providers such as Welfare Services if these factors are inconsistent:

“stress derives from a combination of the management system and the inmate’s needs. It’s this combination overload which is intermittent not constant that proves stressful”.

Welfare Officer May 1997

It is important to note, that throughout most of these interviews, stress was acknowledged as an ever present component of service provision within a correctional centre. Some Welfare Officers interviewed commented that they practised a number of stress management techniques including:

- colleague debriefing where possible.
- leaving the work environment during lunch break.
- funding their own debrief and professional supervision.

Other Welfare Officers stated that it is very difficult to practice stress management techniques within a correctional centre. For example:
“we used to go outside and have a smoke, but you get more abuse out there then inside the building”

Welfare Officer May 1997

Nature of Workload

Most of the Welfare Officers interviewed acknowledged that the nature of their work exacerbates work related stress. The following factors contribute to this stress:

- unstable and/or emotionally vulnerable client group
- transitory client group
- potentially aggressive, manipulative or threatening client group
- emotionally and physically threatening work environment
- dealing with effects of crime and criminal offences
- dealing with disadvantaged clients

One Welfare Officer describes her technique in dealing with such a difficult area of welfare service provision:

“ I’ve learned not to take this so seriously. I always take this to heart I guess, what I mean is that it should be OK to feel things... before, when I first started, I didn’t know that you were allowed to feel for these guys and their families”.

Welfare Officer May 1997
Job Satisfaction

Throughout the interviews, Welfare Officers were asked whether job satisfaction played a role in their overall position as a Welfare Officer.

The response to this question was varied. On the whole, Welfare Officers categorised a number of factors which determine levels of job satisfaction. These factors are as follows:

- ability to efficiently perform tasks in order to fulfill workload expectation.
- availability of resources to assist welfare service provision.
- level of qualitative feedback from correctional system stakeholders.
- available access to supervision and debriefing opportunities.

One Welfare Officer described a recent incident involving issues of job satisfaction:

"we felt our positions were not valued here, derogatory comments etc... when we went away to the Welfare Conference, D&A and Psych picked up our workload. The attitude, when we got back, was completely different, it was like, red carpet, people actually said to us - “We didn’t realise the workload that you carry”. That was really good. They appreciated our work... we were then told it was unlikely we would be allowed to go again”.

Welfare Officer May 1997

Crisis Intervention

Throughout the interviews, Welfare Officers were generally acknowledged to play a significant role in crisis intervention within Correctional Centres. It was also acknowledged that Welfare Officers are utilised to address crisis situations directly affecting inmates’ families.

Welfare’s involvement in crisis work was acknowledged by a significant number of Governors, Program Managers, Welfare Officers and inmates. Some of the Welfare Officers who have been employed within the Department for a considerable length of time explained that they felt that Welfare Services had always performed crisis work within the Centres. Over the years, the formalisation of crisis intervention strategies such as Screening has impacted on the welfare role and has led to the blurring of professional boundaries and Welfare Officers’ being responsible to too many ‘stakeholders’.
These Welfare Officers believe that there is a lack of understanding within some Correctional Centres about the complexities of crisis intervention and preventative techniques. This has resulted in some inappropriate use of Welfare Services skills.

"I got called out to the front (Main Gate) because they didn’t know how to handle a visitor. She was high on drugs, wanting to cash a cheque or something. This has nothing to do with Welfare but I thought, here we go again, they didn’t know how to handle a problem, so it came down to Welfare to manage"

Welfare Officer May 1997

Another illustration of inappropriate use of Welfare Services is as follows:

"recently a woman was falsely apprehended by Custodial Officers and searched for possible drug trafficking...they never found any. A Welfare Officer had to write the report, make the contact and do all the apologising because the Custodial Officers had stuffed it up. It’s not right"

Welfare Officer May 1997

In other Correctional Centres, there seems to be a more concerted effort to fully respond to the complexities of a crisis situation with appropriate use of Welfare Services’ skills. For example, in a small number of Correctional Centres, Welfare Officers are essential members of Risk Intervention Teams which aim to avert potentially critical incidents with the use of both reactive and proactive strategies, rather than utilising Welfare Services as a purely reactive tool after a critical incident has occurred.

A number of Welfare Officers were asked how they dealt with a particular crisis within their service provision. It was explained that in an acute critical incident, Welfare can act as the facilitator for other Inmate Development Services, such as Psychology. For example, one Welfare Officer explained how she deals with potentially suicidal inmates:

"I just talk to them and if it gets too much or they are too distressed, I ask them if they would like to speak to Psychology... I bring Psychology in with me, sort of hand it over, make that transition".

Welfare Officer May 1997
Welfare Officers were also asked to describe some of the stress and crisis minimisation techniques they utilise. Most officers responded that they felt the crucial element to responsive and effective crisis work lies in the ability to stabilise a client in a trusted or safe environment before any reactive work can be initiated.

"If I see someone who's really angry, you can't get a word in, it's best to remain quiet and let them go, they usually calm down to a level that you can say "OK let's look at a few things...what's eating you etc.... They may start with a load of issues....then it comes down to the main issue and you can start your work".

Welfare Officer May 1997

Debriefing

As part of the Welfare Officers' Statistical Data collected in May 1997, Welfare Officers across the State, conducted 177 critical incident interviews. Welfare Officers were also asked to detail any debriefing strategies offered to combat the stress related effects of these interviews. Of the 177 critical incident interviews conducted, debriefing was offered on 15 occasions. Please refer to Appendices 4 & 5 for details of Welfare Services defined 'critical incident'.

One Welfare Officer described how a Correctional Centre recently dealt with debriefing procedures as a result of the death of an inmate:

"we had the death of an inmate and the D&A people had worked with him for a long time and were upset about it, that afternoon the Gaol arranged debriefing for them and you know what we did, went out for tea... we were not offered this debriefing service, although we were the ones that had to deal with all the details...Welfare really needed help then, but we weren't offered it ... why can't this Department acknowledge that Welfare is just as affected by a death as any other service".

Welfare Officer May 1997
Professional Supervision

The issue of Professional Supervision which is discussed in more detail in Part Two, Section G, is of great concern to the Welfare Services personnel interviewed for this study. Many believed that there should be more attention given by the Department, to the provision of regular supervision. On the whole, supervision was seen as positive step in maintaining skill levels or enhancing skills development.

"If we could get the Department to pay for supervision for a couple of hours a month, it would help us as well as the Senior. I have done it myself and it was wonderful, it has taught me the skills I have now... it taught me not to keep things inside, but to let them out and everyone needs to learn from this... everyone needs the opportunity to learn to deal with the problems around us".

Welfare Officer May 1997

A small number of Governors did not agree that supervision was essential. This was generally based on the assumption that welfare tasks did not require specialised skills and therefore supervision was of minimal assistance.

Departmental Resource allocation to Welfare Services

The issue of resource allocation to Welfare Officers was discussed throughout the organised interviews. The response to this issue was varied, dependent upon direct knowledge of welfare service provision. For example, on the whole, Governors were not overly familiar with the resource needs of Welfare Officers within their Correctional Centres. Program Managers, on the other hand, varied in their understanding of resource needs for the Welfare Officers in their correctional centres. Some Program Managers were able to discuss at length, the issue of resource allocation, whereas some Program Managers felt that Welfare Officers did not require basic resources, such as computers, to complete their work related tasks.

Information Technology

A large number of Welfare Officers complained about the lack of information technology freely accessible to them. Officers explained that the limited technology did not seem a great problem to other IDS disciplines. Many officers commented that disciplines such as AOD and Psychology appeared to have more available resources at their convenience. Some officers expressed a sense of inequality between IDS disciplines which had led to some conflict in the past.
This sense of inequality is attributed to a number of factors:

* undervalued work practice of Welfare Services
* lack of consistent communication between internal systems within Centres
* higher workload expectations for Welfare Service then other disciplines
* less defined service parameters for Welfare Services then other disciplines

All personnel directly working within Welfare Services agreed that the current level of resource allocation had a number of other effects. These are as follows:

- aggravated problems with service provision efficiency.
- hampered quick response rate to case management requirements.
- exacerbated stress levels associated with service provision.
- intensified communication problems between service providers and clients.
- sharpened perception of low job satisfaction if Welfare Service resource allocation was compared to other Inmate Development Services.
- made them vulnerable to breaching legal requirements eg: AVOs and DVOs.

Throughout the interviews, Welfare Officers were asked to comment on their current work environments, particularly their office space etc. Most interviewees commented that they felt their work environments were not considered by correctional centre management to be important in the delivery of their service. Many Officers felt that the location of their offices reflected an unconcern for both their personal environment and in some cases, their personal safety. A number of Officers explained that their office space was not conducive to maintaining optimum safety levels. For example, one officer commented:

"My office is completely isolated from custodial view and overlooks the 'pound' area of the Centre. This can sometimes mean that I have to put up with inmates screaming and shouting while I'm supposed to carry out a busy and confidential service... sometimes the noise never stops"

Welfare Officer May 1997
Another interviewee explained that the Welfare Service in a Centre shared both office space and phone lines. This meant that it was impossible to conduct confidential interviews and only one phone call could be made at any one time. The implications of this inconvenience meant that the work practice of this service delivery has become difficult to manage and time consuming.

Throughout a number of interviews, Officers expressed a sense of frustration over attitudes by other staff concerning the provision of welfare services. One officer recounted a recent problem in one centre where other IDS disciplines objected to the high traffic level of inmates accessing Welfare Services. In this instance, other IDS staff complained at the high level of inmates accessing the designated IDS area and objected to having Welfare Services situated in this location and Welfare office space was duly relocated. This has caused undue problems for the effective provision of service and no solution to this problem has manifested.

"It's a joke, we get complaints if we don't see 20 inmates a day, and when we do, they (other staff) complain about the inconvenience it causes them... you would think we would warrant more support".

Welfare Officer May 1997

Many Welfare Officers commented that they had tried to negotiate better working environments but few had had success in gaining support with Centre management. A number of officers had approached Occupational Health and Safety Committees in their Centres but few had success in improving their environment.

"As you can see, my office doesn't have any windows and lousy air conditioning, I sometimes feel I work in a coffin... we have complained through the OHS committee but they say it meets minimum health requirements... I don't know ...even the inmates get windows".

Welfare Officer May 1997

One Welfare Officer raised an interesting issue relating to the affect of the allocation of resources to inmates and how this can adversely affect welfare service provision:

“it’s not just Welfare's lack of resources, it’s the inmates lack of resources that adds to Welfare’s workload...no law library, no access to library, no access to legal phones, no pads and pencils, no tables etc. If they had resources they wouldn’t need to access Welfare”.

Welfare Officer May 1997
ROLE OF WELFARE IN CORRECTIONAL CENTRES

Function of Welfare Services within Correctional Centres

Interviewees were asked to comment on how they perceived the function of Welfare Services, within a correctional centre. Opinions on this subject were varied and generally dependent upon the position of the interviewee within the centres. For example, Welfare Officers found a number of issues impinged on their ability to precisely define the function of Welfare Services. These issues are as follows:

• LACK OF CLEARLY DEFINED WELFARE SERVICE PARAMETERS
• NO ONGOING ANALYSIS OF THE CHANGING NEEDS OF INMATES AND THEIR FAMILIES
• DIVERSITY OF INTERPRETATION OF WELFARE SERVICES ROLE WITHIN CASE MANAGEMENT
• DIVERSITY OF CRISIS WORK STRATEGIES WITHIN CORRECTIONAL CENTRES

Governors and Program Managers generally had an understanding of generic welfare needs within Correctional Centres although the use of Welfare Officers varies considerably. Certain Correctional Centres prefer that Welfare Officers are an integral part of crisis intervention strategies, other Correctional Centres prefer their Welfare Officers to particularly focus on proactive work such as pre-release planning etc. These differing approaches to the use of welfare resources reflect both the diversity and specialised nature of Correctional Centres, as well as the confusion and role blurring referred to above.

The interviews conducted with participating inmates yielded interesting information concerning their perceptions of the role and function of Welfare Services.

The issue of trust was important to most of the inmates interviewed. Many inmates felt that there were very few mechanisms within the correctional system in which an inmate could openly discuss personal issues without these issues being raised in conjunction with Classification and placement decisions. For example, quite a number of inmates commented that although they would utilise the facilities of Psychology and Alcohol and other Drug Services if needed, they felt that the information given to these disciplines by the individual, would be used by these disciplines in decision making processes such as Parole, Placement Review Committees etc. On the other hand, many inmates felt that Welfare Services and counselling were confidential by nature, enabling them to maintain some level of control over the interpretation of family and/or social issues which affected them.
"You see Welfare for just about everything, especially family stuff, you know, contact, maintaining relationships, stuff about your kids... you have to trust the Welfare Officer because you talk about personal stuff and you don’t want everyone to know your business."

