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Executive summary

Tasmania Community Corrections provides advice to courts and the Parole Board to inform sentencing decisions and manages and supports offenders on community based probation, parole and community service orders.

The mission of Community Corrections encompasses the dual purpose of offender rehabilitation and upholding community safety and is articulated in a commitment to work “with offenders on community based orders in ways which aim to reduce re-offending and contribute to a safer society.”

Over recent years, the demand on Community Corrections has steadily increased, as the number of offenders on community based orders has risen. There are also concerns that the current allocate of resources across the three Community Corrections regions (North, North West and South) is not matching relative need across the State, resulting in unequal workloads. At the same time, Community Corrections has also faced increasing difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff, a situation mirrored in other Australian jurisdictions.

Despite a number of initiatives implemented to address these challenges, Community Corrections recognised the need to look holistically at the organisation’s structure and roles and responsibilities to ensure that services are able to respond to current and future demand, in line with contemporary practice.

In May 2008, the Community Corrections Directorate commissioned a review of Tasmania Community Corrections. The review identifies recommendations for future improvements to ensure that Community Corrections is able to respond to current demands and can flexibly adapt to future demands, in terms of recruitment, retention of staff, changing models of practice and changes in the population of offenders on community based orders.

The review builds on work already undertaken by the Directorate and used an approach that includes a desktop review and consultations with a wide range of Community Corrections and external stakeholders to identify challenges and areas for improvement with the current service delivery model. This report provides details relating to areas for improvement for the Community Corrections Service as a whole and is supplemented by:

- a report that specifically focuses on improvements to the Community Service Order (CSO) scheme; and

- an implementation plan for improvements to the Community Corrections model and to the CSO scheme in particular.
Case for change

Feedback from stakeholders highlighted a number of key challenges with the current Community Corrections model, which were considered when developing a recommended model for improvements. These key findings are as described below.

1. **The current flat structure does not recognise or make best use of staff experience.** This has the potential to lead to inappropriate matching of offenders to staff that have the required experience and skill, and limited opportunities for career progress and workforce retention.

2. **There is currently no clear rationale for prioritising and allocating cases and matching resource to risk.** This leads to staff caseloads that are too complex or too large, limited active case management for higher risk offenders, and inconsistent levels of supervision and management that do not match to risk.

3. **There is no whole person focus on offenders and limited focus on rehabilitation** to prevent reoffending.

4. **There is a lack of investment in workforce development** and limited capacity to consider and embed contemporary practice into day-to-day operations. This may mean that the response to offenders may have limited effect and may also impact on support and development opportunities for staff and on recruitment and retention.

5. **There is inconsistent application of processes and procedures** within and across regional offices. This leads to inconsistent responses to offenders and possible perceptions of leniency and lack of supervision and support for offenders in the community.

6. **Offender programs and other necessary interventions are not readily available.** This restricts opportunities to facilitate rehabilitation and reduce reoffending and may impact sentencing decisions.

7. **Community Corrections is perceived to be operating in isolation** from a number of key stakeholders. This leads to inadequate ‘through care’ and aftercare of an offender, particularly at the point of transition from custody to the community, or at the end of a community order and may also lead to potential misunderstandings and misperceptions of the effectiveness of Community Corrections by other stakeholders.

Proposed improvements to the Community Corrections model

The review recommends a number of opportunities for improvements to the current Community Corrections model, as outlined in Figure A, below.

*Figure A: Elements of recommended Community Corrections model*
These elements of the recommended model are summarised in the following table, *Table A.*
### Table A: proposed elements of the recommended Tasmania Community Corrections model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Strategic Direction | The Community Corrections service should be underpinned by principles of offender management and clearly stated aims and objectives for the service. These will form the basis for a common understanding of offender management and inform improvements to the Community Corrections model. | Current aims and objectives for Community Corrections should be revised to reflect contemporary practice, particularly focusing on the fundamental components of offender management and the principles of offender rehabilitation, reparation and restoration to the community. These are underpinned by the following recommended principles for managing offenders:  
* whole of person approach to offender management;  
* a focus on rehabilitation;  
* a whole of system approach;  
* a skilled and competent workforce; and  
* flexible and tailored response. |
| 2 Community Corrections governance | Strong governance is essential to deliver a safe, effective and efficient community corrections service. Community Corrections governance defines how the service and its delivery is managed and by whom at a strategic and an operational level. | The following functions should be managed by the Department of Justice: leadership and strategic direction; policy and program development; workforce strategy; managing funding and submitting future applications; and quality management.  
Under current arrangements, the Community Corrections Directorate will manage many of these functions. However, future consideration could be given to the development of a Directorate of Corrections, which consolidates central office policy level functions across Community Corrections and the Tasmanian Prison Service (TPS). This would align strategies and approaches to working with custody and community based offenders and would realise efficiencies and greater workforce flexibility and career development opportunities. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is also proposed that regional operational teams have responsibility for staff management, assurance of operational quality, data collection and reporting, implementation of continuous improvement initiatives and networking and forming partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Community Corrections management

Effective responses to community based offenders should include management and supervision of offenders on an order, administration of an order, allocation of cases and the delivery of offender programs.

To meet organisational objectives of Community Corrections, all offenders should be managed within a framework of management, supervision and administration based on the principle that “resources follow risk”. Offenders with a higher risk of reoffending, should receive supervision at higher levels of intensity. Offender programs are also an important aspect of offender management to address offending behaviour and reduce reoffending.

Under the model, management of an offender involves completing a comprehensive risk assessment (and re-assessment), writing and presenting reports to courts and the Parole Board, planning community based sentences and developing and reviewing an Individual Management Plan (IMP). The proposed model for Community Corrections recommends that assessments and court and Parole Board reports are undertaken by staff who demonstrate appropriate skills and competence.

Supervision of an offender involves the day-to-day implementation of a sentence and of an IMP. Forming professional relationships with an offender and motivating and supporting them to comply with their order and their IMP is key. Supervision of high risk offenders requires particular skills and experience and should be undertaken by offender managers who can demonstrate this.

The importance of administration tasks to assist an order to stay on course is also important.

Cases should be allocated to the most appropriate member of staff, based on the assessed risk of reoffending of an offender, the skills and experience of staff and on their capacity to manage the case.
Program guidelines should be developed to guide and inform offender management tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of the model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 Organisational structure | The current organisational structure of Community Corrections should be revised to implement elements of the new model. Improvements to day-to-day operational arrangements are also recommended. | The proposed structure includes statewide and regional positions to better meet demands on the organisation, to provide a more focused approach to learning and development and to ensure that resources follows risk, in terms of being able to allocate more experienced offender managers to more complex cases. Positions include:  
- Community Corrections Directorate  
- Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit  
- Statewide CSO Unit  
- Statewide Operations Manager  
- Senior Practice Consultant (SPC)  
- Team Leader (TL)  
- Senior Offender Manager (SOM)  
- Offender Manager (OM)  
- Offender Manager - CSOs (OM-CSOs) (South only)  
- Paid CSO Supervisors  
Operational recommendations are also made to improve responses to offenders, provide improved safety for staff and to realise efficiencies in allocation of resources. These are:  
- all offices should be open during usual business hours;  
- greater focus on health and safety considerations for staff in regional offices;  
- management of offenders to be conducted out of four offices: Hobart, Bridgewater, Burnie and Launceston; |
### Elements of the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• staff can move flexibly around the state to respond to changes in demand;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘country areas’ are redefined to delineate between regional and rural areas to rationalise travel to these areas to manage offenders on community based orders; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pre parole assessments reports to be prepared in the South only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, it is recommended that Community Corrections remuneration is moved from the current Professional Employees Award to the General Stream Award under the Public Sector Union Wages Agreement. This will provide a greater level of flexibility and enable a tiered structure to be created.

### Roles and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Roles and responsibilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the proposed organisational structure, specified roles and responsibilities will support effective and efficient Community Corrections practice and positive outcomes for offenders.</td>
<td>Offender managers should only perform tasks for which their specialist skills and qualifications are needed, and key functions in offender management require specific competence and skills. The specified roles and responsibilities related to offender management promote strong leadership, enable consistency in operations across the state, and reinforce the culture of professional supervision and development to maintain quality aligned to contemporary practice. Offenders will be managed by Senior Offender Managers and Offender Managers, with administrative support provided by Administration Officers and professional support provided by Team Leaders and the Senior Practice Consultant. A Statewide Operations Manager is responsible for overseeing all Community Corrections operations across the State, aligned to policy and priorities. The Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit will have responsibility for developing and delivering induction and ongoing learning for Community Corrections staff; and offender specific programs for community based offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of the model</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quality management</td>
<td>Quality management is the process by and within which quality is defined, measured, monitored and improved. Within the Community Corrections context, quality development is closely linked to risk management. A quality service is one in which offenders are managed safely and where levels of resources and input match levels of criminogenic risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Partnerships</td>
<td>Partnerships with key stakeholders will underpin a renewed focus on offender management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of the model</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

Community Corrections Tasmania manages offenders in the community on probation, parole and community service orders. Community Corrections forms part of the Department of Justice’s Corrective Services Output Group, along with the Tasmania Prison Service (TPS).

In February 2008, the Community Corrections Directorate commenced a review into the structure and operations of Community Corrections and developed an ‘as is’ report of the existing service system and a comparison of other community corrective services in other Australian jurisdictions. In October 2008, an external consultant was engaged to undertake a review of the Community Service Order (CSO) scheme and to continue the review into the wider structure and operations of Community Corrections, building on work that had been completed previously.

The reviews provide a timely examination of the Community Corrections approach to ensure that the service is able to continue to meet increasing demand and can accommodate the use of a new risk/needs assessment tool and potential future changes to the way in which the Parole Board operates.

Within this context, it was therefore appropriate to examine the Community Corrections Service as a whole, looking at its overall structure and the various roles and functions within the Service. In doing this, we have explored the models used by Community Corrections areas in other Australian jurisdictions for their operational, programs and policy areas, with the intent of drawing on any learnings that may inform the development of alternatives for Tasmania Community Corrections.

In particular, the review of the CSO scheme has been a priority of the Department of Justice for some time due to a number of complexities, issues and risks that have arisen in relation to the program’s operations. The review of the CSO scheme follows on from a 2007 review by the Tasmanian Audit Office and subsequent recommendations made regarding the scheme.

1.1 Purpose of the Community Corrections review

The primary objectives of the Community Corrections and the CSO scheme reviews are complementary but have different, specific focuses.

The objective of the Community Corrections review was to ‘ensure that the structure of Community Corrections allows it to respond to current demands and provides the flexibility to adapt to future demands, in terms of recruitment, retention of staff, changing models of practice and changes in the population of offenders on community based orders’. Building on work already completed by the Directorate, the review involves:

---

1 Tasmanian Audit Offices’ Performance Audit of the Management of Community Service Orders (2007). Internal communication.
making recommendations to develop and implement a new model for Community Corrections;

• recommending the workforce and organisational structure across the state; and

• identifying any areas that may benefit from additional resources or focus in the future.

The objective of the CSO scheme review was to develop options and provide recommendations on an appropriate model of delivery that takes into account regional issues and variations. In particular, the review examined and made recommendations regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of the scheme, with a focus on the following areas:

• the consistency with which the scheme is delivered across Tasmania;

• whether the scheme is delivered in line with standards for quality and risk, and whether it meets Tasmanian Government and legislative requirements;

• what the aim of the scheme is and/or should be (e.g. rehabilitation, reparation);

• the availability and appropriateness of projects;

• the length of orders and time taken to complete them; and

• resourcing of the scheme, including human resource allocation.

