

3. EVOLUTION AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF CCS

Community Correctional Services (CCS) in Victoria supervises both adult⁷⁸ offenders on community-based orders, and parolees, to facilitate their reintegration within the community.

This chapter illustrates CCS history, its role, and its achievements to date.

3.1. CCS History

Although community-based dispositions have been in existence in various forms since 1956, an independent organisation to manage them was only created in 1983. This section traces the evolution of community-based dispositions and the development of an organisation to manage them.

The introduction of the adult probation system and the parole system, under the *Penal Reform Act 1956*, was the first effort by the Victorian Government to manage offenders in the community. The Adult Parole Board (APB) was set up to oversee the parole system and it was managed by the prison administration, as part of the Chief Secretary's Department. In the early 1960s, the prison administration became a division of the Social Welfare Department, later named the Community Welfare Services Department. The first community-based dispositions evolved during the 1970s with the establishment of three Attendance Centres under the *Social Welfare (Amendment) Act 1975*. Community-based orders required offenders to attend one of the three centres for several hours per week to undertake rehabilitation programs and community work. The *Penalties and Sentences Act 1981* established the Community Service Order, which had been trialed with 40 offender participants by 1984.

A review of the then Prisons Division in 1983 carried out by the Victorian Public Service Board resulted in its separation from the Department of Community Welfare Services. An autonomous Office of Corrections (OOC) was established under *Community Welfare Services (Director-General of Corrections) Act 1983*, to manage the corrections area. There was recognition that although corrections and welfare have complementary philosophies, they have different goals within a social control model. Community-based Corrections was established as an independent division of OOC to manage community-based dispositions. The prison administration was no longer responsible for managing these dispositions.

Since 1983, a number of legislative changes have enhanced the range of community-based dispositions. These are shown in Table 1 (Chapter 2).

The organisational evolution of Community-based Corrections into CCS as we know it today is shown in Table 3 on the next page.

⁷⁸ See Footnote 1

Table 3. Organisational evolution of CCS

Date	Organisational Status	Objective
1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of autonomous Office of Corrections (OOC) to manage the corrections function • Community-based Corrections established as an independent division of OOC to manage community-based dispositions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for greater emphasis in the management of corrections due to high numbers and prison riots, etc. • Recognition that corrections has a different goal to welfare services within a social control model • Greater focus on correctional dispositions in the community • Greater economic appeal of community-based dispositions due to lower cost relative to prisons
October 1992	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctional Services Division of the Department of Justice replaced OOC as the administrative department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for the introduction of a competitive environment – CORE established a service agency • Increased integration of the corrections system with the rest of the justice system
July 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of the Correctional Services Commissioner (OCSC) was established to manage the corrections system • CORE– the Public Correctional Enterprise was established as a service provider to OCSC with Prisons and CCS as business units • Name of Community-based Corrections changed to Community Correctional Services (CCS) • Introduction of private prison providers 1996-97 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of competition in the correctional system

CCS today is one of three business units of CORE and shares the administrative support functions with the other business units – Prison Services and Business Services⁷⁹. It has a network of 23 full-time and 27 part-time offices throughout Victoria, which are managed through four administrative regions. As at 31 July 2000 there were 391 full-time and part-time staff, including the Head Office, General Managers, Offender Services Unit, Location staff and casuals.

Legislative changes have increased the variety of orders supervised and the corresponding increase in complexity of CCS operations. Three community-based dispositions have been introduced during the past decade - namely the ICO, the CCTO and the FDO. These have been supplemented by an increase in the variety of CBO conditions available to the judiciary. ICOs and CCTOs are more severe orders than those supervised by CCS previously. Supervision of ICOs and CCTOs is more resource intensive due to the greater number and greater complexity of statutory conditions on these orders and the associated risk. The increase in the variety of CBO conditions requires CCS to access new remedial programs and put in place additional management checks and balances. The FDO, the least severe order administered by CCS, today contributes to over 50% of all CCS orders.

The increase in complexity of offender needs is illustrated by an increase in:

- Offenders with multiple needs
- Offenders with psychological/psychiatric needs and suicide ideation, and

⁷⁹ Appendix 10

- Offenders with drug and alcohol problems.