Male Inmate May 1997

Inmates were questioned on why they generally felt unease about interacting with other IDS disciplines. Most inmates commented that they felt Psychology and AOD services were narrowly targeted and did not generically respond to inmates’ whole needs.

The inmates also displayed a general lack of understanding about the roles of Psychology and AOD in assisting the resolution of issues affecting their behaviour. Some inmates commented that they were instructed to attend Psychology and AOD counselling sessions in order to fulfil program requirements for Parole and PRC, but felt very little personal reward:

"I come from another State, I’ve been in gaol there as well. There’s not much difference really... if I need to off load problems I’ll go to see Welfare, never Psych. I’m not crazy”.

Female Inmate May 1997

"Seeing Welfare stops the ‘head miles’ in gaol, you know what I mean?"

Male Inmate May 1997

"I see Welfare to get things off my chest, anything from drug use, family conflict, gaol pressure you name it, but only if I reckon I can trust the Welfare Officer”.

Male Inmate May 1997
A further issue surrounding the function of Welfare Services within Correctional Centres focuses on legal issues. This issue was particularly pertinent for Welfare Officers working in remand and reception facilities. Many Officers believe that there has been a steady increase in inmate demands for legal advice and access to legal representation. Most Correctional Centres studied for this Report tended to rely on Welfare Services to facilitate inmate access to legal representation, legal advice and explanations of the Judicial System.

Although it is recognised that Welfare should be knowledgeable in the workings of the Criminal Justice System, many officers commented that inmates are relying too heavily on their assistance in these matters. The following reasons were given for this increase in reliance:

- **LACK OF ADEQUATE LAW RESOURCES TO REMAND INMATES.**
- **LACK OF ACCESSIBILITY TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION, ESPECIALLY IF REMANDED IN COUNTRY CENTRES.**
- **EFFECT OF INTRODUCTION OF ARUNTA PHONE SYSTEM ACROSS CORRECTIONAL CENTRES.**

One Welfare Officer commented:

> “For PRC we need a good understanding of law, but we shouldn’t be relied on to provide paralegal advice as we are now”.

**Welfare Officer May 1997**

A number of Welfare Officers raised the issue of whether it is appropriate to allow inmates to request legal advice from Welfare Officers, when no clear Departmental guidelines have been developed. They also questioned how equipped Welfare Services was in responding to this need. A number of Correctional Centres have not provided Welfare Services with basic resources like The Legal Handbook. Throughout the conducted interviews, only a handful of Welfare Officers had participated in Departmental training in judicial mechanisms such as bail, fines, sentencing etc. All other Officers explained that this training had not been offered to them and their extensive knowledge had been gained through work experience or previous tertiary training.

A small number of Welfare Officers also explained that Case Officers would frequently request welfare assistance for an inmate concerning legal advice.

**Access to Welfare Services**

Interviewees were asked to comment on the accessibility of Welfare Services within Correctional Centres. The comments are diverse and dependent on need and centre management strategies.
The Welfare Officers' comments surrounding the issue of access were varied. On the one hand, some Officers commented that Welfare Services should be extremely accessible with 'open door' policies and unstructured program delivery. These Officers argue that due to the fact that most of their clients are undergoing a series of ongoing small crises, it is essential to provide a fully accessible service. On the other hand, some Officers commented that 'open door' appointments were intrinsically difficult to manage and increased both workload and worker stress levels. They also argued that ‘open door’ appointments also led to high volume reactive work without clear analysis or control.

When Program Managers were asked to comment on the access issue of Welfare Services, the responses were equally varied. Some Program Managers felt that ‘open door’ appointments are essential and the most effective use for defusing potentially critical incidences among inmates. Other Program Managers commented that open access to Welfare Services proved difficult to manage and could lead to impossible workload expectations.

When Governors were asked to comment on the access issue of Welfare Services, the responses were also varied. A number of Governors commented that an inmate should be able to access Welfare Services at all times (outside inmate Industries work schedules), other Governors felt that inmates should be expected to exercise self responsibility and should understand the enormous pressure placed on Welfare Service resources. Some Governors commented that due to the limited number of available Welfare staff, open door appointments were impossible to initiate, despite demand levels.

A number of inmates commented that access to Welfare Services was reasonable and efficient, whereas some inmates commented that access to Welfare Services was difficult. These views generally correlated with security arrangements in Correctional Centres. For example, inmates in higher security facilities tended to believe that access to Welfare Services was not a high priority and security issues tended to negate the validity of inmates seeking assistance in crisis situations.

"We have problems all the time getting access to Welfare. They're either too busy or the officers won't put your referral through".

Male Inmate May 1997

Another issue raised by a small number of inmates refers to the needs of specifically classified inmates. For example, a number of inmates were interviewed who were currently serving custodial sentences of five years or more. Most of these inmates commented that they felt Welfare Services were directed towards short term offenders and protection inmates and the volume of work generated by these specific groups of inmates left little available time for long term offenders' needs.

Most of these long term offenders, felt that due to the crisis intervention work practice of Welfare Services within most Correctional Centres, inmates with a desire or need to resolve issues
related to long term planning, such as building community support networks, were not given equal opportunity to develop.

"You know, lifers are the forgotten prisoners, the short termers suck up all Welfare's time and they never get to work on your issues.... just because I'm in here for a long time, it doesn't mean I don't have plans for the future".

Male Inmate May 1997

An interesting point raised throughout the interviews with inmates was how most inmates perceive the parameters of welfare service provision. Some inmates insisted that Welfare Services should not be limited to specific aims and objectives, thereby ensuring that this Service remains very accessible and fluid in structure, whereas other inmates stated that they felt Welfare Services should be heavily focused on inmates with families.

A small number of inmates felt that they did not feel they could access Welfare Services unless they had family issues to resolve:

"I'm a lifer. I don't go to see Welfare, except when my Dad died nine years ago. He was the last of my family so I haven't had much need for them since. I've been in gaol for a very long time and I know things have changed and I know Welfare is important in the system to stem aggression and stress, you know, strung out... but you shouldn't rely on them".

Male Inmate May 1997

An interesting point raised by some of the inmates was Welfare Services' responses to inmates from non English speaking backgrounds. One inmate explained that he was currently serving his first custodial sentence, had only received assistance from Welfare Services and had not accessed any other IDS services.

"I'm from Laos originally, but that was twenty years ago but everyone assumes I can't speak English. I've never been to gaol before and no-one bothered to tell me anything about the system".

Male Inmate May 1997

The majority of interviewed Welfare Officers stated that they had conference facility telephones and had accessed Interpreter Services on numerous occasions. Most officers also commented that
welfare work practices with inmates from non English speaking backgrounds were more difficult to manage and relied on the co-operation of the individual inmate, particularly when dealing with families.

A number of Aboriginal Welfare Officers were interviewed across the State. They were asked to comment on how and if their role differed from other Welfare Officers. Some officers commented that they felt that they were sometimes overwhelmed by the workload expectations for Aboriginal inmates for a number of reasons. These are as follows:

* expectation that they function as overall liaison officers for Centres with Aboriginal individuals and communities.
* expectation that they consult on all forms of cultural issues for all tribes throughout NSW.
* expected to mediate on issues related to security management of Aboriginal inmates.
* inappropriate use of their welfare expertise.
* insufficient Aboriginal designated Welfare Officer positions.

Case Management

All the interviewees were asked to comment on how they perceived the role of Welfare Services within the case management structure.

Welfare Officers, on the whole demonstrated a good understanding of the principles of case management, but raised a number of issues concerning Welfare Service contributions to case management. These are as follows:

- **INAPPROPRIATE REFERRALS FROM CASE OFFICERS**
- **LIMITED USE OF WELFARE EXPERTISE IN DEALING WITH ISSUES ARISING FROM INDIVIDUAL CASE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES**
- **UNCLEAR GUIDELINES IN ROLE OF WELFARE IN CASE MANAGEMENT**

A number of Welfare Officers commented on their involvement in case management and illustrated a number of incidents where case management impacted on their workload. There were a number of positive and negative incidents. For example, one Welfare Officer commented that case management has resulted in a huge increase in inappropriate referrals from case officers:
"We have become the dumping ground for the things the custodial officers don’t want to do"

Welfare Officer May 1997

On the other hand, one Welfare Officer commented that the professional relationship between IDS staff and custodial staff has improved as a consequence of the introduction of case management. This officer believes that through this improved relationship, a lot more constructive work can be achieved:

"It’s a very good idea to have a healthy working relationship with a Case Officer... there is a lot of shades of grey when you deal with an inmate which can be dealt with together".

Welfare Officer May 1997

A number of inmates were asked to comment on how they perceived the relevance of case management. The views of this group were varied and diverse. A number of inmates felt that they did not really understand the principles of case management and felt that case management was nothing more than further intrusions into their personal lives, while others commented that they had participated in constructive case management and had found it useful in some ways.

THE FUTURE OF WELFARE IN NSW CORRECTIONAL CENTRES

Proposed Name Change

Throughout the conducted interviews, many interviewees commented that they feel the use of the term ‘welfare’ is no longer appropriate for a number of reasons. These are as follows:

- OUTDATED AND IRRELEVANT USE OF TERM ‘WELFARE’.
- UNPLEASANT REMINDERS TO MANY INMATES, PARTICULARLY ABORIGINES, OF HISTORICAL WELFARE PRACTICES.
- LABEL OF ‘WELFARE’ DOES NOT REFLECT DIVERSITY OF TASK RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITION WITHIN CORRECTIONAL CENTRE.
• TITLE OF 'WELFARE OFFICER DOES NOT REFLECT THE DIVERSITY OF TASKS PERFORMED BY THE POSITION.

The suggestions on the benefits of a name change, are as follows:

• APPROPRIATELY REFLECTS THE DIVERSITY OF TASKS PERFORMED.
• ELIMINATE NEGATIVE CONNOTATIONS LEFT OVER FROM HISTORICAL ROLE OF WELFARE THROUGHOUT SOCIAL SERVICES.
• ASSIST WITH NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN WORK PRACTICE STRATEGIES.
• REFLECT THE MULTI-SKILLING ABILITIES OF THE CURRENT PERSONNEL.

Correctional Centre Specialisation

A number of interviewees commented that as the Department continues to move towards the utilisation of specialised units and programs, Welfare Services must respond to the diversity of needs and service provision which accompanies these changes.

Some interviewees felt that due to the increasing diversity of multi-skilled staff currently employed in Welfare Services, this Service is in an optimum position to positively respond to the changing needs of the Department.

Some interviewees felt that the impact of case management had meant that the Correctional System had utilised Welfare Services as a primary source of program development. They also feel that more effort must be made in co-ordinating the current Welfare Service into a more dynamic, systemic and responsive arm of the Department.

Future Need for Welfare Services

As referred to earlier in this section, Welfare Services are utilised extensively throughout the Correctional System. This utilisation has a profound effect on the workload expectations of Welfare Officers and fulfils a much needed role within the provision of social services to inmates and their families. A number of interviewees expressed the belief that the needs for welfare service provision will continue to be required within Correctional Centres, but more attention must be focused on the development of several areas. These are as follows:

• PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
• RESOURCE ALLOCATION
• CONTINUITY OF PROGRAM INTERACTION
• DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIALISED WELFARE PROGRAMS
SECTION C

WELFARE WORKLOAD EVALUATION SURVEY

This section details the findings from the Welfare Officers Workload Evaluation Survey conducted for the purposes of this study. The following charts depict the response rates of the participants of the Survey and should be viewed as a sample of the Welfare Officers located within NSW Correctional Centres.

NUMBER OF CLIENT/INMATE CONTACT PER DAY

PERCENTAGE OF ONGOING CASE WORK ON A WEEKLY BASIS

No. of workers

Percentage of work time (weekly basis)
PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT IN CRISIS WORK ON WEEKLY BASIS

No. of Workers

percentage of work time (weekly basis)

PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT IN COUNSELLING WORK ON WEEKLY BASIS

No. of workers

Percentage of work time (weekly basis)
PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT IN GROUP WORK ON WEEKLY BASIS

No. of workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Work Time (Weekly Basis)</th>
<th>No. of Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INAPPROPRIATE REFERRALS RECEIVED ON WEEKLY BASIS

- 1-5 referrals: 20.5%
- 5-10 referrals: 13.5%
- 10-15 referrals: 32.0%
- 15-20 referrals: 13.5%
- 20+ referrals: 20.5%
OPPORTUNITIES TO CONTRIBUTE TO CASE MANAGEMENT

yes 79.0%
no 21.0%

HOURS SPENT WRITING REPORTS FOR CASE MANAGEMENT

1-5 41.5%
5-10 24.0%
10-15 24.0%
15-20 7.0%
20+ 3.5%
HOURS SPENT ATTENDING INTERNAL MEETINGS FOR CASE MANAGEMENT

Meetings include: PRC, Classification, Reception Committee etc.