The review also includes the development of an implementation plan which will highlight next steps, activities, timeframes and change and risk management strategies required to implement changes and improvements resulting from the review. The implementation plan will be available as a separate report.

1.2 Review methodology

The review methodology was devised with regard to the preliminary activities undertaken by the Department of Justice including:

• mapping out the activities that Community Corrections currently undertake;

• undertaking an analysis of Community Corrections operations across Australian jurisdictions; and

• completing a workload analysis, essentially identifying resource allocation across Tasmania.
The above activities helped to establish an understanding of the ‘as is’ operations and this key information allowed the continuation of the review by external partners.

The approach to the review of Community Corrections includes the following stages:

- desktop review of the:
  - information provided by Community Corrections on the current activities, workload allocations and jurisdictional comparisons;
  - Sentencing Act and any other key documentation to inform the development of a new Community Corrections model;
- initial consultations with stakeholders including Community Corrections staff and managers, magistrates and court representatives, Tasmanian Prison Service representatives, legal aid, police and community services;
- development and refinement of a draft statewide operating model for Community Corrections with the Project Steering Committee;
- modelling of the workforce requirements around the state;
- final reporting; and
- development of an implementation plan.

1.3 Documenting the review

For simplicity and to support the development of implementation and communication plans required to take recommendations forward, the process and output of the review is documented in the following reports:

- the Review of Tasmania Community Corrections Report;
- the Review of the Community Service Order Scheme Report; and
- the Community Corrections and CSO Scheme Implementation Plan.

1.4 Purpose of this report

This report documents the outputs of each stage of the review for Community Corrections and the recommendations for an improved model. The findings and recommendation for the CSO
scheme component of the review are included in the report, the *Review of the Community Service Order Scheme Final Report*.

This report outlines the evidence for change through presenting areas for improvement identified during consultations with stakeholders. It also provides suggestions and recommendations for improvements to create an improved service model for Community Corrections in general.

As a whole, this report presents a forward direction for Tasmania Community Corrections. The implementation plan, to be developed as part of this project, will provide further details on “how” the changes will be implemented (the activities required) and the timeframe for implementation.

### 1.5 Terminology

This report uses a number of terms that require further explanation, based on the context in which they are used.

The term ‘offender management’ refers to a whole range of activities undertaken to manage offenders in the community. This includes activities taken at a whole of service level, e.g. ‘Community Corrections is the organisation that provides offender management’, as well as at an individual level, e.g. ‘a member of Community Corrections staff is responsible for offender management of an individual’.

The report refers to a number of Community Corrections staff grades by title, including a Senior Offender Manager and an Offender Manager. Both these staff grades are responsible for the management of individual offenders, although Senior Offender Managers will have responsibility for clients who present a higher risk. However, the phrase ‘offender manager’ is a generic term used to refer to any member of Community Corrections staff who conducts offender management activities with an individual.

### 1.6 Structure of the report

The report is structured, as follows:

- **Section 2**: This section provides a brief summary of the current Community Corrections structure and outlines the demand for Community Corrections services.

- **Section 3**: This section summarises the findings from project consultations. It identifies strengths of the current approach and areas for development to evidence the case for change underpinning improvements to the current Community Corrections model.

---

2 Uncapitalised.
• **Section 4:** This section provides an overview and presents a case for change for proposed improvements to the Community Corrections model.

• **Section 5:** This section outlines suggested improvements for the proposed strategic direction for Community Corrections and clarifies the principles of offender management.

• **Section 6:** This section describes the proposed Community Corrections governance arrangements.

• **Section 7:** This section describes the Community Corrections management functions for Community Corrections in terms of management and supervision of an offender and administration of an order.

• **Section 8:** This section describes the underpinning organisational structure for the proposed model and considers workforce structure and operational considerations.

• **Section 9:** This section describes the roles and responsibilities for Community Corrections staff in managing community based offenders.

• **Section 10:** This section provides an outline for a quality management approach that incorporates a framework for quality assurance, ensuring continuous improvements and workforce management strategies.

• **Section 11:** This section identifies key stakeholders for Community Corrections and considers how partnership arrangements may be established.

• **Section 12:** This section identifies next steps to be considered to take forward recommendations included in this report.
2 Overview of Community Corrections

The Report on Existing Structure and Operations \(^3\) (referred to as the ‘as is’ report) prepared by the Department of Justice provides the context of Community Corrections in Tasmania and the way in which service is delivered. This information is important as a background to the current review. This section provides a very broad summary of the current context and operations of Community Corrections and describes the current demand for services across the state.

The mission of Community Corrections encompasses the dual purpose of offender rehabilitation and upholding community safety and is articulated in a commitment to work “with offenders on community based orders in ways which aim to reduce re-offending and contribute to a safer society.”

The statutory responsibility for sentencing and managing offenders in the community is established through the Sentencing Act 1997, the Corrections Act 1997, the Monetary Penalties Enforcement Act 2005, and Parole Orders (Transfer) Act 1983. In Tasmania, three community based order types are available: probation, parole and community service orders (CSOs).

Community Corrections’ budget allocation for 2008-09 is approximately $5 million, the vast majority of which is allocated to salaries. At the time of the review, there are 56.28 FTE staff across the state, divided into four areas:

- Office of the Director (Directorate), based in Hobart;
- Northern Region, with an office in Launceston and outreach to the northern areas;
- North Western Region, with offices in Burnie and Devonport, with satellites working in Queenstown, Smithton, and Ulverstone to provide outreach services within the North Western Region; and
- Southern Region, with offices in Rosny, Bridgewater and Hobart, with satellites working in New Norfolk, and Huonville and outreach to other areas within the Southern Region.

As well as a Director, the range of positions include regional managers, professional supervisors, probation officers, administrative staff, operational staff and policy and programs staff.

\(^3\) Received from Department of Justice, dated 18th October 2008.
2.1 Demand for community sentences

This section summarises the current demand for community based sentences and provides data and information on:

- number of offenders, by order type and by region and office;
- levels of activity by office, including numbers of pre sentence reports (PSRs) and pre parole reports (PPRs), and breaches;
- staffing numbers and proportion of offenders by staff numbers across offices;
- caseloads of probation officers by region; and
- profile of offenders on community sentences including gender, Indigenous status and level of risk.

As illustrated in Table 2.1, over the last eight years, the average daily number of offenders being supervised by Tasmania Community Corrections has increased from 872 in 2002-03 to 1,190 in 2006-07. The total daily average offender population for 2006-07 was 1,190 and for 2007-08, was 1,122.

Table 2.1: Average Daily Offender Population\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO-Other</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO Fine</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: An offender may have more than one type of order, therefore total offender numbers do not necessarily equal the sum of all order types.

The largest proportion of offenders supervised by Community Corrections over this time has consistently been probation orders, followed by CSOs not arising from conversion of a fine (CSO – Other).

\(^4\) From Justice Offender Information Systems Tasmania, in the Directorate’s ‘as-is’ report, page 4
2.1.1 Variation in regional demand and activities

Figure 2.1, below, shows the distribution of the type of orders managed by each Community Corrections Office. This information is taken from a snapshot of caseloads as at 10 October 2008.

*Figure 2.1: Numbers of orders, by type and by office, in 2007*

The figure shows that probation officers in Hobart manage the greatest volume of all types of orders. As a percentage of the total number of orders managed by each office, Launceston and Burnie manage a greater percentage of CSOs than other offices: 64 per cent of all orders managed in Launceston are CSOs and 59 per cent of all orders in Burnie are CSOs. The percentage of CSOs as a total of all orders is lower in the Hobart office because the Rosny office (Clarence) manages a significant proportion of the CSOs in the South. Under the current structure, a single probation officer manages these CSOs in Rosny.

Figure 2.2, below, shows the total number of completed reports for each office during 2007.
The highest number of completed reports across all offices are PSRs, with the Hobart office conducting the highest number in the state. The number of CSO suitability reports to advise courts on an offender’s suitability for CSOs are low in proportion to the total number of CSOs. For example, while CSOs account for 64 per cent of all orders managed in Launceston, only 32 per cent of all reports completed during 2007 were CSO suitability reports. This may be because a CSO suitability report may also be completed as part of a PSR and may not be recorded as a separate report in the Offenders Information System (OIS).

Tables 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, below, provide numbers of the completed reports by each region between 2003 and September 2008. It should be noted that 2008 figures are provided as at 1st September 2008 and do not represent the full year figures.

Table 2.2: Number of PPRs completed by region by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures to 1st September 2008
Table 2.3: Number of PSRs completed by region, by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures to 1st September 2008

Table 2.4: Number of CSO suitability reports completed by region, by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures to 1st September 2008

Of particular interest, this data indicates that the South conduct the majority of PPRs, that the numbers of completed PSR have grown in all regions since 2003 and that there has been a decrease in CSO suitability reports in all regions in 2007, most notably in the North West. As discussed above, this decrease in CSO suitability report may be a consequence of these being completed as part of a PSR and not recorded separately in OIS.

Figure 2.3, below, shows the total number of reports completed each year between 2003-2007. Data up to September 2008 is included in the graph to illustrate the continued trend of demand for reports.
The figures show that there has been a decline in the number of requests for CSO suitability reports, a steady demand for PPRs and an increase in the number of requests for PSRs. This has considerable impact on resources as PSRs are time consuming.

The proportion of workload\(^5\) per probation staff member varies in each region, indicating that the current allocation of resources does not reflect the actual demand in each region. This is illustrated in Table 2.5, below, which compares the proportion of offenders, completed reports and staff across each region in 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per cent total offenders</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent total completed reports</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent total staff(^5)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) In this context, a workload is considered to include the work undertaken by a member of probation staff to manage offenders and complete reports relating to offenders.
The figures show that, during 2007, the South had 65 per cent of all offenders in the state but only 58 per cent of the workforce. By contrast, the North had 23 per cent of the workforce to manage 17 per cent of all offenders and the North West had 20 per cent of the workforce to manage 18 per cent of all offenders. This disparity is also illustrated in Table 2.6, below, which shows the average caseload probation officer in each region. These figures include all activity related to an offender, including preparing reports and conducting breaches.

Table 2.6: Average caseload per probation officers by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that the South has the highest average caseload out of all the regions.

Snapshot data, provided by the Directorate on 10 October 2008, provides information on the actual caseloads of each staff member on that date. This data provides an illustration of the actual caseload requirements to manage offenders only, as activities relating to reports, breaches and other activities have been removed. Therefore, the data presented in Table 2.7 provides a useful illustration of the range of caseload sizes as they relate to offender management only.

Table 2.7: Minimum, maximum and average caseloads as at 10 October 2008, by order type, and number of staff managing the orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caseloads (offenders per probation officer)</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>No. of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation and parole only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All orders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Figures are illustrative only and do not provide weighting for order type, risk level or length of an order. All calculations are made using 2008 staffing figures. This means that caseloads for earlier years may be underestimated, as the number of staff has increased over the years.

7 The figures in this table do not include the caseload of one individual staff member who, on 10 October 2008, had a caseload of 123 CSOs and one probation order as this is an anomaly and skews the data.