3.2. CCS' Role and Core Services

CCS was established as an independent organisation in 1983 to achieve the State's correctional objectives within a social control model. CCS' role as a correction agency within a social control model has not changed since its inception. Its role is to supervise sanctions in the community that meet the sentencing goals of the order handed down by the judiciary. While supervising the orders, CCS seeks to rehabilitate offenders in addition to managing the underlying risk that offenders may pose to the community.

During this review, many stakeholders indicated a preference for a stronger CCS role in rehabilitation and meeting the broader needs of the offender - eg. through providing or brokering programs that address the needs of homeless or intellectually disabled offenders.

The three core services CCS currently conducts are:

- Court and APB advice
- Statutory monitoring/enforcement of compliance, and
- Supervision/case management of moderate risk to high risk offenders.

CCS is responsible for providing advice to the judiciary and APB on the risks and needs of offenders, the appropriateness of sentencing options, appropriate conditions to be imposed with the order and the ability of CCS to manage the offender. This advice is contained in a pre-sentence report that is completed based on an assessment of the offender's risks and needs. Similarly, CCS assesses the eligibility of prisoners for parole and recommends strategies to manage them.

CCS brings cases of non-compliance with order conditions to the attention of the courts and the APB. While CCS policies determining non-compliance allow for discretion by CCS staff, inexperience of some staff can lead to inconsistencies when breaches are taken to court.

Supervision of sanctions and monitoring of compliance involves:

- Inducting offenders and assessing Community Work Only offenders
- Arranging and managing the program and supervision requirements of the sanction, and
- Monitoring the progress of the offender and compliance of the sanction.

In recent years CCS has taken a differentiated process of supervising sanctions based on the type of sanction and level of offender risk. All Fine Default Orders (FDO) and Community Work Only orders (CWO) are managed within a compliance stream. The compliance stream also manages low risk offenders and those offenders nearing completion of their order. The case management stream manages high risk and needs offenders and all offenders on ICO orders (regardless of risk/needs assessments).

The type of conditions attached to CBOs (with conditions), ICOs, CCTOs and some parolees range from:

- Rehabilitation programs - eg. anger management, drug and alcohol intervention, the Sex Offender Program as well as psychological counselling and psychiatric intervention
- Monitoring requirements - eg. supervision and urinalysis , and
- Non-compliance reporting, where what constitutes a breach of conditions is determined by the sentencing magistrates.

Where orders require offenders to undertake programs, CCS generally refers offenders to external program providers for rehabilitation programs and arranges for community work placements, outlined in 3.1.

3.3. Internal Response of CCS

CCS has undertaken several initiatives over the past few years to meet the changing needs of the stakeholders, including:

- Rationalisation of the regional structure

- Formalisation of offender supervision practices
- CCS organisational review
- Development of an intensive case management model
- Development of a young offender strategy
- Review of the risk/needs assessment tool
- A pilot of an enhanced court advice model
- Review of the prosecutions function within the court advice model
- A gap analysis of programmatic services for offenders
- Pilots of new programs
- Initiatives to support parolees
- Review of staff turnover
- Review of training requirements, and
- Assessment of CCS' Duty of Care.

Several recommendations from these initiatives are at different stages of implementation.

CORE has also undertaken a number of initiatives, such as:

- Developing the organisational vision, values and behaviours
- Conducting an analysis of stakeholder requirements
- Developing key performance indicators and service delivery outcomes to ensure higher levels of accountability and consistency of performance, and
- Developing and partially implementing the Business Excellence Plan.

3.3.1. Rationalisation of the CCS Regional Structure 1995

CCS was established in 1984 as one of four divisions within Correctional Services. During this period of time it assumed responsibility to deliver all correctional services for Victoria. The structure divided the state into six regions for service delivery. In 1995, the six regions were rationalised to four. Further changes occurred in 1998 when CCS underwent an organisational review to reposition itself within the criminal justice system. 1998 changes saw four General Managers appointed and located at North West, South West, South East and North East.