ESTIMATION OF INCOMING PHONE CALLS TO WELFARE ON DAILY BASIS
ANSWER MACHINE FACILITY IN WELFARE OFFICE

- Yes: 30.0%
- No: 70.0%

OPEN ACCESS TO COMPUTER FACILITIES

- Yes: 14.0%
- No: 86.0%
SECTION D

WELFARE OFFICERS
JOB ANALYSIS

COMPLETE TASK LIST

The following list represents all of the identified tasks CURRENTLY performed by Welfare Officers throughout the NSW Correctional System. The tasks have been categorised into Reception Tasks, Induction Tasks and Case Management Tasks.

For the purposes of this study, these tasks have been prioritised as a toll for possible restructure of the current workload of Welfare Officers. The Complete Task List has been divided into the following prioritised groupings:

ESSENTIAL These tasks have been identified as essential to the requirements of Welfare Services responsibilities.

ADDITIONAL These tasks lie outside of the essential tasks required of Welfare Officers but are perceived to be of importance to the maintenance of effective service provision.

DISPENSABLE These tasks lie outside of effective Welfare Services provision. These tasks have been grouped as Case Officer and Inmate Task Lists.

Please note: These tasks have been identified by Welfare Officers interviewed for the purposes of the Welfare Workload Evaluation research project.

RECEPTION TASKS

ESSENTIAL
- conduct Screening interview for all new reception inmates
- identification and referral of 'at risk' offenders
- liaise with Clinic/RIT on referrals for 'at risk' offenders
- analysis of Court Lodgement form and Warrants for inmate screening information
- analysis of inmate gaol program participation in previous sentences through Case File
- conduct interviews with inmates transferred within the system
- conduct crisis intervention practices when required
- initiate stress minimisation techniques
- facilitate telephone interviews with family, dependents or friends if required
- participate in Risk Intervention Team
- completion of internal referrals
- participation in Reception Committee

ADDITIONAL
- registration and distribution of referrals
- inform Risk Intervention Team and Custodial Services of inmate referrals
**DISPENSABLE** (Custodial Officers)
facilitation of reception call
facilitation of bail phone calls
facilitation of interpreter services for NESB inmates throughout screening process
organise completion of Social Security notification forms
provide information to inmates on various operational systems in correctional centres
completion of Officers Notification Form (Mulawa)
inform Risk Intervention Team and Custodial Services of inmate referrals
assistance with 'personal care' for inmates when required
information given on legal system ie bail, charges, court procedure
information on legal representation
contact crisis organisations ie RSPCA if required

**INDUCTION TASKS**

**ESSENTIAL**
activation of/ or follow up of Reception referrals
participation on Reception Committee
interview every inmate for completion of Welfare Social Assessment Form
conduct crisis intervention practices when required
initiate and/or continue stress minimisation techniques
identify on-going welfare needs of inmates through Program Pathway development
interview family, dependents etc if required for Program Pathway development
completion of any required internal and on-going referrals
participation in Classification Committee

**ADDITIONAL**
participation in other internal Committees when required ie Health Team
provide information to families on various operational systems in gaol
provide information to inmates on specific programs within specialised gaols
provide information to families on specific programs within specialised gaols
initiate contact with government and non government agencies

**DISPENSABLE** (tasks which can be performed by Case Officers)
provide information to inmates on specific programs within specialised gaols
follow up contact family, dependents and friends
provide information to families on various operational systems in gaol
facilitate contact with legal representation
referrals to external organisations ie Prisoners Aid, CRC Justice Support, COPSG

**CASE MANAGEMENT TASKS**

**ESSENTIAL**
conduct appointment interviews with inmates
conduct ‘open door’ interviews
conduct crisis intervention practices when required
initiate and/or continue stress minimisation techniques
conduct interviews with inmates’ families at Centre when requested
conduct interviews with hospitalised inmates within metro and country areas
activation of referrals from Induction and/or Screening
contribute to inmate case management files
organise and conduct home visits when required
verification on specified internal requests (blue application) relating to inmate needs
production of information leaflets for inmates and/or families concerning specific programs
provide information to inmates on various operational systems in gaol
provide information to families on various operational systems in gaol
provide information to inmates on specific programs within specialised gaols
provide information to families on specific programs within specialised gaols
family counselling (reconciliation, maintenance, establishment)
grief counselling
crisis counselling
relationship counselling (parenting, partners, ex-partners, siblings)
verification of family details in Compassionate Leave Applications
conduct interviews with families in relation to Compassionate Leave Applications
verification of details in Special Gratuity Applications
notification to families of death of inmate whilst in custody
conduct welfare interviews with families of inmates’ who die whilst in custody
provide assistance to families of deceased inmates when requested
completion of PRC reports
completion of Classification reports
completion of Welfare reports
participation in Classification Committee
participation in Program Review Committees
participation in Health Team Meetings
participation in Health Case Management Reviews (Hospital/Burdekin positions only)
attendance of Mental Health Tribunal when requested
participation in IDS Meetings
participation in staff meetings
participation in/or organisation of Living Skills Program
participation in and/or organisation of Pre-Release Programs
organisation of group work with inmates, including:
  - Post release issues
  - Parenting
  - Self esteem
  - Mediation/conflict resolution
  - Stress Management
organisation of government agency information talks
organise referrals for post release services
supervise Welfare Studies students on tertiary placements
participation in Mothers and Children Committee (women)
liease with various government agencies
  - Aboriginal Land Councils
    - family contacts
  - Community Health Teams
    - post release referrals
    - information
  - Dept of Community Services
    - Disability Services
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liaise with various non government agencies

including:

Prisoners Aid
- referrals
- liaison with property
- facilitate services

CRC Justice Support
- referrals
- liaison pre-release
- facilitate services
- prison workshops

COPSG
- referrals
- liaison with contact
- parenting courses

Guthrie House
- referrals
- liaison pre-release

Family Support Agencies State wide
Aboriginal Accommodation Services
Aboriginal Childrens' Services
Linkup
ADDITIONAL

activation of referrals from custodial staff ie Wing Officers, Case Officers, Overseers
activation of referrals from custodial staff specifically concerning ‘protection’ inmates
mediate interviews between inmates and family and or govt organisations
domestic violence counselling
parenting counselling
facilitation of drug and alcohol counselling
facilitation of psychological counselling
facilitation of and/or organise inter-gaol phone calls between inmates
facilitation of family visits to remote gaols
facilitation of Travel Assistance Scheme for inmates’ families
production of leaflets detailing accommodation options for families visiting inmates
participation in Inmate Development Committees
participation in Aboriginal Inmate Meetings (aboriginal designated)
participation in Correctional Centre Management Meetings
participation in inter-agency meetings
assist inmates with contacting Official Visitor
liaise with Official Visitor to facilitate ‘feedback’ with inmate requests
provide information talks for Welfare students visiting gaol
co-ordinate Aboriginal community projects (Aboriginal designated)
liaise with Regional Aboriginal Projects Officer
liaise with various government agencies
including:

Child Support Agency
- registration
- payment issues
Dept of Immigration
- passports
- deportation investigations
- field officer investigations
- Consulate enquiries
Dept of Juvenile Justice
- liaison needs
- location of relatives
- case management
- Aboriginal Liaison Officer
Guardianship Board
- attend meetings
- assistance
- fine payments
- information
- referrals
Drug and Alcohol Rehabs State wide
Womens’ Refuges State wide
Accommodation Services State wide
Major Charities State wide
Ex Aboriginal Reserves State wide
Cultural Centres and Organisations
Consulates
Aboriginal Death in Custody Watch Committee
DISPENSABLE (tasks which can be performed by Case Officers)
organising access/contact with children/family and friends
facilitating overseas phone calls with inmate’s family (subject to approval)
facilitation of Interpreter Services for NESB inmates
facilitate access to legal representation
organise solicitor/inmate interviews within correctional centre
organise interviews between inmates and non government organisations
organise interviews between inmates and government organisations
contact government and non government agencies on request
assist with the organisation of inmate weddings
organise clothes for inmate on discharge or court appearances
organise travel arrangements for inmates on discharge
collect travel tickets for discharged inmates released on weekends
arrange transport for discharged inmates to most convenient travel depot
advocacy on behalf of inmates involving escort and transfer issues
advocacy on behalf of inmates involving classification issues
advocacy on behalf of inmates involving issues of ‘protection’
facilitation of and/or organise inter-gaol phone calls between inmates
facilitation of family visits to remote Correctional Centres
arrange accommodation for families visiting remote gaols
arrange accommodation for families from the country visiting metro gaols
organise transport between gaol and train/bus in remote gaols
participation in Inmate Development Committees
assist in organising gaol events, including: Family Days
Cultural Festivals
Aboriginal Week
organisation of legal interviews for inmates
conduct inmate banking, loan renegotiation, debt management (country gaols)
facilitate arrangements for inmate identification papers prior to release
organise completion of Social Security Special Benefit Form prior to release
assist inmates with contacting Official Visitor
liaise with Official Visitor to facilitate “feedback” with inmate requests
respond to custodial requests to mediate in disputes in Visits section involving visitors
co-ordinate sporting events (Aboriginal designated)
liaise with Regional Aboriginal Projects Officer
liaise with various government agencies
 including: Aboriginal Land Councils
 - cultural issues
Child Support Agency
 - registration
 - payment issues
Courts
 - Local Courts
 - District Courts
 - Supreme Courts
 - clarification of pending charges
 - confirmation of court dates
Dept of Education
 - schools
 - qualifications
 - after care services
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Dept of Health
- services
- benefits
- Medicare
Dept of Immigration
- passports
- deportation investigations
- field officer investigations
- Consulate enquiries
Dept of Taxation
- tax file registration
- tax certificates
Dept of Social Security
- Disability Support Pension
- payments
- pension enquiries
- debt management
- benefits
Federal Police
- inmate property
Home Care Services
- family services
- welfare referrals
Hospitals
- information on family crisis
- inmate assistance
- Social Work referrals
Legal Aid Commission
- legal assistance
- legal advice
- court papers
- appointments
- solicitor interviews
Registry of Births, Death, & Marriages
- identification assistance
- certificates
Road Transport Authority
- vehicle information
- licences
State Police
- inmate property
- legal issues
- Aboriginal Community Liaison Officer
- family contact
State Rail Authority
- travel vouches
- bookings
- timetables
liaise with various non government agencies

Including:  
- Prisoners Aid
  - referrals
  - liaison with property
  - facilitate services
- CRC Justice Support
  - referrals
  - liaison pre-release
  - facilitate services
  - prison workshops
- COPSG
  - referrals
  - liaison with contact
  - parenting courses
- Guthrie House
  - referrals
  - liaison pre-release
- Prison Fellowship
  - referrals
- Aboriginal Cultural Services
- Aboriginal Accommodation Services
- Aboriginal Legal Services
  - legal assistance
  - legal advice
  - court papers
  - appointments
  - solicitor interviews
- Aboriginal Medical Services
- Aboriginal Death In Custody Watch Committee

**DISPENSABLE**

(Inmate Task List **ONLY UNDER CASE OFFICER SUPERVISION**)

Please note: This exercise will act as a tool to encourage independence and self responsibility of inmates in assisting their own welfare needs. These tasks would only be performed by inmates under the supervision of their Case Officer.