8 There is a number of staff (nine) who carry a caseload of six or fewer CSO offenders. These offenders are likely to be located in rural and remote areas and are visited by probation officers who have an allocated country area. They have not been included in the figures in order to illustrate a more accurate snapshot of actual caseloads.
The figures show considerable variation in the caseload sizes, with a minimum of two offenders per probation officer and a maximum of 49 offenders per probation officer. The average caseload is 23 offenders for probation and parole orders and 41 for CSOs only.

Regional information shows that, although the average caseload is slightly different for all regions, with the lowest caseload in the North West (average of 20 offenders on a caseload) and the highest in the South (average of 25 offenders on a caseload). The average caseload in the North is 24. However, there is a greater difference in the median caseload: In the South the median caseload is 31 offenders, in the North it is 26 and in the North West it is 22.

2.1.2 Offender demographics

Key features of the community based offender population are:

- Female offenders make up approximately 20 per cent of the total number of community based offenders.
- The biggest group of offenders on community based orders are aged 17-24, followed by the 25-29 age group.
- Offenders from Indigenous backgrounds make up between 11-12 per cent of offenders supervised on community based orders each year.

All of these demographics have remained fairly consistent over the years.  

---

9 This information is based on year end figures, from 2003 to 2007, provided by the Directorate.
3 Consultation findings

The proposed improvements to the Community Corrections model discussed in this report include a number of elements to address key challenges and issues with the current approach. These were identified through consultations with a range of stakeholders, and through findings of an ‘as is’ analysis conducted by the Directorate and documented in their Report on Existing Structure and Operations. This section presents a summary of the consultation findings.

3.1 Strengths of the current model

A number of strengths were identified with the existing model and approaches to delivering Community Corrections services in Tasmania. These are:

- a workforce that has a good mix of experienced staff, with considerable corporate, operational and procedural knowledge, and newer staff with more recent tertiary qualifications;
- good collaborative working relationships with a number of external providers to support referrals and, in some cases, joint working relationships to support offenders;
- a recent investment of resources in providing central leadership, developing policy responses and maintaining an awareness and understanding of emerging research to continue to improve service delivery in line with contemporary practice; and
- a number of recent changes in the system to improve responses to community based offenders. These include the creation of a separate CSO team in the South to respond to a high demand and the introduction of an improved risk and case management tool, the Level of Service – Case Management Inventory (LS-CMI).

3.2 Areas for improvement

Consultations with stakeholders identified a number of potential areas for improvement. These included:

- organisational structure and function;
- offender management; and
- stakeholder management.

Each of these is discussed in more detail below.

---

10 Internal Community Corrections document, last updated on 17th October 2008.
3.2.1 Organisational structure and functions

Team structure, supervision: Community Corrections operates within a flat structure with very few opportunities for career progress, linked to the development of higher levels of skill, competence and knowledge. Feedback from consultations indicate that, although there is a strong professional supervision framework and positions of Professional Supervisors in each region, pressures on time and resources have limited the effectiveness and scope of supervision provided to offender managers.

Workloads: It was reported that the Directorate has undertaken some work to determine caseload and allocation formulae for probation officers. However, at present, stakeholders noted that there is no explicit understanding about what constitutes a ‘suitable’ caseload. This was both in terms of numbers and type (risk) of offenders managed by a probation officer. Although not commented on during the consultations, there are concerns that this could lead to inappropriate disparities in caseloads which could impact on the quality of input and risk management provided to an offender.

Training: Although a Programs Coordinator has been introduced to focus on staff training and development, it was reported that current ongoing training is limited and is perceived to not match workforce requirements. It was also noted that there is no support to embed training into work practice. Stakeholders also highlighted the lack of induction and orientation for new staff. This was seen as a particularly strong issue as new staff were reported to feel unsupported.

Specialist roles: A few examples of specialist roles undertaken by designated probation officers were noted across the state. These have developed over time to respond to perceived demands and are different in all regions, partly related to size of the workforce in each region. Although this was reported to improve the response to some tasks (e.g. preparing and conducting prosecutions), it was commented that specialised roles may present a risk if the staff member responsible for the task is away. It was also noted that creating specialised roles may lead to deskilling. Feedback from consultations indicated that there is now an opportunity to review these specialisations to ensure they are still appropriate or to consider other functions that should be specialised roles.

Non probation officer staff: The consultations also highlighted a number of issues relating to the functions of other staff. It was reported that there are opportunities for Administration Officers to be more utilised to undertake further administrative tasks to support the management of orders. Community Corrections stakeholders also commented on the need for clarity regarding the role of Regional Managers vis a vis the Directorate in light of the Directorate’s renewed focus on strategic and policy direction.

Systems and quality assurance: At the time of the review, the current Community Corrections Manual was under review and revision. The review found that the wealth of experience and procedural knowledge of the workforce meant that the (old) Manual was not always identified as a working document. In the absence of an induction program, this is particularly challenging for new staff who do not have procedural knowledge. A number of key performance indicators
were reported to be in place that relate to activities (such as time taken to do a task). However, stakeholders noted few output or outcome measures to monitor and measure service delivery and standards of response. While internal vetting of key decisions and reviews of case files occurs in regions and, on an ad hoc basis, statewide, the review found limited evidence of systematic quality assurance and continuous improvement mechanisms.

**Operations and infrastructure:** The review identified a number of areas in which improvements could be made to improve response to offenders and the safety of operation for probation officers. A number of offices close during the lunch period, a time when offenders who work are most able to attend appointments. In some cases, the closure is a consequence of having too few staff to safely open the office. A number of stakeholders also noted, and it was observed, that the closed layout of offices presents a safety risk to probation officers who are required to conduct supervision and assessment meetings with offenders in their own offices.

### 3.2.2 Offender management

**Advice to courts:** A key role of Community Corrections is to provide advice to courts, based on assessments and, through written reports, to inform sentencing decisions. Although Magistrates generally commented on the high quality of court reports, some concerns were raised that the six week timeframe to prepare reports was too long. It was suggested that the current reports often include more information than may be required to recommend sentencing options and that there was opportunity to streamline this process.

**Conducting assessments:** Probation officers raised a number of challenges and barriers in conducting pre sentence and pre parole reports (PSRs and PPRs, respectively). Conducting effective, face to face assessments with prisoners was identified as a challenge, due to restricted visiting times and the amount of time it takes for probation staff in the North and North West to visit the prison. It was also noted that assessments of prisoners can be duplicated as both the Tasmanian Prison Service (TPS) and Community Corrections conduct separate assessments. This is likely to change as both services are now using the same tool, the LS-CMI.

**Identifying risk:** Identifying needs and risks through comprehensive assessment is an essential part of offender management as it informs how to work with the offender to reduce reoffending. Required interventions and goals are documented in an Individual Management Plan (IMP). Feedback from consultations indicated that, currently, risk assessments are not always linked into planning for an offender, although this is likely to change with the introduction of the LS-CMI that links assessment with case management.

**Matching resources to risk:** Currently, interventions and level of supervision and input are not matched to levels of risk. This is in part due to a flat professional structure which does not differentiate between skills and experience of offender managers. However, this aspect of practice does not align to contemporary best practice, which emphasises the need to match resources to risk.
Supervision: The review found considerable variation in the way offenders are supervised, with practice not applied consistently across the state. Examples included a varying number of home visits in different regions. A small number of stakeholders from outside Community Corrections also reported a perception that community based offenders are not sufficiently supervised or supported, although this view is not substantiated and may be a symptom of the variations in practice across the state and/or a lack of understanding of the processes of Community Corrections.

Compliance monitoring and breaching: Across all regions, there was a reported perception that there is poor monitoring of non compliance with conditions of probation orders (e.g. non attendance at supervision), although this was not able to be substantiated through the quantitative analysis. Feedback also indicated that non compliance is managed variably between offices and by individual offender managers. Variations include judgements about what constitutes unacceptable behaviour, leading to a breach, timeliness in addressing breaches and decisions about whether to prosecute. A number of identified causes of variations include availability of time, confidence in professional ability (e.g. to prosecute) and perceptions of court responses. Inconsistencies in breaching were noted by both probation and other stakeholders.

Offender programs: A number of Community Corrections staff have been trained to deliver offender programs. However, it was reported that delivering programs without a reduction in other roles and responsibilities is challenging and places pressure on all staff. As a result, few programs have been delivered. Magistrates acknowledged the difficulty in running programs but noted implications on an offender’s ability to comply with an order if programs are not available. Some Magistrates indicated that the lack of availability of programs may influence decision making about a sentence.

Transition and exit planning: Literature notes the importance of transition and exit planning in ensuring that reductions in offending behaviour are sustained. The consultations found that, in general, there is limited focus on transition and exit planning for the end of an order. A risk reassessment is conducted prior to an order ending, but this does not appear to be linked into supporting the offender to manage the transition.

3.2.3 Stakeholder management

Delivering effective responses to offenders, many of whom are in contact with numerous agencies and organisations, requires strong working arrangements with a number of key stakeholders. The key stakeholders for Community Corrections should include courts, the Parole Board, police, TPS and other community services.

A number of examples were provided in consultations of good professional relationships between individual Community Corrections staff and other stakeholders.
However, the review found limited evidence of a strong, formal partnership working between Community Corrections and other stakeholders. Although there were reported to be lines of communication between Community Corrections and the courts and Parole Board, stakeholders raised a number of concerns that indicate that the current partnership structures are not meeting the needs of any organisation and, in some cases, may be negatively impacting on service delivery and outcomes for offenders and the community.

The review found even greater limitations in the relationship between Community Corrections and the police and TPS. Although no examples were given of where this has had a negative impact on services and offender outcomes, there may be opportunities to consider how better working relationships could lead to better assessment and management of community based offenders or offenders being considered for parole.

Integrated, collaborative working with TPS in the future is particularly important in light of evidence from the literature and growing practice in other jurisdictions which considers a wider, whole of corrections response to offending. This whole of corrections response recognises that offenders move between custody and community (and vice versa) and that there is benefit in a combined response to supporting an offender throughout their journey to reduce reoffending.

### 3.3 Summary of the case for change

The following key findings emerged from the analysis of consultation findings and require consideration in the proposed improvements to the Community Corrections model:

8 The current flat structure does not recognise or make best use of staff experience and has the potential to impact on:

- inappropriate matching of offenders to staff based on required staff experience and skill to address offender’s risk; and

- career progress and workforce retention.

9 There is currently no clear rationale for prioritising and allocating cases and matching resource to risk. This leads to:

- the potential that staff are managing caseloads that are too complex or too large for their skills and experience;

- limited active case management for higher risk offenders; and

- inconsistent levels of supervision and management that do not match to risk.
10 There is no clear whole person focus on offenders and limited focus on rehabilitation to prevent reoffending.

11 There is a lack of investment in workforce development and limited capacity to consider and embed contemporary practice into day to day operations. This may mean that:

- the response to offenders may not be effective in achieving desired outcomes for offenders and for the wider community;
- staff may feel unsupported and ill equipped to undertake their roles;
- new staff are not supported in the most efficient way to enable them to deliver a safe response to offenders and to provide value to the Community Corrections team; and
- recruitment and retention may be impacted.