3.3.2. Formalisation of Offender Supervision Practices

Over the past ten years, CCS has increasingly articulated its policy on offender supervision to formalise the practices and procedures used by case management staff. The policy indicates the critical times for targeted intervention by case officers and the development of an individual management plan. CCS' expectations about management of offenders have also been specified. Case management staff are expected to engage in pro-social role modelling based on Victorian research undertaken in 1993.⁸⁰ Extensive state wide training was also undertaken in this area.

3.3.3. CCS Organisational Review

The key outcome of the organisation review was the articulation of a differentiated, two-tier model to manage offenders incorporating:

- A cost effective, compliance management stream to manage FDO, CWO and other low-risk offenders, and
- A team based case management stream to manage moderate-to-high risk offenders.

CCS has implemented the two-tier structure recommended, although the extent of distinction between the two streams is dependent on the scale of local operations and regional/location manager discretion.

Further work has been done to develop and implement the case management model, including:

- Articulation of the brokerage model for offenders to access rehabilitation programs from external providers (although some deficiencies of the model have become evident eg.

⁸⁰ Trotter, C. (1993), *The Supervision of Offenders – What Works? A Study Undertaken in Community-based Corrections Victoria*, Department of Justice: Melbourne

accessibility and availability issues, rural issues, timeliness issues, information exchange issues, etc)

- Pilot of a partnership arrangement with a non-government organisation to manage unpaid community work for FDO/CWO, although further assessment of the concept, conducted in 98/99 by CORE found that outsourcing this function did not have economic benefits
- Enhancement of the quality of court advice function by using more experienced staff, which resulted in an enhanced court advice function being piloted
- Development of a new organisation model with the following features:
 - Increase in the number of General Managers (VPS 5)⁸¹ from two to four, one for each region
 - Location Managers (VPS 4) supporting General Managers with the number of location managers being reduced from 16 to 11, and
 - Each General Manager charged with statewide responsibility for one of case management, knowledge and resource management, courts and APB advice and reporting, and discipline and discretion.

3.3.4. Intensive Case Management Model

CORE and Swinburne University of Technology worked on a study between March 1997 and July 1999 to develop an enhanced case management model to be used within CORE. The model advocated an “integrated multiple function model of case management, based on an individual case management within a team setting”. The processes involved include intake, assessment, classification, referral, intervention, monitoring, evaluation and advocacy, all aimed at addressing offenders’ individualised circumstances. The seven key principles of this model are:

- Team work, with team members coming from various and different roles
- Regular issues-centred case conferences
- Case management as a transformation process, for personal development of the offender/prisoner and a reduction in the risk of reoffence
- A central case management role – ie a staff member in each prison unit or CCS location is primarily responsible for case management and team work in relation to the management of offenders
- Professional support for staff including education, mentoring and supervision
- Offender centred approach and philosophy, including offender input into case management development, and mutual development of the case management plan, its implementation and evaluation, and
- Encouragement of a collaborative culture, so that aspects of the sentence or order (other than security, containment and breach management) are managed collaboratively.

Another key feature of the model is the allocation of case officer to offender being based on the relevancy of officer skills and experience as determined by offender assessment. A pilot at Sunshine has revealed that, for this model to be successful, the maximum caseload is 30-35 cases per officer.

3.3.5. Young Offender Strategy

A Youth Offender Strategy has been developed within CORE to manage offenders between the age of 17 and 25. The strategy supports a holistic approach to manage youth, as the wide range of criminogenic risk and protective factors affecting offending behaviour is different to that of the general offender population. The specific recommendations for CCS are:

- Incorporation of youth specific factors in their assessment to determine the requirements for supervision
- Development of a strong relationship with Juvenile Justice to exchange information regarding case history
- Adoption of an outreach approach to managing/supervising youth, and
- Development of a Young Offender Program which incorporates life skills training and cognitive behavioural therapy. It should also include an adventure-based component during commencement to elicit motivation, trust and develop confidence.

⁸¹ VPS 5 refers to the level of an administrative position within the Victorian Public Service. VPS positions range from VPS 1, the lowest, to VPS 5, the highest.