- assist with organising access/contact with own children/family/friends
- assist with facilitation with access to own legal representation
- assist with the organisation of inmate own weddings
- assist with the organisation of clothes for inmates on discharge or court appearances
- assist with arranging accommodation for own family visiting remote Centres
- assist with arranging accommodation for own family from the country visiting metro Centres
- assist in organising Centre events, including:  
  - Family days
  - Cultural festivals
  - Aboriginal Week
- assist with co-ordinating sporting events (Aboriginal designated)
- liaise with various government agencies
  - Aboriginal Land Councils
liaise with various non government agencies

Including:

- Prisoners Aid
  - referrals
  - liaison with property
  - facilitate services

- CRC Justice Support
  - referrals
  - liaison pre-release
  - facilitate services
  - prison workshops

- COPSG
  - referrals
  - liaison with contact
  - parenting courses

- Guthrie House
  - referrals
  - liaison pre-release

- Prison Fellowship
  - referrals

- Aboriginal Cultural Services

Child Support Agency
- registration
- payment issues

Courts
- Local Courts
- District Courts
- Supreme Courts
- clarification of pending charges
- confirmation of court dates

Dept of Taxation
- tax file registration
- tax certificates

Dept of Social Security
- Disability Support Pension
- payments
- pension enquiries
- debt management
- benefits

Legal Aid Commission
- legal assistance
- legal advice
- court papers
- appointments
- solicitor interviews

Registry of Births, Death, & Marriages
- identification assistance
- certificates

Road Transport Authority
- vehicle information
- licences

- cultural issues
Aboriginal Legal Services
- legal assistance
- legal advice
- court papers
- appointments
- solicitor interviews

Aboriginal Medical Services

Aboriginal Death In Custody Watch Committee
SECTION E

WELFARE OFFICERS
SKILLS ANALYSIS

The following list represents the professional competencies required by Welfare Officers in order to complete the CURRENT identified duties on the Essential and Additional Task List. This list is very comprehensive and reflects the immense expectations by the Department and Welfare Officers in order to perform ‘best practice’ principles. These skills have been identified by Welfare Officers, Senior Welfare Officers, Chief Welfare Officer, Governors and Program Managers throughout the NSW correctional system.

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES, SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

(i) Professional Qualifications in any of following areas:

- tertiary level Social Welfare
- Bachelor of Social Sciences, ie:
  - Arts/Social Science
  - Psychology
  - Counselling
  - Criminology

(ii) Working Knowledge of the following areas:

- Departmental Act, policies and procedures
- NSW and Federal Departmental Acts, policies and procedures
- relevant non Government policy and procedure
- NSW Probation and Parole Service policy and procedure
- all State and Federal court systems
- correctional philosophies and theories of criminality
- Ethics and ethical problem solving
- Equality issues

(iii) Analytical Skills, including:

- interview techniques
- investigative techniques
- attentive listening
- report writing
- understanding principles of social psychology
- diagnostic skills regarding social issues
- understanding drug and alcohol issues
- understanding of acute stress/anxiety issues
- understanding principles underlying ‘at risk’ behaviour
(iv) **Counselling Skills** in the following areas:

- grief counselling
- family counselling (reconciliation, maintenance, establishment)
- crisis counselling
- relationship counselling (parenting, partners, ex-partners, siblings)
- domestic violence counselling
- parenting counselling
- sexual assault counselling
- transitional counselling
- facilitation of inmate problem solving

(v) **Workload Management Skills** in the following areas:

- time management of case work, ie: agency contact, reports, meetings, planning.
- ability to manage workload expectation of over 120-200 case work
- ability to manage workload expectation incorporating inmates’ families
- ability to implement case management principles
- ability to initiate crisis management principles
- ability to implement professional supervision principles
- ability to work to a deadline
- ability to manage high turnover and transitory inmate population

(vi) **Advocacy Skills** in the following areas:

- knowledge of Government systems and entitlements
- knowledge of negotiation techniques
- ability to apply negotiation skills with relevant agencies

(vii) **Crisis Intervention Skills** in the following areas:

- ability to implement stress minimisation techniques
- ability to initiate crisis management principles
- ability to diagnose problems affecting clients
- ability to initiate clear and concise communication
- mediation skills
- ability to deal with aggressive/passive clients
- ability to deal with psych affected clients
- ability to deal with acutely distressed clients
- ability to develop short term planning
- ability to evaluate crisis intervention techniques
(viii) **Specialised Skills** in the following areas:

- awareness of Intellectually Disabled case work management
- awareness of Mental Illness case management principles
- knowledge of cultural issues relating to NESB population
- knowledge of cultural issues ATSI population
- knowledge of issues relating to juveniles and/or young offenders
- knowledge of issues relating to women offenders
- knowledge of issues relating to male offenders
- knowledge of issues relating to sex offenders
- knowledge of issues relating to criminology
- awareness of resources available for people affected by the criminal justice system
- knowledge of issues relating to families of inmates and/or ex-inmates
- knowledge of issues relating to transition

**PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES**

- non judgemental attitude
- professional judgement/decision making
- self motivated
- ability to exercise initiative
- tolerance of high stress work environment
- ability to exploit opportunities
- ability to work unsupervised
- ability to activate assertive decision making
- ability to operate in crisis situation
- high tolerance of stress induced by workload levels
- high tolerance of stress induced by nature of work
SECTION F

WELFARE SERVICES POLICY AND PROCEDURES

For the purposes of this study, it was necessary to review the existing Departmental policy and procedural resources available to Welfare Officers throughout NSW correctional centres.

In May 1995, the Department issued the Welfare Officers Policy and Procedures Manual. This Manual was to act as a resource tool in the following areas:

- various aspects of Departmental policy and procedures
- conditions of employment
- the role of Welfare in Correctional Centres
- Correctional Centre Services
- basic information concerning the Judiciary System
- Welfare Officer work practice guidelines
- Welfare Services Directory
- NSW Correctional Centre Directory

Throughout the interviews conducted in this study, a number of Welfare Officers were asked if they utilised the Welfare Officers Policy and Procedures Manual. Most of interviewees commented that although the Manual is an invaluable tool for basic Departmental policy and procedure, it has become dated in key areas such as the welfare role in Correctional Centres and is in need of updating.

Welfare Officers also commented that it was difficult to discern certain aspects of Welfare policy and procedures, if the area in question, fell outside standard Departmental operational procedure. For example, Welfare Officers expressed concern over the lack of clarity concerning various issues which are not addressed in the Manual. Issues such as:

- Do Welfare Officers assist inmates after their release?
- Information transfer and maintenance responsibility.
- What is the current policy on home visit procedure?
- Professional Standards and how they are maintained.
• what is the role of the Senior Welfare Officer?

• what are the guidelines on Professional Supervision?

• are Welfare Officers included in mandatory reporting obligations of child abuse?

• policy on confidentiality and ethics

A number of Welfare Officers expressed the opinion that it was essential for the Manual to be updated as a priority, due to the fact that unless Welfare Services had concise and up to date guidelines, the efficiency and appropriateness of welfare work practice is compromised.

Some Welfare Officers expressed the opinion that they felt more effort should be made by the Department to develop welfare policies and procedures which reflect the changing nature of correctional theories and principles in NSW.
SECTION G

PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISION ISSUES

As discussed in Part Two, Section B, the matter of Professional Supervision is an important issue currently discussed by Welfare Services within the Department. The discussion of Supervision falls into two main areas: the importance of supervision and access to Supervision.

Importance of Supervision

Many of the Welfare Officers interviewed for the purpose of this study agreed that Supervision strategies are an essential element in work practice management. Supervision is seen as important for a number of reasons. These are as follows:

SKILL MAINTENANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
ACCOUNTABILITY FACILITATION
DEBRIEFING FACILITY
WORK PRACTICE IMPROVEMENT
WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT

Access to Supervision

The Welfare Officers interviewed for this study felt that although there had been efforts made by most Senior Welfare Officers to conduct Supervision sessions, these sessions were not sufficient for the needs of the Service. These officers felt that more effort should be made in facilitating access to supervision. It is important to note that the Welfare Officers currently working in remote Correctional Centres understood that due to resource and time constraints, the regional Senior Welfare Officers found it difficult to maintain personal supervision sessions and were forced to rely heavily on telephone contact. The Senior Welfare Officers for the South West Region and the Northern Region have to travel vast distances in order to facilitate Supervision requirements. These Senior Welfare Officers are provided with inadequate travel funds to ensure regular supervision and are concerned that telephone contact with these remotely located Welfare Officers can only marginally address the maintenance and development of work practice skills.

Many Welfare Officers currently located in correctional facilities, close to or in the Sydney Metropolitan area also complained that they do not receive the level of Supervision which they believed they required.
SECTION H

WELFARE OFFICER TRAINING NEEDS

The following section will explore some of the current and future training requirements for Welfare Officers within the Correctional Centres. These identified training needs have been gathered from the completed interviews conducted throughout the study. Firstly, the interviewees were asked to identify the current skills which require UPGRADING in Welfare Services and secondly, they were asked to nominate areas which required MAINTENANCE training. Suggestions differ in response to the training and critical needs of program management at individual Correctional Centres. The individuals interviewed for this study represent a cross section of stakeholders found within Correctional Centres. The following two lists reflect the identified 'upgrade training needs' and 'maintenance training needs', in order of preference:

TOP FIVE IDENTIFIED UPGRADE TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

1. GRIEF COUNSELLING
2. CULTURAL STUDIES
3. UNDERSTANDING SUPERVISION
4. LEGAL SYSTEM AND PROCEDURES
5. SPECIALISED PROGRAMS WITHIN CORRECTIONAL CENTRES

TOP FIVE IDENTIFIED MAINTENANCE TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

1. CRISIS COUNSELLING
2. MANAGING CRISIS WORK
3. INCARCERATION AND SEPARATION ISSUES
4. CONFLICT RESOLUTION TECHNIQUES
5. THEORIES OF CRIMINALITY/CRIMINOLOGY
PART THREE
CORRECTIONAL WELFARE SERVICE
PROVISION MODELS ACROSS AUSTRALIA

For the purposes of this study, State* Correctional Services were contacted concerning the provision of Welfare Services within their Correctional Centres. The following information has been compiled through a series of brief interviews with relevant staff from each state in Australia. Section A offers a brief description of each welfare service provision model. Section B briefly discusses the similarities and differences between states.

SECTION A

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF CORRECTIONAL WELFARE MODELS ACROSS AUSTRALIA

The following section is based on information given through telephone interviews conducted with relevant staff from State Correctional Systems.

QUEENSLAND

Queensland has a population of approximately 3493 inmates. According to the Queensland representative interviewed, Queensland Corrective Services Commission employs counsellors who perform welfare orientated tasks. These Counsellors are divided into three groupings:

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Counsellors
- Drug and Alcohol Counsellors
- Generic Counsellors

Each Correctional Centre employs at least one representative from each of these Counsellor specialisations.

Queensland has a high population of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander inmates, approximately 22% of the total population. Emphasis is placed on program delivery focusing on cultural and familial issues which are affected by incarceration.

According to the representative interviewed, the Queensland Correctional System is scheduled to become completely corporatised on 1 July 1997. This will result in the formation of QCOR which is a Government owned corporation. One of the primary roles of QCOR will be the management and provision of welfare services. This operational procedure will seek to ensure that the Counselling Service available to inmates across Queensland, will be uniform and consistent across the State.

Although the Queensland system relies heavily on case management principles, the implementation of case management practice has been slow and has resulted in problems with program and service delivery, staff demarcation and inmate unrest.

* State refers to both State and Territory.
VICTORIA

Victoria has a population of approximately 2500+ inmates with an estimated 4.5% Aboriginal population. Two representatives were interviewed for the purposes of this study, the Program Manager, Loddon Prison and the Program Manager, Ararat Prison.

Loddon Prison is a 200+ bed, minimum security facility. It was explained that Loddon is a purpose built facility and reflects the corporatisation of a sector of the Victorian State Correctional System. The professional staff allocation is as follows:

- 1 Psychologist
- .5 Counsellor (newly created position)
- 1 General Nurse

Currently, Loddon has not established the .5 Counsellor position and relies extensively on case management practices to assist with inmate development. It was explained that Loddon enjoyed the flexibility of program diversity due to its policy of out sourcing program delivery. The diversity of available programs ranged from physical and recreational development, through to anger management and relationship group work. The Program Manager explained that the coordination of these programs is overseen by the Program Co-ordinator and the formation of groups is reliant on self referrals from inmates or Case Officer referral.

The Program Manager stated that the success of Loddon can be attributed to a number of reasons:
- purpose built nature of centre
- newly recruited custodial officers employed only when centre opened.
- tough discipline on drug trafficking: ie inmate transferred if visitor found with drugs.
- full employment of inmates and training opportunities
- encouragement of inmates with self responsibility tasks.
- continuous unit management and case officer training in operation.
- positive image among the inmate population.

Ararat Prison is a 256+ medium security facility which specialises in the containment of sex offenders which constitute 95% of Ararat Prison’s inmate population.

The Program Manager of Ararat Prison explained that Ararat is structured to operate through the use of internal resources rather than out sourcing to the private sector, like Loddon. Ararat’s professional staff allocation is as follows:

- 3 Welfare Officers
- .5 Psychologist
- .5 Drug and Alcohol Worker

Welfare Officers at Ararat are responsible for the provision of crisis intervention services, Basic Skills Program and a number of other targeted group work programs such as self esteem building and anger management. Although there is an operational therapeutic program designed for sex offenders at Ararat, there is a recognition that other interventionist practices by professional staff and Case Officers are crucial.
Ararat is slowly developing case management practice and over the past few years, efforts have been made to increase the effectiveness and responsiveness of Case Officers to the management of inmates.