12 There is inconsistent application of processes and procedures within and across regional offices. This leads to:

- inconsistency in responses to offenders, particularly relating to breaching; and
- possible perceptions of leniency and lack of supervision and support for offenders in the community.

13 Offender programs and other necessary interventions are not readily available. This:

- restricts opportunities to facilitate rehabilitation and reduce reoffending; and
- may impact sentencing decisions.

14 Community Corrections is perceived to be operating in isolation from a number of key stakeholders. This:

- leads to inadequate ‘through care’ and aftercare of an offender along their criminal justice pathway, particularly at the point of transition from custody to the community, or at the end of a community order; and
- may lead to potential misunderstandings and misperceptions of the effectiveness of Community Corrections by other stakeholders.
4 Proposed improvements to the Community Corrections model

The following chapters outline suggested improvements to the current Community Corrections model that have been identified through the review process. There are a number of areas in which opportunities for improvement have been identified. These are:

- strategic directions, including principles of managing offenders;
- governance for Community Corrections;
- Community Corrections management, including functions of managing offenders;
- the underpinning organisational structure, including roles and responsibilities;
- quality management, including workforce development and quality assurance; and
- partnerships and collaboration.

Figure 4.1, below, illustrates how the elements identified for improvement combine to create overall improvements for the Community Corrections model as a whole.

*Figure 4.1: A proposed framework for improvements to the current Community Corrections model*
Some of the recommended improvements do not involve significant change to current practice. In some cases, the proposed changes may simply involve clearer articulation about intent, or a stronger focus on embedding principles and activities more firmly across the whole Community Corrections Service. In other cases, more systematic change will be required to implement suggested areas for improvement. Where relevant throughout these chapters, short, medium and long term strategies for bringing about suggested improvement are also described.

4.1 Addressing the case for change

Proposed improvements to the existing Community Corrections Service model aim to ensure that:

- offenders around the state receive equitable, consistent responses;
- offenders are managed safely to complete an order, as directed by the courts or the Parole Board; and
- resources are used effectively and efficiently to ensure maximum return to the community and to match resources to offenders’ risk to reduce the likelihood of reoffending as much as possible.

Improvements have been identified as a result of contemporary practice identified in the literature, through jurisdictional analyses and in response to issues and challenges identified through the consultations. Figure 4.2, below illustrates how the issues and challenges that have been identified with the current service model will be addressed through the proposed improvements.
Figure 4.2: Case for change – area for change to address issues and challenges with current model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current CCS model</th>
<th>Area of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current flat structure does not recognise or make best use of staff experience</td>
<td>Organisational structure and roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently no clear rationale for prioritising and allocating cases and matching resource to risk</td>
<td>Program management, roles and responsibilities and quality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No whole-person focus on offender and limited focus on rehabilitation to prevent reoffending</td>
<td>Strategic direction, quality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of investment in workforce development and limited capacity to consider and embed contemporary practice in to day to day operations</td>
<td>Program governance and quality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent application of processes and procedures within and across regional offices</td>
<td>Program governance, program management, quality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender programs and other necessary interventions are not readily available.</td>
<td>Program governance, program management, partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Corrections is perceived to be operating in isolation from a number of key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Program governance, partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Strategic direction

Future development of Community Corrections should be underpinned by principles of offender management and clear aims and objectives for the service going forward. These form the basis for a common understanding of offender management and inform improvements to the Community Corrections model.

As a service, Community Corrections aims to:

- advise and support the courts to inform sentencing and management of offenders;
- advise and support the Parole Board to make decisions about parole for offenders in custody and on parole;
- facilitate and implement court decisions in accordance with the expectations of the court and the public;
- facilitate and implement Parole Board decisions in accordance with the expectations of the Parole Board and the public;
- through effective offender management, increase the safety of the public;
- supervise offenders in a manner appropriate to their offence and based on an assessment of their individual risk and needs (i.e. mental health, Indigenous, intellectual disability);
- facilitate change and rehabilitation to reduce reoffending; and
- enable reparation and restoration to the community.

5.1 Supporting principles

A number of principles for offender management have been identified to underpin the proposed Community Corrections model and support the achievement of program aims and objectives. Key principles are:

- **Whole of person** – management of offenders uses a whole of person, evidence based, offender focused approach that involves providing supervision to support an offender to comply and cooperate with their order;

- **A focus on rehabilitation** - requires a focus on reducing the likelihood of reoffending through rehabilitation and a range of individualised responses;
• **A whole of system approach** - requires partnerships with internal and external stakeholders to enable a whole of system approach;

• **A skilled and competent workforce** - offender managers have the competencies and skills to effectively manage and support offenders; and

• **Flexible and tailored responses** - requires resources and service responses to be individualised and matched to an offender’s needs, risks and circumstances; and provides responses that are flexible over time as needs, risks and circumstances change.

Elements of the proposed Community Corrections model build on these principles to improve the way in which the Community Corrections aims and objectives can be delivered effectively and efficiently. These principles reflect existing Tasmania Community Corrections principles and are in line with national and international best practice.
6 Community Corrections governance

Strong governance is essential to deliver a safe, effective and efficient community corrections service. Community Corrections governance defines how the service and its delivery is managed and by whom at a strategic and an operational level.

This chapter outlines the critical elements of Community Corrections governance, as shown in Figure 6.1, below.

Figure 6.1: Elements of Community Corrections governance

6.1 Roles and responsibilities of the Department of Justice

A number of functions are required to provide the overall leadership, guidance and direction for Community Corrections and to establish the frameworks within which to deliver and monitor service delivery. It is suggested that the following elements of the governance of Community Corrections services are managed centrally, at a policy development level:

- leadership and strategic direction;
- policy and program development;
- workforce strategy;
• managing funding and submitting future applications; and

• quality management.

6.1.1 Leadership and strategic direction

Providing leadership and direction for Community Corrections is crucial to ensure that the service is able to meet current and future demand and achieve its aims and objectives. Under the current structure, the Directorate is not always able to prioritise this task as considerable resources are still required to support operational issues.

Strong leadership will require developing clear strategic directions to determine the overall directions of Community Corrections. This is important to set priorities for the sector, based on an understanding of demand and needs, to guide all decisions about service growth and planning. In the future, strategic directions for Community Corrections may be aligned with a whole of department strategy to managing offenders and a whole of government approach to reducing reoffending.

Part of the role of providing leadership and strategic direction will also involve leading and contributing to any discussions on legislative reviews or reforms that relate to offenders, both in the community and in custody.

6.1.2 Policy and program development

Oversight of planning, development and implementation of policy and programs is a key function that should be delivered from a central policy level to enable consistency in practice. It should be achieved through:

• developing operational policy and practice guidance for Community Corrections staff in relation to day to day operations of managing offenders in the community. Policies and guidance should align to the quality assurance framework. Examples of such guidance may include assessment procedures, information sharing protocols, memoranda of understanding with other services and guidelines for safe working with offenders;

• developing practice standards to ensure all offender management is conducted consistently and to high standards across the state; and

• developing professional competency standards for each role to enable staff skill to be matched to roles.
6.1.3 Workforce strategy

A workforce management strategy is necessary to ensure that the workforce are appropriately skilled and supported to deliver quality responses to the courts, the Parole Board and to offenders on community based orders. Managing this at a central level enables consistent professional standards to be established across the state ensuring that workforce development is aligned to strategic direction and service planning.

Workforce management should include:

- workforce planning to ensure effective workforce forecasting to meet service demand;
- supporting recruitment against an agreed workforce plan, through developing job descriptions and competencies and leading statewide recruitment campaigns;
- identifying and implementing retention strategies; and
- focus on learning and professional development, including:
  - developing and overseeing statewide orientation and induction (to supplement local orientation and induction); and
  - developing and coordinating the delivery of ongoing education and training that is linked to improvements in the sector\(^{11}\).

Further details of a workforce development framework are included in section 10.3.

6.1.4 Managing funding and assets

Negotiating and managing funding allocations to Community Corrections and managing the financial assets and infrastructure of the service should also be a central, policy level responsibility. Having a central oversight in this way allows decisions regarding funding and resource allocation to be based on a statewide, strategic approach to developing the service, to deliver government objectives and priorities.

This whole of service oversight also enables better strategic planning of service development that may involve the development of business cases to support new approaches or models of delivery.

\(^{11}\) In this context, ‘sector’ refers to services delivered by organisations and agencies that also provide services to the Community Corrections client group.
6.1.5 Quality management

Quality management is a critical part of any service delivery. Within the Community Corrections context, quality management involves establishing standards of delivery and ensuring that these are achieved, in order to deliver a service response that is safe, effective and efficient for offenders and the wider community.

Quality management requires a number of elements:

- the development of practice and program standards which guide and inform service delivery;
- the development and implementation of mechanisms to highlight and investigate areas of operational risk and to respond to and address these as appropriate;
- articulation of clear targets and outcomes against which to measure performance and results;
- ongoing monitoring and evaluation of delivery and performance against standards and targets; and
- implementing changes to continue to improve delivery in line with contemporary practice and to meet demand.

Quality management must be underpinned by robust information technology and data systems and clear data definitions. A proposed approach to quality management is described further in section 10.

6.1.6 Potential central governance arrangements

Under the current governance arrangements, the functions outlined above would be the responsibility of the Directorate of Community Corrections.

However, consideration could be given in the future to the development of a Directorate of Corrections, which consolidates central, policy level functions across Community Corrections and the Tasmanian Prison Service (TPS). This would:

- enable a common strategy and clear, joint objectives for working with offenders;
- create efficiencies in resources required to plan and manage services;
- ensure that professionals working with offenders, either in custody or in the community, have the same training and development opportunities and the same understanding and professional knowledge about working with offenders;
• enable the opportunity for more flexible career progression and pathways across Community Corrections and TPS; and

• enable cross learning between the organisations and between staff in Community Corrections and TPS.

6.2 Roles and responsibility of the regional teams

Under the Community Corrections model, it is proposed that regional operational teams have responsibility for the following functions to deliver effective responses to community based offenders:

• staff management;

• assurance of operational quality;

• data collection and reporting;

• implementation of continuous improvement initiatives; and

• networking and forming partnerships.

6.2.1 Staff management

Day to day management of staff requires ensuring that staff are available and are supported emotionally and operationally to undertake their roles safely and effectively. This may include:

• ensuring there are sufficient, appropriately qualified staff to undertake day to day activities and addressing gaps;

• managing and approving recreational, personal and other leave and ensuring that appropriate cover is available if necessary;

• dealing with human resource issues, including complaints; and

• undertaking supervision and supporting professional development.

Responsibility for staff management should sit with regional teams to ensure that responses are in relation to local context and can be provided in a timely way. Effective staff management will require alignment to and consideration of central policies, priorities and strategies, such as alignment to a workforce strategy.
6.2.2 Assurance of operational quality and continuous improvement

Regional teams have a responsibility to ensure the continued quality of service delivery by implementing and embedding elements of the organisation’s quality management framework. This involves:

- ensuring individual staff deliver, and are able to deliver, responses to standards and within guidelines;

- ensuring that, collectively, the response provided to offenders in the regions is effective, efficient and enables offenders to be managed safely in the community; and

- instilling a quality focused culture in all staff.

Another key responsibility of regional teams is to implement and monitor the impact of any continuous improvement initiatives that are required to improve service responses. These may be initiated from a regional level or may be under the direction of the Directorate of Community Corrections as part of system wide improvements.