3.3.6. Review of Assessment Tool

The current Victorian Risk and Needs Assessment Tool, based on the Wisconsin Assessment of Client Risk and Needs Scale, was adopted in 1994. It measures the re-offending risk and the needs of the offender. A study indicated that the tool has limited predictive validity, has a tendency to over-predict risk and does not support the development of an accurate intervention plan.⁸² Work conducted by CCS over the past year has led to the addition of a Suicide Screening Assessment and identification of modifications to the current tool to develop better predictive capability.⁸³

3.3.7. Pilot of an Enhanced Court Advice Model

The court advice model within CCS was established during the 1980s. CCS piloted an enhanced model in January 2000 and co-located experienced staff to service this function in the Melbourne Magistrates Court. The feedback on this model has been positive with comments indicating that the model is responsive and useful. Although dedicated staff members provide court advice in other locations as well, they are not co-located and may not be as experienced as the staff participating in the pilot. CCS is planning to establish similar units across other major courts.

3.3.8. Review of the Prosecutions Function

The Victorian Government Solicitor's Office has recently reviewed the prosecution function within the court advice model. The key recommendations being considered by CCS are:

- Implementing the enhanced court advice model in all major courts
- Prosecution training to be provided to applicants who meet the position and person-specific criteria for Court Services Officers
- Special prosecutions training to be provided by Leo Cussen Institute
- Improved information exchange for the prosecutors within CCS and with external agencies, and
- Listing of breach cases on specific days of the calendar.

3.3.9. An Analysis of Gaps in Programmatic Services for Offenders

As an outcome of the 1998 CCS Organisational Review and strategy for operations, the CCS framework delivery now operates according to a brokerage model. The model requires that Community Correctional Officers assess the needs of offenders with a high risk of re-offending to determine the types of interventions that can be brokered that assist them to reduce their re-offending behaviour. The results of a recent analysis of programmatic services clearly showed that service availability for most types of programs is extremely variable.⁸⁴

3.3.10. Pilot of New Programs

Due to the lack of community programs targeted to the needs of Special Needs Groups, CCS has initiated a number of pilots or interim programs to meet their needs. These include:

- W.O.M.E.N. (Ways of Maintaining Effective Networks) targeted at high risk women offenders on parole/CBOs with drug and alcohol intervention needs
- Ethno-specific counselling
- Cognitive skill based pilot program
- New Trax program for young offenders and
- Cultural immersion programs for indigenous offenders.

3.3.11. Initiatives to Support Parolees

To support the transition period from prison to the community a number of programs have been planned including:

- A three-phased Community Transition Program ("New Horizons Program") is being established to target young male repeat offenders with substantial drug and alcohol problems. Phase 1 and 2 involve 16-weeks training in a minimum-security prison followed by an 8-12 week transition

⁸² Moulday, N. (1994) *Predicting Dangerousness with the Victorian Risk/Needs Assessment tool: A Validation Study*, Department of Justice: Melbourne

⁸³ McLachlan, C. (2000), *Risk of Re-offending and Needs Assessment Tools – Which Best Meets the Needs of CORE?*, Department of Justice: Melbourne

⁸⁴ See Appendix 9

phase within a transitional unit. Phase three is a post-release support phase within a highly supportive framework. Modules include drug and alcohol treatment, cognitive programs, pre release preparation, community service, vocational and educational training, and

- Five post release programs will be piloted with women, young offenders, older offenders with dependent children, older offenders with imprisonment history and Indo-Chinese offenders who have a history of drug abuse. Within these pilots three months pre release support will be followed by six months intensive case management after release. A holistic approach will be used with emphasis on development of post release support within the community.

3.3.12. Review of Staff Turnover

Last year CORE/CCS implemented two initiatives to reduce staff turnover and increase staff satisfaction outlined below:

- The proportion of staff in ongoing positions was increased from 30% to 70%, and
- Based on particular experience and expertise, the salary of some staff earning less than \$30,000 was increased to \$31,000.

There has been a reduction in staff turnover after these initiatives from 46% turnover for VPS2 CCO Fixed Term (January to June 1999) to 21% percent in June 2000.