Ararat also utilises a Community Justice Panel to assist in program development. This panel represents the local community and has a local Aboriginal member. Its aim is to foster links and support between the local community and the correctional centre.

The Program Manager explained that she is currently examining a program delivery model for a Case Management Team. This model focuses on the formation of a specialist team, similar to that of Western Australia, which would advise and supervise the case management of the individual inmate, advise on strategies and facilitate program delivery.

It is important to note that although these two Victorian centres focus on different models of management and service delivery, the inmate population of each centre is intrinsically different as is the staff management principles. Loddon emphasises the importance of a staff appraisal system and contract employment in maintaining high work standards and diversity of choice. Loddon’s inmate demographics allow for this flexibility. On the other hand, Ararat has a far more problematic inmate population which require high quality reactive and interventionist work practice. This work demands a higher level of professional staff involvement and more complex case management requirements. Over the past few years, Ararat has moved closer to higher levels of program delivery and although this has caused some transition problems, the long term effects have been successful.

TASMANIA

Tasmania has a population of approximately 250+ inmates with a 9% Aboriginal population. Due to the current restructure of the inmate development programs in Tasmania, it was difficult to organise a telephone interview. The Program Director of the Tasmania Department of Corrective Service supplied a comprehensive report which outlined the current restructure undertaken in Tasmania.

Prior to the restructure, Tasmania Department of Corrective Services employed five Welfare Officers to service the three Correctional Centres located across Tasmania. According to this report, these Welfare Officers were ‘over worked’ with little opportunity to maintain or develop skills to further improve work practices. It was noted that these workers experienced very little job satisfaction and felt that their positions were undervalued within the system although they were in constant demand for their existing skills.

The Tasmania Programs Unit has restructured its program delivery to reflect educational training and the benefits of life education. The Welfare Officers have had their job description restructured to reflect the new directions. They now provide the proactive services/groups to facilitate inmates gain skills to assist them to resolve personal/social issues. These groups include:

* Anger Management
* Conflict Resolution
* Life Planning

50
SOUTH AUSTRALIA

South Australia has an inmate population of approximately 1450 inmates. This population is located in eight Correctional Centres across the State, including one Correctional Centre for women. The Professional Services Unit Manager of Yatala Prison, was interviewed for the purposes of this study. She explained that the professional services available at Yatala Prison, which has a transitory inmate population of approximately 400+, are organised as follows:

- 5 Social Workers
- 3 Aboriginal Liaison Officers
- 2 Clinical Psychologists

The current professional staff structure within the other South Australia Correctional Centres is as follows:

- **Port Augusta**: 2 Social Workers, 2 Aboriginal Liaison Officers, 1 Clinical Psychologist
- **Port Lincoln**: 1 Social Worker
- **Cadell**: 2 Social Workers, 0.5 Clinical Psychologist
- **Mabelong**: 1 Social Worker
- **Adelaide (women)**: 1.5 Social Workers, 0.5 Clinical Psychologist
- **Pre-Release**: 1 Social Worker
- **Mt Gambier**: 1 Social Worker

South Australia has not had a Prison Drug Unit for a number of years and relies on the remaining professional services and Case Officers to provide AOD information, group work and counselling services.

South Australia is committed to the principles of case management and is slowly developing effective case management practices which involve Case Officers in crisis intervention and 'at risk' status identification. Welfare Services within the Correctional Centres are seen as a 'resource bank' and Case Officers are encouraged to consult with the Social Workers on inmate development issues. Social Workers are also involved in crisis intervention work and facilitating training sessions and group work. This interventionist approach is seen as a co-operative effort from all involved stakeholders including: Health Services, professional staff, custodial staff and inmates and their families. It was explained that the South Australian Department of Correctional Services is interested in addressing unresolved personal and social issues of inmates as a means of reducing anxiety caused by incarceration, as well as aiming to reduce recidivism.
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Western Australia has an inmate population of approximately 2220 inmates. Western Australia has the highest imprisonment rate per capita in Australia. This population is located in thirteen Correctional Centres across the State, including one Correctional Centre for women.

The Manager of the Corrective Health Services, Offender Management Division, Ministry of Justice, was interviewed for the purposes of the study. It was explained that the provision of welfare services is partially borne by the Corrective Health Service. The Health Service provides 10 Prisoner Support Officer positions which are designated Aboriginal positions. These workers also service other cultural groups. It is estimated that the current Aboriginal inmate population is around 33% of the total inmate population and considerable effort has been made to identify specific programs which address cultural and other relevant issues, such as peer support assistance and public health matters.

Western Australia also has a Forensic Case Management Team which co-ordinates a state wide service. There are 4 Social Workers employed in this team as well as a number of Clinical Psychologists. This team functions as the case management and crisis intervention component of inmate management.

NORTHERN TERRITORY

The Northern Territory has an inmate population of approximately 500+ inmates. This population is located in two Correctional Centres in Darwin and Alice Springs, which include facilities for women. There is also an estimated 2000 people on Community Service orders. The Manager of the Professional Services Unit, Northern Territory Correctional Services, was interviewed for the purposes of the study. It was explained that the Northern Territory is undergoing major structural changes to the provision of professional services.

It is envisaged that the Northern Territory correctional system will shortly implement the following positions:

- Aboriginal Liaison Officers
- Pre-release Officers
- Aboriginal Custodial Officer trained in program delivery
- Clinical Psychologists

It is estimated that 70-80% of the total inmate population of the Northern Territory is Aboriginal, with most of these inmates speaking English as a second language. Program delivery for this inmate population focuses on maintaining cultural cohesion, issues relating to alcohol misuse and other relevant matters. It was also explained that the Department utilised community Aboriginal Elders as a major source of program delivery, particularly for the maintenance of community and individual cultural values during custodial sentences.

It is estimated that the Northern Territory Correctional Services is about to witness a significant increase in its inmate population due to mandatory sentencing legislation about to be introduced.
SECTION B

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CORRECTIONAL WELFARE SERVICE PROVISION MODELS ACROSS AUSTRALIA

SIMILARITIES

The interviews conducted throughout the Study reflected a number of common issues which affected welfare service provision across Australia. These common issues are as follows:

• Each State has designated staff that fulfil the role of welfare services provision.
• Most states have designated Aboriginal welfare service providers.
• There is a high inmate demand for welfare services within Australian Correctional Centres.
• The identification of what constitutes inmates' welfare needs has a similar systemic formula across Australia, eg family issues, social issues, crisis work.
• The principles and practices of Case Management have been slow to develop in most of the Australian Correctional Systems.
• States are formalising crisis intervention strategies and utilising welfare service providers as a major component in the development of these strategies.
• States are formalising the role of welfare service providers as essential to program delivery within Correctional Centres.

DIFFERENCES

• States' have a variety of position titles for the provider of welfare services:
  
  Welfare Officer New South Wales (public system)
  Welfare Officer Victoria (public system)
  Counsellor Queensland (private system)
  Social Worker South Australia (public system)
  Prisoner Support Officer Western Australia (public system)
  Welfare Officer Northern Territory (public system)
  Welfare Officer Tasmania (public system)

• Welfare Services are funded and supervised under a variety of different arrangements. For example, in Western Australia some Welfare Services are provided by Correctional Health Services, whereas some Victorian centres will outsource Welfare Services to community or private agencies.

• Each state has a different position description and selection criteria for employment.
Welfare program delivery varies across Australia, dependent on identified need, accountability, ethos and cost effectiveness. For example, NSW has targeted Drug and Alcohol Services as a separate service from Welfare Services, whereas South Australia has abandoned its Drug and Alcohol Unit in favour of integrating welfare services and AOD services into one service provider.

The employment of Psychologists in Australian Correctional Centres varies tremendously. For example, NSW employs psychologists extensively, whereas South Australia employs a small number of Clinical Psychologists only, and crisis intervention work is performed by Social Workers and Case Officers. Victoria and Western Australia substantially out source Psychological Services, whereas the Northern Territory and NSW choose to employ their own staff.
PART FOUR
RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations have been made in order to address the aims and objectives of the Study. Please refer to Part One for details on the aims and objectives.

The recommendations have been categorised into two groups. The first group of recommendations will require additional allocated funding for development. It is further recommended that these proposed projects be placed under the management of the Chief Welfare Officer.

The second group of recommendations do not require funding allocations for their development within Welfare Services, but will be dependent on the co-operation of other Departmental sectors, for implementation.

Overall, the following recommendations are intended to act as guidelines for future planning initiatives undertaken by Welfare Services within the Department.

PART A

RECOMMENDATIONS REQUIRING FUNDING ALLOCATION

1. UPDATE THE WELFARE OFFICERS POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL

It is recommended that specialised funds are allocated to redesign and update the Welfare Officers’ Policy and Procedures Manual. The Manual will need to include the following:

- redesign the Manual for easier access and suitability
- consult Welfare Officers and Senior Welfare Officers about information requirements
- up to date internal and external service directories
- comprehensive policy and procedural matters
- guidelines on legal responsibilities
- guidelines on confidentiality
- guidelines on ethical issues affecting the provision of welfare services
- guidelines on skill maintenance and development
- guidelines on professional standards
- guidelines on stress management

It is envisaged that the proposed redesign and update could be completed within a three month time frame. Initial costings for this project have been based on the employment of a Project Officer at Grade 7/8, total remuneration package valued to $51,485 (salary $43,328 - $47,960).
One Project Officer for 3 month project @ approx $12,871.25.

It is also recommended that the Manual be updated at least every two years, to ensure that it maintains a key role in the provision of quality resources to Welfare Officers across the State. Costings for this continued update should be budgeted into the projected expenditure for each financial year.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING PACKAGES FOR WELFARE OFFICERS

It is recommended that specialised funds are allocated to Welfare Services in order to undertake a project aimed at developing provisions for developmental and maintenance training of Welfare Officers. It is envisaged that the development of these packages will require “one off” funding initially for a sixth month period. It is then envisaged that this project be reviewed on a yearly basis to ensure responsive training initiatives are maintained. The development of this package will need to incorporate the generic requirements of Welfare Officers across the State, as well as, information pertaining to the particular centre in which the staff member will be located. This project consists of four main components. These are as follows:

- Development of Correctional Centre Counselling Induction Training Package to include:
  - security awareness
  - policy and procedural matters
  - guidelines on work practice
  - guidelines on workload expectations
  - guidelines for professional standards
  - guidelines for stress management

It is recommended that Senior Welfare Officers be responsible for the implementation of this particular training package. In order for this recommendation to become effectual, funds will need to be allocated for the following:

- Subsistence Allowance @ $120.45 per night (country) and $169.15 (metro) for Senior Welfare Officers when conducting Induction Training for new employees. It is estimated this Induction Training would take no less then four days to complete. This funding is to be met by the Regional cost centres. Another option would be to arrange for the costings of these four training days to be divided between the Regions and the Correctional Centres.

For example, the current South/West Regional Senior Welfare Officer’s total yearly subsistence allowance is $1600. This will need to be increased to accommodate the required travelling for the Induction Training. It is estimated that the Induction Training component of the subsistence allowance would be in excess of $1800 in the South/West and Northern Regions and $400 per Senior Welfare Officer in the Metropolitan Region.
• Development of Welfare Services Training Upgrade Package to include:
  - Grief Counselling
  - Cultural Studies
  - Understanding Supervision
  - Understanding the legal system

• Development of Welfare Services Training Maintenance Package to include:
  - Crisis Counselling
  - Managing crisis work
  - Separation and Incarceration Counselling
  - Conflict Resolution Techniques
  - Theories of Criminality/Criminology

• Development of a Welfare Officer Career Management System. To include:
  - consultation with relevant staff concerning aims and objectives of the system.
  - development of benchmarking principles for career management system.
  - review and implementation of Departmental Performance and Career Management System, September 1996.

It is envisaged that the framework for the proposed training packages could be completed within a six month period. Initial costings for this project have been based on the employment of a Project Officer at Grade 7/8, total remuneration package valued to $51,485 (salary $43,328 - $47,960).

• One Project Officer for 6 month project @ $25,742.25

• Subsistence Allowance of $1500.

It is recommended that the resource management of this training package should be maintained by the Chief Welfare Officer with the assistance of the Senior Welfare Officers. The provision of training packages should remain flexible and incorporate principles of outsourcing if required.