6.2.3 Data collection and reporting

In a quality culture, data collection and reporting against key performance indicators and outcome measures is important to measure performance against goals and standards. Regional teams are responsible for collecting information on activity and offender outcomes, based on clear data guidelines and supported by effective information technology and data systems. This should be reported to the Directorate on a regular basis to inform statewide monitoring of performance.

6.2.4 Networking and forming partnerships

Delivering responses to offenders, many of whom have a range of needs, requires close working relationships with a number of stakeholders. Under the proposed arrangements, staff in regional offices will play a considerable role in identifying key stakeholders in their region and developing and maintaining working relationships to support the delivery of services to offenders. Partnerships at a regional level are also critical to ensuring that organisations work collaboratively to meet the needs of offenders, without duplicating resources.
7 Community Corrections management

Within the Community Corrections service response, there are a number of functions that must be considered in order to provide effective responses to community based offenders and to meet the organisational objectives of Community Corrections, as shown in Figure 7.2.

Figure 7.1: Elements of the recommended Community Corrections structure

Offender management requires a range of interventions at both a service and an individual offender level. The proposed model is based on the following elements of offender management:

- management of offenders on an order;
- supervision of offenders on an order; and
- administration of an order.

Under each of these, a range of key activities, tasks and interventions will be undertaken by an offender manager to ensure the offender is able to complete their order and to address risk of reoffending, where appropriate. In cases where an offender has a number of orders, managed by a number of offender managers, some of these activities may overlap.

Allocation of cases to staff members to undertake all elements of offender management is also crucial. Effective allocation ensures that a member of staff has the appropriate skills and
capacity to be able to undertake the required tasks, matched to an offender’s level of risk and complexity.

Research and evidence shows that, in addition to effective management, supervision and administration of an order, better outcomes for reducing offending are associated with the delivery of offender programs that address specific offending behaviour to reduce and manage risk factors that lead to offending.

Not all interventions will be provided to all offenders. To be most effective (in terms of ensuring compliance and addressing risk of reoffending) and efficient (in terms of the best use of available resources), management of offenders should be based on the principle that “resources follow risk”. Offenders who present the greatest risk of reoffending and risk to themselves and/or the community will have more intensive input from an offender manager. This principle is in line with evidence based approaches that offenders at a high risk of reoffending require and respond to more intense, and often more resource intensive, levels of management and input.

7.1 Rationale for improvements to the Community Corrections structure

In general, these offender management functions are already undertaken by Community Corrections staff under the current model. However, as part of the proposed Community Corrections model, these elements of offender management will be more clearly articulated and embedded as core activities undertaken for all offenders. In contrast to the current system, this will ensure that:

- the core activities of assessment, monitoring, reassessment and intervention will be applied to all offenders;\(^\text{12}\);

- all offenders, regardless of their order, are considered in terms of risk of reoffending and need to address reoffending behaviour; and

- there is greater differentiation between the tasks and activities required for individual offenders, based on risk and improved ability to delegate the task to the most appropriate offender manager.

The activities involved in managing offenders on a probation or parole order are described in more detail below. Further procedural and process details are provided in more detail in the Community Corrections Manual, which is being updated concurrent to this project. This section also discusses considerations for allocating cases to offender managers and for managing high risk offenders.

\(^{12}\) This includes offenders on CSOs, as discussed in a separate report, Review of the CSO Scheme.
7.2 Management of Offenders

The purpose of managing offenders is to address criminogenic and other risk factors to prevent reoffending. This requires a number of approaches:

- assessment and reassessment, using the LS-CMI, to identify risks and consider options for an order and for management of an order through a series of interventions;

- writing and presenting reports to inform court decisions (through pre sentence reports - PSRs) and the Parole Board (through pre parole reports – PPRs);

- sentence planning to determine how the sentence will be conducted and to establish requirements of the offender while on the order;

- development of an Individual Management Plan (IMP) to set goals and activities to address criminogenic risk factors and reduce the risk of reoffending;

- regular review of the IMP, to review an individual’s progress against those goals and to alter goals and interventions as needed; and

- evaluation of management approach and outcomes to determine how well the interventions and activities are addressing needs and meeting outcomes for offenders.

All offenders on probation and parole orders should be managed in this way.

7.2.1 Conducting assessments

Assessment is a critical component of the management of an offender, as the information gathered during assessment indicates the level of risk that an individual poses and dictates the work that is done with an offender during their order. Inaccurate, incomplete or non comprehensive assessments may lead to issues in identifying and addressing risk and inappropriate decisions about orders. This may, in some cases, impact on the safety of the individual offender or the community and may limit opportunities to address criminogenic risk to prevent reoffending.

All offenders on all orders should undergo an assessment to:

- determine their suitability for an order;

---

13 It is recognised that offenders on Community Service Orders are likely to require a lower level of assessment. Assessment for suitability for CSOs are discussed in the report on the Review of the Community Service Order Scheme.
• consider criminogenic risk factors, the risk of reoffending and the risk of causing harm to the community while on a community based order;

• identify interventions required to reduce criminogenic risk; and

• determine suitability for offending specific programs.

Standardised assessment tools ensure accurate, consistent and comparable assessment across the state. Offenders on, or considered for, parole and probation orders should be assessed using the Level of Service – Case Management Inventory (LS-CMI). This assessment will inform recommendations to the courts and Parole Board through PSRs and PPRs and will be the basis for development of Individual Management Plans, which set goals and activities to address offending risks through the course of an order.

Conducting assessments for parole and probation orders should involve:

• history taking;

• specific evaluations, e.g. Static 99 for sex offenders, SARA for family violence perpetrators, substance abuse or psychiatric assessments;

• visiting the offender’s home; and

• collecting collateral information through family, friends and other services to inform the ‘picture’ of the offender’s needs and risk.

As is current practice, under the proposed model, assessments will be conducted either at the first point of contact an offender has with Community Corrections, to inform a pre sentence or pre parole report, or after an order has been made and the offender reports for their first supervision session. To achieve a comprehensive and accurate assessment, the process should be conducted face to face wherever possible, in line with legislation and standard timeframes.

In recognition of the complexity and importance of good assessment, it is recommended that offender managers who have demonstrated competence in the following key skills and knowledge areas conduct assessments and prepare subsequent PSRs or PPRs:

• sentencing options and court processes, in order to make recommendations to the court and to understand the context of the assessment outcome;

• understanding of criminogenic and risk factors and how these contribute to offending behaviour;
• good knowledge of the LS-CMI and other assessment tools (or other assessment tools that may be introduced in the future);

• establishing appropriate rapport and demonstrating effective interviewing skills to communicate clearly with offenders, to facilitate effective assessment; and

• clear, concise report writing.

7.2.2 Providing advice to courts and the Parole Board

Frequently, courts and the Parole Board may request Community Corrections to provide them advice on the suitability of an order or parole and this is a key function of Community Corrections. Informed by assessments, advice to courts and the Parole Board provides contextual information on an offender and makes a recommendation about an offender’s suitably for an order in the form of a PSR or PPR. Advice is important to enable sentencing or parole decisions to be made based on critical, relevant information about the offender. The current legislation allows for advice to be provided to courts and the Parole Board in verbal or written format.

All reports providing advice to courts or the Parole Board should be:

• fit for purpose, in that they provide sufficient information to develop a recommendation about the suitability of an order;

• provided in a timely way, to aid the course of justice and not unfairly discriminate against an individual awaiting sentencing or parole decisions;

• based on an appropriate level of assessment and information gathering; and

• based on comprehensive knowledge and understanding of sentencing options and is therefore provided by a member of staff who has this knowledge.

Clear guidelines about the content and structure of the reports should be agreed with the relevant stakeholders to ensure that reports are fit for purpose and can be produced efficiently within an appropriate timeframe. Guidelines should clearly differentiate between types of reports and the purpose of requests for advice from the courts, in particular. To make the best use of resources and effort, the following report types should be available:

• **Standard report**: Used for the majority of requests from the court or Parole Board, this is based on a comprehensive assessment, including extensive collateral information gathering and is presented to the court in a full, written report using an agreed template; and
• **Specific purpose report**: Used on an exception basis, this provides advice in response to specific direction and requests from the court or Parole Board. A specific purpose report should be available in a shorter time frame than the standard report. The timeframes, level of detail and scope of the report to provide specific advice should be negotiated with the court or Parole Board at the time of the request.

This report may not require comprehensive assessment and information gathering but may require information to be gathered on a specific element of concern to the court or Parole Board. An example includes if the court wants specific information about the outcome of drug and alcohol treatment that an offender has previously undertaken.

### 7.2.3 Development of an Individual Management Plan

Following on from strong assessment, another critical component of effective offender management is being able to develop, implement and monitor a clear Individual Management Plan (IMP). An IMP:

• clearly identifies an offender’s criminogenic and other needs;

• sets out an offender’s goals and objectives for the period of the order. These are often agreed in discussion with the offender and may include a mixture of compulsory and voluntary goals; and

• identifies timeframes and actions to be taken by the offender, the offender manager and other named stakeholders to support an offender to address criminogenic needs.

Effective offender management requires regular formal and informal monitoring of actions and behaviours against goals and may include review and revision of voluntary goals. Offenders with more complex needs are likely to have more complicated IMPs, which require greater skill to manage, implement and monitor.

### 7.3 Supervision of Offenders

All offenders on probation orders and on parole must be actively managed on a day to day basis, based on their IMP, which takes into consideration assessment of risk and requirements of the order. This is the supervision of an offender and requires a range of approaches, for example:

• forming an appropriate, professional relationship with an individual offender, with clear boundaries and explicit expectations about the role of Community Corrections staff and the offender during an order;
• motivating offenders to comply with the order and to address any risk factors that contribute to their offending behaviour through approaches specified in the IMP;

• ‘brokering’ interventions from other organisations, such as drugs and alcohol services, to address criminogenic risk factors, for facilitating access to offender specific programs;

• liaising with other program providers to monitor an offender’s progress and, where specified by an order, compliance with a program. This may include involvement in case conferencing and joint working;

• referrals to other appropriate services and supports to address other needs in an offender’s life, such as education, training or employment needs;

• reducing relapse into offending behaviour by preparing offenders for interventions and modelling and reinforcing positive behaviour and coping strategies, possibly in line with behaviour an offender learns on offending specific and other related programs; and

• providing support to offenders to enable them to continue to comply and engage, particularly around periods when an offender’s personal circumstances change, which might change their risk factors or impact on their motivation. An example might be a death of a family member or friend or the release from prison of a known associate.

### 7.3.1 Supervising high risk offenders

All offenders on probation and parole orders should receive supervision. However, the scale and intensity of supervision will vary between individual offenders, based on their assessed risks and needs, the complexity of their IMP, the timeframe of the order and the motivation and capabilities of an offender. High risk clients with complex criminogenic needs, who are the most difficult to engage, will require the most intensive supervision by Community Corrections staff and, under the proposed model, should be managed by more experienced, senior staff (see section 9.4).