3.3.13. Review of Training Requirements

In 1998/99 a staff development framework was prepared. The framework clearly articulates training strategies and implementation issues. However, to date, implementation has not taken place.

3.3.14. Assessment of the 'Duty of Care' of CCS

A screening assessment tool is currently used to identify the risk of suicide, the tool is used as part of the CCO Court Advice, Parole and Review Assessments by the CCO. In addition to identifying suicide risk the tool also assists in developing interventions that need to be employed to reduce the risk of harm to an offender. In recent times CCS has further addressed the issue of Duty of Care and has prepared a Duty of Care discussion paper. The paper identifies that determining the appropriate boundaries/expectations for CCS' Duty of Care is difficult due to:

- An absence of current case law in this area, and
- Multiplicity of legislation that governs this area.

3.3.15. Business Excellence Plan

A Business Excellence Plan⁸⁵ has been developed by CORE to rejuvenate the organisation in three areas:

1. Customers and stakeholders

- Improve continuity of care for offenders and prisoners
- Improve effectiveness of programs designed to reduce offending behaviour, and
- Reduce harm to prisoners and offenders.

2. People

- Promote increased commitment and involvement of staff
- Enhance the effectiveness and development of staff, and
- Improve the health, safety and wellbeing of staff.

3. Business

- Build an integrated knowledge management system by June 2001
- Effectively manage CORE's financial processes, and
- Nurture a culture of excellence, evidenced by achieving an Australian Business Excellence Award by 2003.

In the 1999/2000 financial year CORE entered the Australian Quality Council's Business Excellence Award program at the Business Improvement Level. CORE achieved a Business

⁸⁵ See Appendix 11

Excellence Award at the Foundation Level. This year CORE has applied for a Progress Level award within the same category to demonstrate progression in its objectives.

The organisation has prepared a submission to identify achievements over the last financial year in the seven business excellence categories.

3.4. Conclusion

CCS has initiated a number of activities over the last few years aimed at enhancing service delivery and responding to stakeholders needs in a changing environment. There are many areas that have been identified where future developments are essential for Community Correctional Services to ensure the needs of Government, Courts, Community and Offenders are met, and where the expectations of stakeholders are congruent with the service that CCS delivers. Future work is required to enable CCS to successfully:

- Address the increase in the imprisonment rate by establishing CCS as a genuine and legitimate sentencing option in its own right, and enhancing the credibility of its service with the Adult Parole Board, the judiciary and the community;
- Address the increase in the proportion of orders not successfully completed either due to breach of conditions or further offence;
- Manage the risk of re-offending by targeting CCS resources and services to meet the needs of high-risk offenders;
- Enhance the targeting of CCS resources to high risk offenders by implementing an efficient and reliable assessment tool to accurately assess risk and identify needs;
- Address the rise in proportion of drug related crimes by ensuring programs and services are available to meet the needs of these offenders; and
- Address the increasing number of young offenders within the CCS population by ensuring that CCS employ diverse strategies to effectively manage this group. It is also pertinent for CCS to develop collaborative relationships with Juvenile Justice Services to effectively manage this offender group.

Specific projects required to ensure the above strategies are successfully addressed include:

- Comprehensive Human Resource Management strategy which includes a Service-wide assessment of current qualification and experience levels, recruitment strategy to address identified gaps and projected Service needs, and training and development strategy;
- Remuneration review to ensure the CCS Human Resource Management practices reflect the roles and responsibilities of staff working within the area and are comparable with other related fields and jurisdictions;
- Development of an effective communication strategy;
- Review of breach policies and consideration of a breach agreement between the courts, APB and CCS;
- Assessment and evaluation of programs, services and delivery mechanisms required to meet the needs of the judiciary, APB and offenders; and
- Implementation of an offender management model which allows for effective targeting of resources and provision of the desired level of supervision.

Focussing on these areas will address both the immediate and future needs of the government and judiciary, and contribute to CCS providing an optimal service to the courts, APB, community and offenders.

Details of individual projects required to support management of the key areas outlined here are provided in Chapters 5 and Chapter 8.