3. INCREASED PROFESSIONAL SUPERVISION

It is recommended that specialised funds are allocated to develop and implement strategies for Professional Supervision of Welfare Officers. The development of these strategies would include:

• adoption of an agreed Supervision model.

• implementation of the previously identified training packages.

• consultation with relevant staff concerning aims and objectives of Supervision, as well as implementation and evaluation of Supervision strategies.
adoption of 'Supervision days' allocated to each Welfare Officer. Initial projected supervision days to be minimum of 3 -7 days per year, per person (determined by supervisor). These 'supervision days' would incorporate both Supervision and training components.

adoption of Supervision formula (eg. Probationary officers, to be supervised ½ day on a weekly basis for the first three months of employment. Full time officers to be supervised ½ day on a monthly basis.)

adoption of Regional ‘planning days’ bi-annually for Supervision Evaluation. Planning days to include any interested and relevant staff within the Department. Cost model to include travel allowance for Chief Welfare Officer, Senior Welfare Officers and Welfare Officers.

develop a cost model for Supervision requirements. To include:

- increased subsistence allowance for Senior Welfare Officers and Chief Welfare Officer.
- travel allowance for Welfare Officers when required
- development of cost model accountability between Correctional Centres, Regional Command Centres and Head Office.

It is envisaged that the proposed project could be completed within a six month time frame. Initial costings for this project have been based on the employment of a Project Officer at Grade 7/8, total remuneration package valued to $51,485 (salary $43,328 - $47,960).

- One Project Officer for 6 month project @ $25,742.25
- Subsistence Allowance of $1500.

It is recommended that the resource management of the development of Supervision strategies should be maintained by the Chief Welfare Officer, with the assistance of the Senior Welfare Officers.

4. RESOURCE ALLOCATION

The findings of this study indicate that 86% of Welfare Officers currently working within the Correctional System, are seriously under resourced. It is recommended that a number of initiatives be undertaken to address this problem. These recommendations are as follows:

Information Technology

- the purchase of 30 computers and printers in the 1997/98 financial year @ $2000 per unit at a cost of $60,000. Costs underwritten by Head Office, Welfare Services.
• the purchase of 30 computers and printers in the 1998/99 financial year @ $2000 per unit at a cost of $60,000. Costs underwritten by Head Office, Welfare Services.

• Installation of network access for 30 computers for Welfare Services use, at approximately $100 per computer, at a cost of $3000 for 1997/98 and $3000 for 1998/99. Costs underwritten by Regional Command Centres or individual Correctional Centres.


• the purchase of telephone answer machines in the 1997/98 financial year @ $60.00 per unit. Costs underwritten by each individual Correctional Centre where applicable.

• the purchase of information resources such as reference books (Legal Handbook etc) and Government information resources @ $150.00 per year, per Correctional Centre. Costs underwritten by individual Correctional Centre.

Travel Allowance for Senior Welfare Officers

In order to implement a number of the recommendations of the study, the current levels of travel allowance within Welfare Services will need to be increased. The following table indicates the proposed model for allowance increases:

South/West Region will be taken as an example:

Existing Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Cost (yearly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence/Travel</td>
<td>$1600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Cost (yearly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Induction Training</td>
<td>$1445.40 subsistence allowance $1600.00 supervision cost (travel and training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Days x 2</td>
<td>$240.90 subsistence allowance $100.00 travel (nil if access to Dept transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>$2409.00 dependent on number of Centres $1600.00 travel (Welfare Officer expenses if required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Allowance</td>
<td>$1600.00 meetings, training days, mediation etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$8995.30* (yearly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* this figure will differ across Regions dependent on location of Senior Welfare Officer and number of centres in Region.
Training Allowance for Welfare Officers

The current average training allocation per Welfare Officer is $200.00 per year (course fee component only). In order to facilitate the proposed training packages in Recommendation 1, the current training funds will need to be increased to $520.25 per officer, per year. This figure encompasses all costs of yearly training and also allows one night subsistence per year if required. Cost underwritten by Regional Command Centres.

Improvement in Welfare Officers Working Environment

The study recommends that certain improvements are made to the working environment for a number of Welfare Officers. These include:

- conduct audit of all Welfare Officers’ offices to ensure optimum health and safety requirements. A number of Welfare Officers are currently located in office space which has either no windows, inadequate lighting or inadequate space.

- adopt an initiative to ensure that all Welfare Officers have separate outside telephone access and STD status.

- adopt an initiative that all Welfare Officers are provided with separate and discrete office space to ensure confidentiality, adequate work space and optimum work practice principles.

These recommendations should be costed to individual Centres for action. This recommendation should be evaluated by the Regional Senior Welfare Officers within six months of operation to ensure activation.

5. DEVELOPMENT OF WELFARE SERVICES POLICY AND WORKLOAD STRATEGIES

It is recommended that specialised funds are allocated to the development of Welfare Services Policy and Workload Strategies. This project should include the following considerations:

- develop strategies to assist in the design of welfare services parameters.

- develop strategies concerning moves towards the use of Welfare Officers with specialised skills within specialised Centres.

- conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of existing Departmental policy and procedures relating to Welfare Services.

- develop strategies and implement measures aimed at addressing workload stress levels.

It is envisaged that this proposed project could be completed within a six month time frame. Initial costings for this project have been based on the employment of a Project Officer at Grade 7/8, total remuneration package valued to $51,485 (salary $43,328 - $47,960).

- One Project Officer for 6 month project @ $25,742.25
• Subsistence Allowance of $1500.

It is recommended that the resource management of the project should be maintained by the Chief Welfare Officer with the assistance of the Senior Welfare Officers.

6. DEVELOPMENT OF WELFARE EXPERTISE IN CASE MANAGEMENT TRAINING

The study illustrated a number of problems with the communication linkages between Welfare Officers and Case Officers within the Case Management system. In order for these communication channels to be utilised more effectively, a number of strategies need to be developed. These include:

• develop a training package for use in Primary Training (Custodial Officers) which incorporates the notion of using Welfare Services' expertise more effectively in Case Management.

• develop training strategies to assist Welfare Officers to initiate information sessions for Case Officers concerning welfare issues and promoting the use of Welfare Services expertise and advice.

• develop information resources for use in Correctional Centres concerning the importance of utilising Welfare Services expertise to conduct case management, rather than referring all inmate welfare needs on to Welfare Services for action.

• liaise with Centre Case Manager Supervisors to ensure appropriate use of Welfare Services.

It is envisaged that this proposed project could be completed within a three month time frame. Initial costings for this project have been based on the employment of a Project Officer at Grade 7/8, total remuneration package valued to $51,485 (salary $43,328 - $47,960).

• One Project Officer for 3 month project @ $12,871.25.

• Subsistence Allowance of $750.00.

It is recommended that the resource management of the development of this project should be maintained by the Chief Welfare Officer with the assistance of the Senior Welfare Officers.

7. RENAMING WELFARE SERVICES

The study recommends that Welfare Services undertake a name change. Please refer to Part Two Section B for details supporting this recommendation. The study recommends that the following positions be renamed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare Officers</th>
<th>Correctional Centre Counsellors (CCC's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Welfare Officers</td>
<td>Regional Co-ordinators, Counselling Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Welfare Officer</td>
<td>Manager, Counselling Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The renaming of the Welfare Service would involve a number of initiatives which will require funding. These include:

- Information distribution to inmates and their families on the name change.
- Information distribution to relevant agencies concerning name change.

The costs of this change would be underwritten by Head Office, Welfare Service, by the provision of one off funding of $1500.00.

2. FORMULA FOR BENCHMARK RATIOS

This report recommends the adoption of the following ‘benchmark formula’ in determining future welfare staffing levels in NSW Correctional Centres. The formula has been structured to reflect how Welfare Services staffing levels could effectively respond to the welfare needs of inmates in specialised centres. This formula is set out below:

**Workload Benchmarks for Welfare Officers’ Staffing Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correctional Centre Requirements</th>
<th>Projected No. of inmates per staff</th>
<th>% of weekly welfare timetable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMAND CENTRE</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open door interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>induction procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow-up caseload (crisis prevention)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning welfare pathway</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONG/SHORT TERM SENTENCED</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open door interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow-up caseload (crisis prevention)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of welfare pathway</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIALISED CENTRES</strong></td>
<td>85-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open door interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow-up caseload (crisis prevention)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of welfare pathway</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRE-RELEASE CENTRES

open door interviews 5%
follow-up caseload (crisis prevention) 30%
planning welfare pathway 30%
pre-release appointments 25%
crisis intervention 10%

Total 100%

EXAMPLE OF BENCHMARK FORMULA FOR USE IN DETERMINING WELFARE OFFICER STAFF RATIO

eg. Remand Centres

Open Door Interviews = 40% of daily workload = 3.2 hours @ 1/2 per hour per inmate = 8 inmates per day
Induction Process = 20% of daily workload = 1.6 hours @ 1/2 per hour per inmate = 4 inmates per day
Crisis Prevention = 20% of daily workload = 1.6 hours @ 1/4 per hour per inmate = 8 inmates per day
Welfare Planning = 10% of daily workload = 45 minutes per day to accumulate on weekly basis
Crisis Intervention = 10% of daily workload = 45 minutes per day to accumulate on weekly basis

In order to implement this proposed formula, a number of initiatives will be required. These are as follows:

- development of feasibility study on the implication of adoption of benchmark formula.
- construction of a “model cost centre” to introduce this formula.
- review of current recommendations on Welfare Services workload.
- extensive consultations with relevant Departmental staff on formula implications for funding.
- development of ‘pilot study’ in a small number of Centres to measure formula ‘robustness’.
- development of ‘mapping’ analysis to measure projected changes in staff allocation.
- development of evaluation strategies to adequately measure outcomes of planning and implementation strategies.

It is envisaged that this proposed project could be completed within a six month time frame. Initial costings for this project have been based on the employment of a Project Officer at Grade 7/8, total remuneration package valued to $51,485 (salary $43,328 - $47,960).
• One Project Officer for 6 month project @ $25,742.25
• Subsistence Allowance of $1500.

It is recommended that the resource management of the project should be maintained by the Chief Welfare Officer with the assistance of the Senior Welfare Officers.

PART B

RECOMMENDATIONS NOT REQUIRING FUNDING ALLOCATION

These recommendations do not require funding allocations for their development within Welfare Services, but will be dependent on the co-operation of other Departmental sectors, for implementation.

1. ADOPTION OF NEW POSITION DESCRIPTION

The study recommends that Welfare Services utilise a reformatted job description for Welfare Officers. This proposed job description recommends that Welfare Officers are referred to as Correctional Centre Counsellors. Please refer to the Appendix 6 for details.

2. DEVELOPMENT OF WELFARE SERVICES TASK LIST

The study recommends that in conjunction with recommendation Part A, more effort should be given to prioritising a workable Welfare Services Task List. Please refer to Section Two (D) for tasks currently performed by Welfare Officers. This list includes proposed changes, to maximise welfare expertise. This process could include the following strategies:

• Regional analysis of current tasks performed by Welfare Officers.
• Correctional Centre analysis of current tasks performed by Welfare Officers.
• Identification of specialised skills required of Welfare Officers in certain Centres.
• Prioritise tasks as they pertain to the aims and objectives of Welfare Services.
• Initiate discussions on the effectiveness of Welfare Service delivery. This should include all interested and relevant staff from the Region.
• Consult with inmates and their families on their requirements of a Welfare Service.
• Consult with government and non government agencies on effective service delivery.
• Reach agreement between Governors and Senior Welfare Officers.

These initiatives could be undertaken by the Senior Welfare Officers under the supervision of the Chief Welfare Officer. This recommendation could only be undertaken if the above mentioned recommendations are also undertaken.
3. DEVELOPMENT OF STRESS MANAGEMENT

This study recommends that all Welfare Officers are encouraged to take a more proactive role in the prevention of stress in the workplace. A number of strategies should be considered. These are as follows:

• increased communication between Welfare Officers and Program Managers in planning service delivery.

• increased communication between Governors and Welfare Officers in the requirements of welfare service provision.

• increased communication between Welfare Service and other IDS and custodial staff on the appropriate use of welfare services in Correctional Centres.

• increased communication between Welfare Officers on the aims and objectives of service delivery.

• initiation of discussions on personal stress management.

• facilitation of effective debriefing processes.