High risk offenders are likely to include individuals who:

• are sex offenders;

• have mental health issues;

• have an intellectual disability; and/or

• are from an Indigenous background.
It is likely, though not universally the case, that offenders in one or more of these categories will require a degree of input that is best provided by more experienced offender managers. Managing these individuals may also require specialist or more advanced generalist knowledge, for example:

- understanding how drug and alcohol misuse impacts on offending behaviour and risk;
- specialist knowledge regarding risk factors and management approaches for sex offenders;
- ability to identify triggers that indicate episodes of acute mental illness, to be able to respond appropriately (including making timely referrals to prevent onset);
- knowledge and understanding of cultural backgrounds and how, for example, community interactions and views impact on offending behaviour;
- confidence and experience to work flexibly with a challenging individual to meet IMP goals and complete an order;
- an advanced understanding of how complex risk factors impact on and compound offending behaviour, in order to develop an IMP to address criminogenic risk factors, directly or indirectly;
- greater experience in case coordination and stronger liaison and case conferencing with other services; and
- advanced general skills including strong boundary setting, excellent adaptive communication skills, and the ability to model behaviour with challenging individuals.

7.4 Administration of an order

All orders require administration to ensure the order remains on course. The type of administrative activities will vary with the requirements of the order but will include:

- maintaining paperwork and electronic databases;
- arranging and conducting appointments;
- monitoring compliance;
- scheduling and conducting reviews;
• administering breaches, including prosecuting; and
• terminating a case at the end of an order.

Effective administration involves tasks that relate to legislative and process requirements of an order, rather than to the management of an offender per se. As such, a number of administrative tasks can be undertaken by administration staff, rather than by offender managers. Administration requires the support of appropriate IT systems and clear process guidelines, which outline when and how something should be done. Administration is an integral part of managing an offender on an order and, as such, administration tasks should be conducted in a timely way and to a high standard.

7.5 **Allocation and continued management of cases**

Allocating tasks, including assessment and report writing and managing offenders, is important to ensure that staff are competent and able to undertake the task in terms of skills and experience and available time.

Assessments and reports for probation and parole should be allocated to any offender manager who:
• demonstrates the competencies required to undertake the task, as outlined in section 7.2.1, above;
• has capacity to undertake the work in the required timeframe; and/or
• has an existing relationship with or knowledge of the offender.

Evidence based practice suggests that, ideally, an offender should be managed by the offender manager who conducted the initial assessment. However, this may not always be possible, due to caseloads, staff availability (e.g. annual leave) and staff experience. Therefore, under the proposed model, an offender may be allocated to another offender manager after an assessment and report are completed in a number of cases:
• if the assessed level of risk requires that the offender be managed by another offender manager (e.g. a high risk offender should be managed by a more experienced member of staff);
• if the offender manager who conducted the assessment does not have capacity to undertake a new case;
• to provide caseloads for less experienced offender managers who have not demonstrated the required competence to conduct assessments or prepare reports on their own; and
• cases that increase or decrease in criminogenic risk (based on assessment) can be transitioned between offender managers (or vice versa) during an order.

Transfer of an offender between offender managers may require consideration of a number of factors and should involve discussion between the existing offender manager, the Team Leader and the proposed offender manager. The decision must ensure that resources continue to be used effectively, but without negatively impacting the offender’s likely compliance or risk level in the future. When a case is transferred mid order, a handover meeting should be conducted between the offender managers and the offender.\(^\text{14}\)

### 7.6 Delivering offender programs

Programs that address specific offender behaviour are recognised as important to support individuals to reduce and manage risk factors that lead to offending. Examples of the range of offender specific programs that are commonly used include those related to drug and alcohol misuse, anger management, life skills and thinking skills and sex offending, for example OINTOC, SAINTOC, the FVOIP\(^\text{15}\) and the Sober driver program, currently available in Tasmania.

Delivering offender specific programs requires:

• knowledge of the subject matter, including legislation, offending behaviour, risk factors and triggers for offending and effective interventions;

• knowledge of a range of skills to engage the offender in a program, such as motivational interviewing, ability to set clear boundaries, ability to be outcome/solution focused;

• an ability to deliver adult learning (a trained trainer);

• matching the availability of programs (including time, location and frequency) to the demand for programs. For some programs, this demand is set by the courts (e.g. family violence programs); and

• appropriate time allocated to planning, delivering and administration of the program, as well as follow up of an offender and liaison with the relevant offender manager.

Programs are generally delivered alongside management and supervision of an order, to address goals and needs outlined in an IMP. For many programs, effectiveness is improved if the

\(^{14}\) Although this is desirable, to introduce the offender to their new offender manager, it may not be practical to do this.

\(^{15}\) These programs are the Offending is not the only choice (OINTOC), Substance abuse is not the only choice (SAINTOC) and the Family Violence Offender Intervention Program (FVOIP).
behaviours and skills learnt during the program sessions are reinforced by the offender manager during supervision of the order.
8 Underpinning organisational structure

Feedback from the consultations highlighted a number of issues and challenges as a direct or indirect result of the current organisational structure. This includes concerns about inconsistencies in caseloads between different probation officers and possible inequitable distribution of resources across the state. The current structure is reportedly based on historic resourcing distribution and is not felt to match demand or be most effective in delivering a contemporary community corrections service.

Feedback from consultations indicated that there is current limited explicit prioritisation of cases or matching of staff experience to an offender’s complexity and criminogenic needs. Concerns were also raised about the level of consistency in applying processes and procedures across the state and within regions and about the pressure on current resources to provide an appropriate level of supervision and professional development, particularly for new staff. The review also highlighted limitations that a current flat organisational structure has on career progression and on being able to promote and support professional development within the organisation.

To address these issues, revisions are proposed to the organisational structure of Community Corrections. This is considered in two parts: the structure of the organisation, in terms of the workforce; and the arrangements by which services operate day to day, such as layout of an office and opening hours. This is shown in Figure 8.1, below.

Figure 8.1: Elements of the underpinning organisational structure of the proposed model
8.1 **Workforce structure**

The proposed Community Corrections model includes a number of changes to the existing staffing structure and organisation across the state. These changes are proposed to:

- enable equitable allocation of resources, based on demand, and to maximise the use of resources across the state;
- enable a differentiated response to offenders, based on levels of risk and complexity;
- provide a statewide overview of operations to ensure consistency in practice and standards;
- recognise skills and experience of Community Corrections staff and provide career development opportunities; and
- provide stronger professional supervision to staff.

Table 8.1, below shows the teams/units and positions that are part of the proposed Community Corrections model.

*Table 8.1: Community Corrections teams, units and positions at statewide and regional levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide teams and positions</th>
<th>Regional positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Corrections Directorate</td>
<td>Team Leader (TL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit</td>
<td>Senior Offender Manager (SOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide CSO Unit</td>
<td>Offender Manager (OM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Operations Manager</td>
<td>Offender Manager - CSOs (OM-CSOs) (south only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Practice Consultant (SPC)</td>
<td>Paid CSO supervisors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed structure for Tasmania Community Corrections is illustrated in Figure 8.2, below.
Figure 8.2: Proposed Tasmania Community Corrections Service Organisational chart
Key features of the proposed organisational structure for Community Corrections are outlined in Table 8.2, below, with comments on the improvements and benefits of the proposed structure.

Table 8.2: Features of the proposed structure for Community Corrections and benefits and improvements on the current model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of proposed organisational structure</th>
<th>Improvements and benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Corrections Directorate</td>
<td>Under the proposed model, and in line with recent directions they have already been taking, the Directorate will be able to focus more strongly on providing leadership, guidance and setting and supporting strategic and policy directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Operations Manager</td>
<td>This position will provide a more consistent approach to delivery across the state by being responsible for all operational issues and by being the link between strategic and policy planning and delivery on the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Senior Practice Consultant (SPC)</td>
<td>The SPC will provide professional support and direction for all regional staff. The position will focus on providing case related professional development and secondary consultation and will ensure that contemporary best practice is embedded in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiered professional structure in the regions, comprising Team Leaders, Senior Offender Managers (SOM), Offender Managers (OM) and Administration Officers (AO)</td>
<td>A tiered structure will enable better management of cases through allocating higher risk cases to more experienced, competent staff, with greater resources for case related support. It will also provide a career pathway for staff wishing to progress through the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide units for some elements of CSO delivery and for staff training and offender programs</td>
<td>Statewide units for managing CSO project sites and for staff training and offender programs will undertake an number of functions to free up regional resources to focus on offender management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant proposed change to the existing Community Corrections organisational structure is the introduction of a Senior Offender Manager (SOM) position. Under the proposed model, SOMs will have responsibility for managing higher risk offenders. The introduction of a more senior offender manager position has a number of benefits, as it:

- creates a tiered professional structure that better supports career development and professional development, linked to challenges of undertaking more complex roles;

- creates a competence based team structure that is able to match a higher level of skill and experience with greater levels of offender risk and need. This moves away from the current approach where case allocation does not match an offender to an offender manager’s skills; and
- provides greater capacity to actively manage high risk offenders, with greater focus on rehabilitation and reducing risk. Having SOMs enables differentiation between the relative caseloads of offender managers and creates a structure in which SOMs can carry smaller caseloads to provide higher levels and intensity of management.

Descriptions of the functions and roles and responsibility of staff and units are described in section 9, below\(^\text{16}\).

### 8.2 Operational considerations

Throughout the review, a number of issues and challenges were identified relating to operational arrangements, which impact on the quality and consistency of service delivery. These include:

- Some Community Corrections offices close during the lunch period. This restricts the hours that offenders, particularly those who work, are able to attend appointments with offender managers.

- The layout of a number of offices creates an environment in which staff may be physically isolated in a building and where interviews and meetings with offenders are conducted in personal offices. This presents significant risk to the members of staff and is inappropriate for setting professional boundaries with offenders. The layout of the offices, with private office rooms for the majority of staff, also does not foster a culture of peer support and informal case conferencing. This is particularly challenging for new staff.

- Having two offices in close proximity - the North West (Burnie and Devonport) and in the South (Hobart and Rosny) - creates an additional requirement for administrative support and, in the North West, creates operational challenges if only one staff member is in the office. This places considerable pressure on Regional Managers to provide quality, day to day oversight of operations across all offices in their region.

- Currently the distribution of staffing resources is not matching demand in terms of numbers of offenders in each region. This is evident through variations in caseloads, illustrated in section 2.1, above. Under the current structure and historical working arrangements, Community Corrections staff do not work flexibly within regions and across the state to be able to respond to changes in demand.

- A number of staff manage offenders in “country areas”. This involves occasional visits to these areas to meet with offenders, which is resource intensive, can be an inefficient use of time and may have implications for safety for offender managers.

- Many offender managers attend home visits alone. Concerns were raised about the safety of individuals, particularly women or new offender managers, undertaking some visits alone. This was particularly highlighted for home visits to complete a PPR, where an offender may not be known to the service.

\(^{16}\) Teams, Units and positions relating to CSOs only are discussed in the CSO Scheme Review Report. This includes the Statewide CSO Unit, Offender Managers - CSOs and paid CSO supervisors.
The review identified some challenges in probation officers in the North and North West conducting face to face PPR assessments with prisoners. Face to face assessments with these prisoners requires the probation officer to travel to Risdon, in the south, or requesting the prisoner to be escorted to holding cells in the north. Both options are time consuming and resource intensive.

To address these issues, it is recommended that a number of changes be made to operational arrangements, as follows:

- All offices across the state should be open for the same hours, over lunchtime and during normal business hours. Exceptions may be permitted if there is only one member of staff present in an office as this presents a safety risk.