The key stakeholders in ensuring these recommendations are the following:

Welfare Officers
Senior Welfare Officers
Program Managers

4. DEVELOPMENT OF MORE EFFECTIVE DEBRIEFING PROCEDURES

The study recommends that more effective debriefing opportunities are given to Welfare Officers within Centres. The findings from this study concerning debriefing opportunities were disappointing. Please refer to Part Two, Section B for details and the Appendices 4 & 5 for detailed data on debriefing services as a result of a critical incident. The following suggestion may assist in formulating effective debriefing:

• increase in Supervision opportunities
• increase in professional communication
• increase in Program Managers' involvement in critical incident issues.
• increase in acknowledgement of stress inducing tasks.
• clearer debriefing procedures
• promotion of debriefing procedures as beneficial to work practice

All relevant staff are responsible for ensuring that the current debriefing procedures are utilised effectively and sensibly.
READING LIST


*Introduction to Job Analysis, Guidelines for writing position descriptions*, Job Evaluation Unit, Personnel Services Branch, NSW Department of Corrective Services.


*Project Department Restructure*, Tasmanian Department of Corrective Services, May 1997

APPENDICES
WELFARE WORKLOAD EVALUATION SURVEY
MAY 1997

Name: _____________________________

Gaol: _____________________________ Region: _______________________

Work Location: (Please circle) Screening Remand Sentenced

Gaol Classification: (please circle) Maximum Medium Minimum

Please circle appropriate answer:

1. Please estimate client/inmate contact per day:
   1 - 5  5 - 10  10 - 15  15 - 20  20 - +

2. Please estimate the percentage of ongoing work in your caseload:
   0% - 20%  20% - 40%  40% - 60%  60% - 80%  80% 100%

3. Please estimate the percentage of time spent on crisis work on a weekly basis:
   0% - 20%  20% - 40%  40% - 60%  60% - 80%  80% 100%

4. Please estimate the percentage of time spent on counselling work on a weekly basis:
   0% - 20%  20% - 40%  40% - 60%  60% - 80%  80% 100%

5. Please estimate the percentage of time spent on group work on a weekly basis:
   0% - 20%  20% - 40%  40% - 60%  60% - 80%  80% 100%

6. Please estimate the number of inappropriate requests/tasks performed on a weekly basis:
   (ie: inmate gaol accounts, phone accounts, property enquiries etc)
   1 - 5  5 - 10  10 - 15  15 - 20  20 - +
7. Are you given opportunities to contribute to case management?
   YES       NO

8. Please estimate hours spent writing reports for inmate case management/PRC?
   1 - 5      5 -10      10 - 15     15-20     20 - +

8. Please estimate hours spent at internal meetings per week, ie: PRC, Reception, IDS etc.
   1 - 5      5 -10      10 - 15     15-20     20 - +

9. Please estimate the amount of incoming phone calls you receive on a daily basis?
   1- 10      10 - 20     20 - 30     30 - 40     40 - +

10. (a) Do you have an Answer Machine in your office?
    YES       NO

    (b) Do you feel you need an Answer Machine in your office?
    YES       NO

11. (a) Do you have a computer in your office?
    YES       NO

    (b) Do you feel you need a computer in your office?
    YES       NO
**WELFARE OFFICER STATISTICS**

Name: ........................................ Centre: ........................................ Month: ........................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NMATE INTERVIEWS (not screening)</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 9 May</td>
<td>12 - 16 May</td>
<td>19 - 23 May</td>
<td>26 - 30 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. of interviews with inmates</td>
<td>&lt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&lt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. of inappropriate* interviews with inmates</td>
<td>&lt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&lt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. of interviews with Aboriginal inmates</td>
<td>&lt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&lt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
<td>&gt;1/4 hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CRITICAL INCIDENT INTERVIEWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o. of interviews re:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death of an inmate</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death of family of inmate</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious illness/accident</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious illness/accident - family</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual assault of inmate</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debriefing was offered by: (please tick)

- Fisher/McHale
- Staff Psychologist
- Gaol Psychologist
- Welfare colleagues
- Peer Support Team
- Other

**FAMILY INTERVIEWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>&lt;1/4 hr</th>
<th>&gt;1/4 hr</th>
<th>&lt;1/4 hr</th>
<th>&gt;1/4 hr</th>
<th>&lt;1/4 hr</th>
<th>&gt;1/4 hr</th>
<th>&lt;1/4 hr</th>
<th>&gt;1/4 hr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o. of requests for home visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requests were from:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor/Senior Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOME VISITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of visits actually completed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. of visits unable to made because:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interviews that could/should have been done by another member of staff e.g. bail phone calls, flowers, buying court clothes, accommodation for parolees, legal calls etc. Includes self referrals and referrals by staff.*
### Outside your area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of time</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Permission not granted by:

- Governor
- Program Manager

**Defined by WO as inappropriate:**

- **Why?** (Attach)

### if not completed, was it referred to another agency, outside of Welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
<th>Total hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Liaison/Referral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of referrals - in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of referrals in - not appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of referrals - out: internal (D/A, Psych etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of referrals - out: external (other agencies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internal Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of meetings attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hours spent in meetings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Management Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification/Reception Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare Regional Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Development Services Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others: ie OH&amp;S Health Team Meetings etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interagency Contact/Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Induction/Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of written assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no. of referrals - out:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Groupwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent per week (at group &amp; preparation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no to the above, would you run a group if:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- you had the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- you were trained in groupwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSMENTS** (written)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of case management/PRC assessments</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of other reports/advice</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FIELD VISITS** - no. of fields visits (other than home visits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Agencies</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COMMUNITY AGENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to CRC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to Prisoners Aid Association</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to Children of Prisoners</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to Glebe House</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to Rainbow Lodge</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to Guthrie House</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to Goulburn Emerg. Accom.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of referrals to Coolock House, Grafton</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING BACKGROUND INMATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of interviews with NESB inmates</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Interview purpose:**

- language/interpreter

- days of religious significance

- food

- newspapers/books/videos

- Consul/embassy

- deportation

- passport

- community welfare agencies

- outside religious support

- other - please specify

**Country of Birth, no. from:**

- China
  - Italy
  - Lebanon
  - Romania

- (former) Yugoslavia

- Vietnam

- Other
# Welfare Officer Statistics - November 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>North/West</th>
<th>South/West</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inmate Interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Inmate Interviews</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>7812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>4612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Inappropriate</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Critical Incident</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Aboriginal Inmate</strong></td>
<td>602</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by Phone</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>3969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Person (at Centre)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visits</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liaison/Referral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Referrals - In</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Referrals In - Not Appropriate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Referrals - Out (Internal)</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Referrals - Out (External)</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Induction/Screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Written Assessments</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Referrals - Out</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments - Written</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Case Man/PRC Assessments</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Other Reports/Advice</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Field Visits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Referrals To: CRC</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners Aid Association</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Prisoners</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe House</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Lodge</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthrie House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn Emergency Accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooleglock House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NESB Inmates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interviews with NESB Inmates</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Purpose: Language/Interpreter</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of religious significance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers/books/videos</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consul/embassy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deportation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passport</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community welfare agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside religious support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Screening Interview</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Former) Yugoslavia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Total Welfare Statistics - May 1997

### INMATE INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL</th>
<th>EASTERN</th>
<th>NTH/WST</th>
<th>STA/WST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO. OF INMATE INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>8112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>4319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>3793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF INAPPROPRIATE INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF ABORIGINAL INMATE INTERVIEWS</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRITICAL INCIDENT INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL</th>
<th>EASTERN</th>
<th>NTH/WST</th>
<th>STA/WST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO. OF CRITICAL INCIDENT INT.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF INTERVIEWS RE: Death of an inmate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; debriefed Yes/No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of family of inmate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; debriefed Yes/No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious illness/accident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; debriefed Yes/No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious illness/accident -family</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; debriefed Yes/No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault of inmate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; debriefed Yes/No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEBRIEFING WAS OFFERED BY:-

- Fisher/McHele: 0 0 0 0 0
- Staff Psychologist: 0 0 1 0 1
- Gaol Psychologist: 0 0 0 0 0
- Welfare colleagues: 2 0 9 1 12
- Peer Support Team: 0 0 0 0 0
- Other: 0 0 0 3 3

### FAMILY INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL</th>
<th>EASTERN</th>
<th>NTH/WST</th>
<th>STA/WST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BY PHONE</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>3223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1/4 hour</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN PERSON (AT CENTRE)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOME VISITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL</th>
<th>EASTERN</th>
<th>NTH/WST</th>
<th>STA/WST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF REQUESTS FOR HOME VISITS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUESTS WERE FROM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor/senior staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF VISITS ACTUALLY COMPLETED</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF VISITS UNABLE TO BE MADE BECAUSE:-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside your area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission not granted by Governor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission not granted by Program Manager</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined by WO as inappropriate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to another agency outside of welfare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOURS SPENT AT HOME VISITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL</th>
<th>EASTERN</th>
<th>NTH/WST</th>
<th>STA/WST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LIAISON/REFERRAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL</th>
<th>EASTERN</th>
<th>NTH/WST</th>
<th>STA/WST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF REFERRALS - IN</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF REFERRALS IN - NOT APPROPRIATE</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF REFERRALS - OUT (INTERNAL)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF REFERRALS - OUT (EXTERNAL)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTERNAL MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL</th>
<th>EASTERN</th>
<th>NTH/WST</th>
<th>STA/WST</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF MEETINGS ATTENDED</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOURS SPENT IN MEETINGS</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>153.75</td>
<td>735.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management Meetings</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Welfare Statistics - May 1997</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Review Committee</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>115.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification/Reception Committee</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>245.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Regional Meetings</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS Meetings</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>127.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERAGENCY CONTACT/MEETINGS**

| NO. OF GOV. AGENCY MEETINGS | 2 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 26 |
| HOURS SPENT IN GOV. AGENCY MEETINGS | 3.5 | 9.5 | 28 | 5 | 46 |
| NO. OF NON-GOV. AGENCY MEETINGS | 0 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 19 |
| HRS IN NON-GOV. AGENCY MEETINGS | 0 | 4 | 16 | 19 | 39 |
| NO. OF GOV. AGENCY PHONE CONTACTS | 278 | 293 | 668 | 387 | 1626 |
| NO. OF NON-GOV PHONE CONTACTS | 145 | 345 | 450 | 250 | 1190 |

**INDUCTION/SCREENING**

| NO. OF WRITTEN ASSESSMENTS | 506 | 371 | 86 | 55 | 1018 |
| NO. OF REFERRALS - OUT | 205 | 309 | 55 | 16 | 585 |

**GROUPWORK**

| NO. OF INMATES | 0 | 0 | 346 | 36 | 382 |
| TIME SPENT PER WEEK | 0 | 23 | 32.5 | 8 | 63.5 |
| WOULD RUN A GROUP IF HAD TIME | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| WOULD RUN GROUP IF TRAINED | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 |

**ASSESSMENTS - WRITTEN**

| NO. OF CASE MAN./PRC ASSESSMENTS | 53 | 93 | 135 | 109 | 390 |
| NO. OF OTHER REPORTS/ADVICE | 62 | 73 | 140 | 65 | 340 |

**FIELD VISITS**

| NO. OF FIELD VISITS | 10 | 14 | 26 | 11 | 61 |

**COMMUNITY AGENCIES**

| NO. OF REFERRALS TO:- | crc | 19 | 65 | 36 | 61 | 181 |
| prisoners aid association | 62 | 162 | 31 | 30 | 285 |
| children of prisoners | 13 | 9 | 7 | 23 | 52 |
| glebe house | 9 | 5 | 16 | 5 | 35 |
| rainbow lodge | 1 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 19 |
| guthrie house | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| goulburn emergency accomm. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| coolock house | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**NESB INMATES**

| TOTAL INTERVIEWS WITH NESB INMATES | 150 | 360 | 165 | 325 | 1000 |
| < 1/4 hour | 65 | 150 | 64 | 121 | 400 |
| > 1/4 hour | 85 | 210 | 101 | 204 | 600 |

**INTERVIEW PURPOSE:**

| Language/Interpreter | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 18 |
| Days of religious significance | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| Food | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 11 |
| Newspapers/books/videos | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Consul/embassy | 19 | 17 | 11 | 18 | 63 |
| Deportation | 7 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 46 |
| Passport | 9 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 21 |
| Community welfare agencies | 12 | 20 | 43 | 2 | 77 |
| Outside religious support | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 13 |
| Other | 34 | 24 | 24 | 5 | 87 |

**COUNTRY OF BIRTH:**

| china | 9 | 18 | 5 | 12 | 44 |
| italy | 14 | 18 | 17 | 13 | 62 |
| Lebanon | 26 | 48 | 45 | 84 | 203 |
| Romania | 7 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 18 |
| (former) Yugoslavia | 16 | 15 | 1 | 14 | 46 |
| Vietnam | 31 | 46 | 35 | 127 | 239 |
| Other | 37 | 85 | 47 | 37 | 206 |
POSITION DESCRIPTION

CORRECTIONAL CENTRE COUNSELLOR

Primary Objective

Provide comprehensive support and assistance to inmates and their families through the provision of services such as crisis intervention, counselling, advocacy, negotiation and assessment. Provide advice and expertise on a range of family and social issues to ensure the delivery of a professional and reliable welfare service.