- It is strongly recommended that mechanisms are introduced to improve health and safety in all Community Corrections offices. This includes installing and training staff in the use of personal and office safety alarm system and establishing clear processes for responding to safety alarms. It is also recommended that, where possible, all Community Corrections offices are open plan. In all offices, a sufficient number of interview rooms should be available and all offender interviews and meetings that are conducted on the premises should take place in these. This will require a review of the current office layouts to determine changes that can be made, or to consider a move to more suitable premises.

- Management of offenders is conducted out of four offices: Hobart, Bridgewater, Burnie and Launceston. This is a significant change from the current situation and will bring about a number of improvements. Managing offenders from four offices will:
  - enable efficiencies in administration overheads, which can be reallocated,
  - allow management and oversight of regional teams to be more focused; and
  - address health and safety concerns related to low staff numbers in each office and assist in preventing offices from closure as a result of having only one staff member present.

- Mechanisms are developed to enable staff to move flexibly around the state, to respond to changes in demand. This should be closely monitored through considering relative caseloads across the state and identifying short and long term changes in demand.

- To minimise travelling to country areas, it is recommended that the definition of “country area” delineates between regional areas and remote areas. Under the proposed model, offender managers will travel to visit offenders in remote areas, defined as areas that have no public transport and are geographically isolated. It is suggested that remote areas are the East Coast, Circular Head and the West Coast. Visits could also be conducted to other regional areas that are not classified as remote, if the number of offenders in that area justifies travel to that area. Offenders in other areas will be expected to attend meetings with their offender manager at the four Community Corrections offices.
• To minimise the resources required to conduct PPR assessments for prisoners returning to the North or North West, it is recommended that offender managers in the South prepare all parole reports. This will result in more timely PPRs that are developed in face to face consultation with the offender, without the need for them to be transferred to regions for interviews. Home assessments for parolees should continue to be conducted by offender managers in the region where the offender lives. This is important to ensure that home circumstances are considered in the PPR and so that offender managers in the regions are involved in initial planning and are familiar with the case, before the offender is released back to the region.

8.2.1 Remuneration related to staffing position

The new model for Community Corrections proposes a significant change to the structure of the organisation through the introduction of a hierarchy of positions to enable the establishment of a career structure to support progression and retention. Each level, OM, SOM and Team Leader is a designated role with a defined number of positions available.

Movement into a more senior position will be by application to a vacant position, based on merit and an interview process that considers competence and experience to undertake the position being applied for. Staff members seeking a promotion to SOM or Team Leader will be required to apply for the new role in the same way as an external candidate and to demonstrate how they meet selection criteria and requirements for a new role.

To support the introduction of a hierarchical structure, it is proposed that Community Corrections remuneration is moved from the current Professional Employees Award to the General Stream Award under the Public Sector Union Wages Agreement. This will:

• enable recognition of the increased skill and knowledge required for more senior positions by allowing positions to be allocated to different bands under the Award, based on the roles and responsibilities of each position type. Under the current Award stream, there is not sufficient distinction between bands to enable this;

• provide better opportunities for matching professional development to career progression, as the General Stream provides more opportunity for advancement assessment points at earlier stages in a career; and

• create greater flexibility that allows the transition of staff across regions and functions.

---

9 Roles and responsibilities

This chapter describes the roles and responsibilities for managing offenders on community sentences.

Figure 9.1: Roles and responsibilities for managing offenders on community based services

Under the new model, it is proposed that offenders are managed by SOMs and OM, with administrative support provided by AOs and professional support provided by Team Leaders and the Senior Practice Consultant.

The proposed roles and responsibilities related directly to offender management are intended to:

- promote strong leadership and bring together operations across the state to ensure consistency in delivering services;
- enable matching of offender managers who have the appropriate skill, competence and experience to work with higher risk, more complex offenders and to undertake more complex tasks;
- recognise that a number of key functions in offender management require specific competence to ensure effectiveness;
- reinforce the culture of professional supervision and development to maintain quality and ensure the practice continues to align to contemporary practice; and
- allow more appropriate allocation of functions to ensure that offender managers only perform the tasks for which their specialist skills and qualifications are needed.
An overview of the intended roles and responsibilities to manage offenders are provided in this chapter. This chapter also provides details of the roles and responsibilities of the Statewide Training and Programs Unit, introduced to develop and deliver learning and development to Community Corrections staff and to develop and deliver offender programs for community based offenders.

9.1 **The role of the Statewide Operations Manager**

Under the proposed changes to the Community Corrections model, a Statewide Operations Manager will oversee the operations of all Community Corrections Service offices across the state and the Statewide CSO Unit.

The Statewide Operations Manager will:

- provide oversight of, and coordinate the planning and implementation of, community corrections in the regions while maintaining a focus on the statewide strategic directions and priorities;
- conduct ongoing monitoring of service delivery and performance regionally and at a statewide level;
- performance manage Team Leaders and work with them to resolve escalated performance related issues for regional staff;
- monitor trends in offending and identify, consider and implement appropriate measures and strategies to improve outcomes for offenders and internal and external stakeholders; and
- provide leadership, drive the establishment of a professional culture and enable effective, consistent service delivery and achievement of organisational goals across the state.

The Statewide Operations Manager could either be based centrally, at the Directorate, or could be located in a regional office with frequent travel to other regional offices.

The advantage of being based in a regional office is that the Statewide Operation Manager will be located on the ground, which is likely to create a better, first hand understanding of the challenges and strengths of operations and the performance on the ground. However, this may favour the region in which the position is based. The advantage of basing the Statewide Operation Manager position centrally, is that the position is linked in more closely with the strategic policy and planning structures. A centrally based position may also be seen to be more impartial and more equally accessible by all regions. In either situation, travel to all regions must be a key part of the role.
9.2 The role of the Senior Practice Consultant

It is proposed that a statewide Senior Practice Consultant (SPC) role is introduced to ensure quality of service delivery and to provide professional development and case specific supervision for staff. Under the proposed structure, it is suggested that the SPC:

- provides advice and improves practice by contributing to staff learning and development through informing learning and development programs and providing secondary consultations to staff on a case by case basis;
- informs and supports the Statewide Operations Manager to identify and implement changes to practice, based on evidence, to improve outcomes for offenders, the community and other stakeholders;
- contributes to the development of standards and practice guidelines; and
- provides an audit, business review and quality assurance role and ensures that professional standards are upheld.

Similar to the Statewide Operations Manager role, the SPC position could be based centrally, for example at the Directorate, or in a region. Advantages and disadvantages for both are discussed in relation to the Statewide Operations Manager. Either option should involve frequent travel to all regional offices, on both a planned basis and in response to requests by a region.

A key role of the SPC, particularly in the early stages of any change, will be to encourage offender managers to regard professional development as an important part of working within a professional organisation and to motivate them to engage in development opportunities. The role will require proactive engagement of Community Corrections staff in the regional offices and may initially focus on conducting mini audits and case reviews to identify areas for training and development.

9.3 The role of Team Leaders

Under the proposed, new structure there will be a number of Team Leaders in each region. The Team Leader role will be responsible for actively leading a team of offender managers and for ensuring and maintaining quality. It is proposed that all Team Leaders report directly to the Statewide Operations Manager.

In line with general norms for team leader staff ratios in human services, it is proposed that there is a ratio of approximately six offender managers to each Team Leader. This is to ensure that staff are appropriately supported to undertake case work with offenders and that quality and standards can be effectively monitored and maintained. Team Leaders should not carry a caseload but will monitor and ensure consistency and quality of service responses by conducting the following operational tasks:

- managing day to day human, physical and financial resources and delivery of the service at a regional level to meet the needs of the client group and to ensure the safety of staff;
• prioritising and allocating tasks related to offender management on a daily basis and assisting offender managers to maintain an appropriate caseload;

• conducting joint working with offender managers, particularly with new staff, and conducting case conferencing and professional guidance on complex cases;

• approving and signing off on reports, letters to court (including PSRs and all CSO suitability reports) and the Parole Board, breaches and terminal reports, for all orders;

• providing regular supervision of individual staff, supporting professional development; and

• ensuring quality and adherence to standards and guidelines.

In addition to these operational responsibilities, it is also proposed that Team Leaders liaise with the Directorate, through the Statewide Operations Manager, to contribute to strategy, policy and standards development. Team leaders also play an important role in promoting a professional culture and a positive team environment for their team.

A key responsibility of Team Leaders is to establish appropriate links and networks between Community Corrections and other stakeholders to facilitate the management of community based offenders and to raise the profile of the organisation in the community. This will involve establishing and attending local and regional networking meetings with external stakeholders.

9.4 The role of offender managers

With the proposed changes to the Community Corrections model, it is suggested that offenders are managed by Senior Offender Managers (SOMs) and Offender Managers (OMs). Under the new model, it is proposed that offender managers have the following responsibilities:

• conduct assessments and prepare reports for probation (PSRs) and parole (PPRs) and to undertake home visits;

• provide day to day management and supervision of offenders through IMPs, as described in section 7.2;

• work with administration officers to ensure orders are appropriately administered;

• participate in case conferencing and joint working with other offender managers;

• liaise with external services and offender specific program providers in order to manage an offender based on their IMP;

• prepare breaches and conduct prosecutions related to own caseload; and

---

18 Collectively referred to as ‘offender managers’.
• participating in regular supervision with Team Leaders and professional development opportunities.

The majority of Community Corrections Staff in regions will be Offender Managers. OMs may be new recruits to Community Corrections or may have considerable experience and a long career in Tasmania Community Corrections or in services in other jurisdictions. As a result, the range and levels of skills and knowledge will vary considerably across OMs.

In addition to OMs, there will be a number of Senior Offender Managers (SOMs) in each region. A number of factors differentiate between these two positions:

• SOMs should only manage high risk offenders, while OMs will manage and supervise medium and low risk clients on probation and parole. A number of OMs may also work with a small number of high risk clients, with support from the Team Leader, to develop skills and competence;

• SOMs manage high risk offenders on parole and probation and may carry smaller caseloads than OMs, to recognise complexity of high risk cases;

• it is assumed that all SOMs have the required competence to undertake assessment and report writing for all types of offenders. Some OMs, particularly new staff, may need support to develop this competence; and

• under direction from the Team Leader, SOMs may support OMs in joint case management and co working of cases where this is appropriate. An example might be supporting a less experienced OM to conduct assessments and develop reports to enable them to improve their knowledge and skills to demonstrate competence.

9.4.1 New offender managers

In the last year, there have been a considerable number of new staff joining Community Corrections, particularly in the South. Further, new staff are likely to be needed in the future to fill vacancies left by retiring staff and to increase the workforce in line with likely continued growth in demand.

Under a model that matches complexity and risk to the skills of an offender manager, it is important to consider the role of newer, less experienced Offender Managers. As a principle, new staff should not be placed in professional situations which, as a result of their lack of experience, may directly or indirectly place them, an offender or the community at risk of harm. Therefore it is proposed that:

• levels of responsibility and autonomy in undertaking tasks (and increasing task complexity) is linked to demonstrated competence;

• there is a staged approach to introducing new staff to more complex tasks through mentoring and on the job training, in discussion between new staff, the Team Leader and the
SPC, where appropriate. For example, new staff may initially conduct assessments for CSOs to help them to build up competence required for PSR and PPR assessments; and

- new staff (and other less experienced OMs) are given the opportunity through shadowing, joint working, supervision and training to develop skills and knowledge in order to be able to demonstrate competence.