Key Accountabilities

* Aim to develop, implement and maintain clear and effective channels of communication and associated procedures to ensure that inmates and their families are given the opportunity to resolve personal and social issues which may adversely impact on either party.

* Provide information, expertise and support in terms of crisis intervention including participation in Risk Intervention Teams to assist in the resolution of critical situations and when resolved, contributes to the inmates ability to manage the effects of incarceration.

* Cooperate as a team member with other IDS and correctional staff through the provision of information, counselling and other relevant assistance which contribute to the effective and professional delivery of IDS services to inmates.

* Assess, counsel and monitor progress of inmates to ensure the provision of relevant and adequate support in regard to personal or family matters, to minimise stress and anxiety and to ensure that inmates are aware of the availability of assistance available internally and externally to the centre.

* Conduct all matters with the highest degree of professional integrity and confidentiality and develop professional relationships with inmates and staff that, as far as practicable, promote an environment of mutual trust and empathy.

* Provide reports to relevant bodies, such as the Program Review Committee, in regard to the placement of inmates to ensure the facilitation of decision making processes.

* Liaise with the local community and community based organisations, to encourage the promotion of community based involvement, and to consult with these agencies to facilitate community support.
* Ensure all policies and procedures within the welfare programs area of the correctional centre comply with anti-discrimination and occupational health and safety legislation and promote the establishment of equal employment opportunity in accordance with agreed government policy.

**Reporting Relationships**

As with other IDS staff, Correctional Centre Counsellors report to the Governor through the Program Manager in regard to delivery of a welfare service. There is also a direct reporting relationship to the Regional Co-ordinator, Correctional Centre Counselling Service, who has the responsibility for professional supervision and standards set by the Manager, Correctional Centre Counselling Service.

The Correctional Centre Counsellor operates within a team environment and cooperates with other Inmate Development positions within the centre and relevant custodial positions as required.

**Knowledge, Skills and Experience**

* Significant and demonstrable experience gained in a social science environment is essential. Formal qualifications in a relevant discipline are desirable and would be highly regarded as would qualification and experience in counselling, second language and a sound understanding of cultural differences.

* A thorough appreciation and capacity to conduct welfare related and associated program activity over a wide area which involves social, ethnic, and cultural issues and specific initiatives such as pre-release programs and group work within correctional centres.

* High level oral and written communications and interpersonal skills to enable the development of trust, empathy and cooperation with inmates and their families, colleagues and professional and community based organisations.

* Ability to perceive changes in inmate behaviour and respond appropriately, applying proven crisis intervention, conflict resolution, mediation and negotiation skills.

* Ability to provide information, advocacy and counsel, including grief counselling, in a non-judgemental fashion by maintaining professionalism in a stressful and emotionally/physically threatening environment.

* Computer literacy, keyboard skills and experience in the use and application of software in the preparation of reports and maintenance of records.
* Broad knowledge and understanding of all aspects of the operation of a correctional centre, in particular Area and Case Management, Inmate Classification and Placement, court procedures, bail, appeal, parole and probation processes.

* Sound knowledge and understanding of Occupational Health and Safety (OH&S), Ethnic Affairs Policy (EAP), anti-discrimination legislation, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) principles and a sound awareness of a Correctional Centre Counsellor’s legal obligations and professional accountability.

* Completion of Security Awareness Training.

* Completion of Correctional Counselling Induction Training.

**Communication**

Communication, both verbal and written, and the application of interpersonal skills is a significant component of the role of a Correctional Centre Counsellor as the position is required to liaise with inmates and their families on personal and sensitive issues. This contact can range from the provision of expert information in regard to options and facilities available, to the resolution of complex and stressful issues which impact directly on the inmate as well as their family. The Correctional Centre Counsellor also provides counselling on a range of issues and is required to initiate crisis intervention techniques when required.

The position also has regular and routine contact with other IDS staff within the centre either individually or on a team basis and provides information and advice in social welfare and associated matters. These discussions may also require input by the position into matters concerning the placement of inmates. Other contacts are with custodial staff in regard to case management issues and the provision of background information in regard to inmates, families and their needs.

Externally, the Correctional Centre Counsellor liaises with a wide range of government and non-government organisations to facilitate access to support and assistance while the inmate is within the system as well as facilitating on-going support following release.

**Decision Making**

The Correctional Centre Counsellor is accountable for specific welfare programs offered within a correctional centre in consultation with the Regional Co-ordinator, Correctional Centre Counselling Service and Program Manager. The position operates within designated guidelines, policies and procedures and exercises a high degree of autonomy in regard to the determination of priorities, workloads and the day to day delivery of welfare service within the centre. Certain welfare functions would be undertaken only after consultations with supervising staff.

Decisions are made following consultation with other IDS positions and/or custodial staff and are based on the needs of, and options considered most beneficial to inmates.
and/or inmates families. More complex matters in regard to service delivery are
resolved by the Program Manager in consultation with the Regional Co-ordinator,
Correctional Centre Counselling Service. Matters concerning policy are referred to the
Manager, Correctional Centre Counselling Service.

Challenges and Constraints

The position requires close association with inmates, both individually and in group
situations. The Correctional Centre Counsellor must respect the security arrangements
of the centre and be constantly aware of potential danger and threat to personal safety.
The associated security restrictions inherent in such an environment also have a
significant effect on the day to day operation of the position.

A major constraint of the Correctional Centre Counsellor is the generally poor
understanding of the role of the position that exists both within and external to the
Department. This can result in inappropriate requests being made of the position which
lie outside the job description and an overload of requests on Correctional Centre
Counsellors may result.

Additional constraints are;
- the lack of regular professional supervision as some of the Regional Co­
  ordinators, Correctional Centre Counselling Service are located in the
  Regional Offices and in country areas, and may not be able to maintain
  regular personal contact and support
- limited access to both the appropriate range and quality of support
  services such as DOCS, in many country areas
- high case loads and work volumes which challenge the position in the
  areas of time and resource management.

The lack of resources (computer facilities, data base etc, lack of government provided
transport) allocated to Correctional Centre Counsellors can seriously affect the efficiency
of service provision.

Time constraints are another significant factor impacting on Correctional Centre
Counsellors as there is not always sufficient time available to satisfactorily resolve all
issues.

Role

The Correctional Centre Counsellor facilitates support to inmates, assisting them to
settle into the Correctional Centre. In the initial reception screening process the
Correctional Centre Counsellor assesses and attends to immediate welfare needs such
as contacting families, arranging for placement/care of children, securement of
property/animals and providing information about the correctional system.
The Correctional Centre Counsellor is responsible for the liaison with the inmates' family. Such liaison involves providing information about the correctional system including visits, availability of travel assistance and also makes appropriate referrals to community agencies for assistance with identified needs.

As part of the inmate development team the Correctional Centre Counsellor initiates and supervises short and long term welfare case management plans and contributes to the overall case management, advocating on behalf of the inmate when required.

Aboriginal Correctional Centre Counsellors provide a service to all inmates, but with particular emphasis on Indigenous inmates, and also fulfill a cultural and advisory role to correctional staff on Indigenous issues and needs.
INMATE REFERRAL SHEET

This form to be used for Requests to see or obtain service from Inmate Support Staff, eg. Education, Welfare, Drug and Alcohol, Psychology, Legal Aid, Official Visitor, etc.

PLEASE READ THE INSTRUCTIONS OVERLEAF, PRINT THIS FORM CLEARLY AND FILL IN YOUR SECTIONS BEFORE PLACING THIS FORM IN THE REQUEST BOX IN YOUR UNIT.

WHICH SERVICE DO YOU REQUIRE? WELFARE - URGENT

INMATE'S NAME: __________________________ MIN NUMBER: _______ SENTENCE: __________________ UNIT OR WING: _______ YARD NO. AND/OR WORK LOCATION: _______ DATE: _______

WHAT DO YOU WANT: (Give Clear Details About What You Need) I need to contact Child Support Agency in Albury - my court date has been brought forward to 2nd June so far no contact with Legal Aid or Solicitor - also need legal aid papers - for family law matter. Also need Welfare to see why I have had no psychotherapy for my hand - as it was ordered by the court's and normal therapy has been done?

INMATE'S SIGNATURE: __________________________

PLACE THIS COMPLETED FORM IN THE REQUEST BOX IN YOUR UNIT.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING SECTION IS FOR STAFF ONLY

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

ACTION RECOMMENDED (Indicate any Special Needs, eg, Interpreter Services)

SIGNATURE: __________________________ PRINT: __________________________ DATE: __________________

ACTION TAKEN

SIGNATURE: __________________________ PRINT: __________________________ DATE: __________________

IF YOU SEE THE INMATE GET THE INMATE TO SIGN BEFORE YOU RETURN THIS FORM TO THE UNIT.

SIGNED: __________________________ SEEN. DATE: ___/___ INMATE TO SIGN: __________________________
INMATE REFERRAL SHEET

This form to be used for Requests to see or obtain service from Inmate Support Staff, eg: Education, Welfare, Drug and Alcohol, Psychology, Legal Aid, Official Visitor, etc.

PLEASE READ THE INSTRUCTIONS OVERLEAF, PRINT THIS FORM CLEARLY AND FILL IN YOUR SECTIONS BEFORE PLACING THIS FORM IN THE REQUEST BOX IN YOUR UNIT.

WHICH SERVICE DO YOU REQUIRE?  WELFARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INMATES NAME</th>
<th>MIN NUMBER</th>
<th>SENTENCE</th>
<th>UNIT OR WING</th>
<th>YARD NO. AND/OR WORK LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 yrs</td>
<td>3 Unit (c)</td>
<td>22-5-97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT DO YOU WANT: (Give Clear Details About What You Need)

My money hasn't come from Parole and I need to contact my wife to tell her know that I've been moved and all the visit arrangements so she doesn't have to be turned away.

INMATE'S SIGNATURE: [Signature]

Place This Completed Form In The Request Box In Your Unit.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING SECTION IS FOR STAFF ONLY

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

ACTION RECOMMENDED (Indicate any Special Needs, eg, Interpreter Services)

SIGNATURE: _______________  PRINT: _______________  DATE: _______________

ACTION TAKEN

SIGNATURE: _______________  PRINT: _______________  DATE: _______________

IF YOU SEE THE INMATE GET THE INMATE TO SIGN BEFORE YOU RETURN THIS FORM TO THE UNIT.

SIGNED: ___________________  SEEN: DATE: __________  INMATE TO SIGN: _______________
INMATE REFERRAL SHEET

This form to be used for Requests to see or obtain service from Inmate Support Staff, eg: Education, Welfare, Drug and Alcohol, Psychology, Legal Aid, Official Visitor, etc.

PLEASE READ THE INSTRUCTIONS OVERLEAF, PRINT THIS FORM CLEARLY AND FILL IN YOUR SECTIONS BEFORE PLACING THIS FORM IN THE REQUEST BOX IN YOUR UNIT.

WHICH SERVICE DO YOU REQUIRE?  WELFARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INMATES NAME</th>
<th>MIN NUMBER</th>
<th>SENTENCE</th>
<th>UNIT OR WING</th>
<th>YARD NO. AND/OR WORK LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/5/97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT DO YOU WANT: (Give Clear Details About What You Need).

I WOULD LIKE A RECEPTION CALL TO LET MY FAMILY KNOW WHERE I AM PLEASE.

INMATE'S SIGNATURE: ______________________  Place This Completed Form In The Request Box In Your Unit.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING SECTION IS FOR STAFF ONLY

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

ACTION RECOMMENDED (Indicate any Special Needs, eg, Interpreter Services)

SIGNATURE: ______________________  PRINT: ______________________  DATE: ______________________

ACTION TAKEN

SIGNATURE: ______________________  PRINT: ______________________  DATE: ______________________

IF YOU SEE THE INMATE GET THE INMATE TO SIGN BEFORE YOU RETURN THIS FORM TO THE UNIT.

SIGNED: ______________________  SEEN: ______________________  DATE: __/__/__  INMATE TO SIGN: ______________________
In 1800, I addressed the problem to believe. He was also concerned about his health and his family because of the credit of $100. He assured me to be ready for the time being. I gave assurance that he had a plan to fill out so far.