These stages in induction and professional development are also covered in section 10.3, under Workforce Development.

9.5 The role of Administration Officers

Administration Officers have a key role to play in the delivery and smooth running of Community Corrections. The new model does not make any specific recommendations for changes to the role of AOs in Community Corrections. However, the model does recommended extended use of AOs for some administrative tasks that are currently undertaken by offender managers. AOs in all regions will continue to support offender managers through19:

- operating and maintaining information and record systems;
- preparing, collating, possessing, verifying and recording data;
- liaising with offenders, staff and other stakeholders to answer and direct enquiries and to set up appointments; and
- preparing and sending documentation, such as letters and breach notices, requested by offender managers.

AOs in the North and North West also play a significant role in delivering CSOs in those regions. These roles and responsibilities are described in the separate CSO Scheme Review Report.

9.6 The role of the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit

Under the new model, it is suggested that a Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit is introduced to develop and deliver:

- induction and ongoing learning and development for Community Corrections staff; and
- offender specific programs for community based offenders.

19 These roles are taken from the Department of Justice Duty Statements for Community Corrections, provided as an appendix to the Directorate’s as-is report.
Collocating these functions in a single unit will create efficiencies and alignment as developing and delivering learning and development and offender programs both require an understanding of the demands on Tasmania Community Corrections and knowledge about ‘what works’ in managing offenders.

It is suggested that the Unit is located centrally to link in with strategic and policy directions and to consider practice and service planning at a statewide level. However, learning and development and offender programs should be delivered throughout the state to be more accessible to staff and to offenders.

The two roles of the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit are discussed separately, below.

### 9.6.1 Delivering learning and development

Under the current structure, a Programs Coordinator, based in the Directorate, is responsible for identifying, developing and providing learning and development to Community Corrections staff. However, there is a reported perception that ongoing learning and development is limited, not matched with workforce development requirements and not seen as important, particularly by more experienced staff.

A central unit with responsibility for developing and delivering training will enable greater focus on understanding and meeting statewide and regional learning and development needs in relation to demand and strategic priorities. In addition, as part of the new model, it is recommended that learning and development is strongly linked to a culture of professional development, in which each member of staff is supported to develop professionally.

It is proposed that the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit will deliver effective staff training through:

- working closely with the SPC and other stakeholders to understand the organisation’s induction, learning and development and professional development requirements. This may change periodically as profile of offenders, legislation and policy directions change;

- developing new courses and new approaches to meet the learning and development needs, based on evidenced, contemporary practice;

- supporting Team Leaders to deliver office based induction and orientation programs for new staff;

- delivering learning and development programs in all regions, based on an agreed schedule, as well as in response to direct requests from the regional offices; and

- monitoring and reporting to the Directorate on the delivery, quality and outcomes of the learning and development.
Further details on the proposed development and implementation of learning and development are provided in section 10.3.

9.6.2 Delivering offender programs

Under the current Community Corrections model, Probation Officers are required to deliver programs as part of their core roles and responsibilities, although this is reportedly difficult to manage while carrying responsibility for other tasks. This has limited the numbers of programs that have been run. This has implications on the ability for Community Corrections to address offending behaviour and achieve reductions in reoffending. The current arrangements also have implications on the quality and consistency of offender programs as offender managers may not have appropriate experience or skills to deliver programs.

In the new model, it is proposed that programs are delivered by the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit to enable a focus on developing and delivering offender programs and to ensure quality. In relation to delivering offender programs, the Unit will:

- work closely with the SPC and other stakeholders (e.g. the courts and police) to identify trends in offender profiles and to keep up to date with contemporary and evidence based practice related to offender management;
- develop new programs and make amendments to existing programs, based on evidence, contemporary practice and ongoing monitoring;
- deliver and facilitate programs in all regions, based on an agreed program calendar, and on levels of demand and information from the regional offices;
- monitor and report to the Directorate on the delivery and quality of the programs and ensure consistency across the state;
- monitor and report to the Directorate on the outcomes of programs on the offender, for example, in terms of reducing reoffending;
- develop offender program guidelines and revise eligibility criteria in line with new delivery methods, in discussion with the SPC and the Directorate;
- keep offender managers up to date with the content and facilitation of programs and feedback on attendance and performance of offenders on the program(s);
- ensure that offender managers are able to encourage and support an offender’s participation in the program and to reinforce learning and behaviour and work with the offender to complete any program worksheets required.

The new approach to develop and deliver offender programs will mean that programs are not “core” responsibilities of offender managers. However, to maintain and reinforce the essential links between offender programs and offender management, offender managers in some regions may wish to co facilitate a number of programs. This will require discussion between the
offender manager and the Team Leader and may form part of ongoing professional development.

The review has highlighted that the full range of offender programs are unable to be delivered effectively or efficiently with the current resources. Therefore, in the short term, it is recommended that the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit restricts offender program responsibilities to delivering the FVOI Program only, for which funding is already available.

The future delivery of programs should be considered in light of any additional resources that may become available. For example, if future funding is made available to deliver a wider range of offender programs, it is recommended that a program coordinator role be introduced within the Statewide Training and Development and Programs Unit. This role will be necessary to specifically oversee the development, delivery and quality assurance of offender programs as the skill set and knowledge for this role may differ slightly from that for staff learning and development.

As discussed under program governance, section 6.1, it is also recommended that consideration be given to aligning program development and delivery between TPS and Community Corrections in the future, to realise efficiencies.


## 10 Quality management

Recommendations for improvements to the Community Corrections model and the CSO scheme are underpinned by a strong focus on providing offender management services that are of a high quality. Quality management is the process by and within which quality is defined, measured, monitored and improved. Within the Community Corrections context, quality development is closely linked to risk management: A quality service is one in which offenders are managed safely and where levels of resources and input match levels of criminogenic risk.

A number of elements are considered relating to quality management for Community Corrections, as illustrated in Figure 10.1, below.

*Figure 10.1: Elements of quality management under the proposed model*

![Quality Management Diagram](image)

Implementing a quality culture in Tasmania Community Corrections involves ensuring:

- service delivery is consistent across Tasmania to deliver justice, contribute to reducing reoffending and improve the safety of the community;
- that effective risk management, reparation and rehabilitation are at the centre of all decision making, planning, development and delivery of services;
- continuous improvement in service delivery and responses to address the risk posed by offenders in the community and to meet the needs of the courts, Parole Board and wider community;
- leadership promotes and is supportive of developments, innovation and flexibility that improve management of offenders in the community and contributes to a reduction in offender behaviour; and
• the workforce is skilled and competent to deliver services in line with contemporary best practice.

As part of an improved service model, staff should be encouraged to support a quality culture by:

• actively seeking to know, understand and conform to practice standards;
• keeping managers regularly informed of progress against key performance indicators; and
• maintaining a quality culture through case reflection, case conferencing, peer support and learning and regular (and considered) attendance at supervision and professional development opportunities.

10.1 A framework for quality assurance

It is strongly recommended that Community Corrections’ commitment to quality is clearly demonstrated through the development and implementation of a quality assurance framework, which defines quality within the Community Corrections context and identifies measures of ‘quality’ for ongoing monitoring.

Responsibility for developing a QA framework rests with the Directorate, with input from the SPC and the Statewide Operations Manager. To ensure the framework is understood and embedded in practice throughout Community Corrections, it is also important to consult with staff at regional levels to get their input and buy in to the framework elements.

It is suggested that a QA framework includes the following elements. These will guide the work undertaken by Community Corrections staff and ensure that Community Corrections is accountable for the service it provides.

• program guidelines;
• practice standards; and
• incident management.

The following sections put forward suggestions for these QA elements and consider how they might be developed and implemented in the Community Corrections context.

10.1.1 Program guidelines

The objective of program guidelines are to provide information and guidance to Community Corrections staff about Community Corrections processes and procedures. Guidelines should support the delivery of all aspects of Community Corrections services through providing information on how, why, when and by whom various activities are undertaken. These should be broadly consistent across the state, with a few variations that may relate to local context.
The Community Corrections Manual, which is currently under review and revision, already documents program guidelines. When completed, the manual should be seen as an important reference tool by all Community Corrections staff and should be a central part of any induction programs that are developed. To support the new model, it is recommended that the manual also incorporates any new aspects of the Community Corrections model that are adopted following this review. This is likely to include the following:

- differentiation between the role of the SOM, managing complex offenders, and the OMs, managing medium, low and no risk offenders. This should include processes relating to transfer of offenders between offender managers when levels of risk change;

- guidelines, agreed with the Department of Public Prosecutions and regional police prosecution teams to provide consistency regarding responsibility for prosecutions;

- guidelines, agreed with the courts, to guide all elements of court reporting, including timeframes, content, and method of delivery; and

- details of data and information to be captured and reported through team leaders to the SPC for ongoing and period monitoring and performance management.

It is recommended that program guidelines also include specific guidelines relating to offender programs. These should include program eligibility criteria, conditions of attendance at a program and processes involving feedback between the program trainer and offender managers.

As well as providing a guide for how to undertake tasks and activities, the program guidelines also enable tasks and activities to be monitored to ensure that they are being undertaken appropriately and that the appropriate support and structures are in place to enable this.

In some cases, where the guidelines refer to processes involving other stakeholders, such as the courts, police or the Statewide Training and Programs Unit, they should be developed in consultation with that stakeholder. For external stakeholders, it may be necessary to formalise this arrangement, and the agreement that is documented in the guidelines, through mechanisms such as MOUs. This is discussed in section 11.

10.1.2 Practice standards

Program guidelines should be aligned with practice standards which set minimum and expected requirements and levels of standard for delivering services. Practice standards will provide the basis for quality assessments and interventions with offenders and responses to the courts and Parole Board as stakeholder.

Standards will:

- ensure that the service aims for quality assessment, management and positive outcomes, in terms of reducing reoffending, for all community based offenders;

- articulate the minimum standard of assessment and management that should occur;
• provide guidance about evidence based, best practice interventions with offenders;
• describe competence required to undertake assessment and reporting tasks; and
• establish clear criteria against which performance can be measured.

Community Corrections practice standards will target operational and service delivery arrangements as follows:

• organisational management – including governance, probity, financial accountability, confidentiality, complaints and incident resolution, human resource management and adherence with relevant state and federal legislation;
• service delivery – including assessment and management of offenders with particular focus on identifying and responding to high risk.

Standards should clearly identify performance criteria and expected offender outcomes and be measurable. To support the new model, it is recommended that standards should be articulated around:

• effective leadership and management;
• organisational culture;
• staff capacity and professionalism;
• demonstrating a culture of safety, risk management and responsivity;
• promoting the safety of the community;
• strengthening the offender management process, in particular around effectively identifying and managing risk on an ongoing basis;
• positive outcomes for offenders, such as completion of orders, reduced rate of reoffending, completion of offender programs and other relevant interventions; and
• working collaboratively with other stakeholders, as required, to effectively manage offenders in the community.

10.1.3 Incident management

It is recommended that an incident management strategy is developed and clearly communicated to all Community Correction and other staff working with offenders. This will provide better accountability and mechanisms to identify incidents and respond to them in a timely way to address the causes and minimise the impact of the incident.
It is also recommended that incident reporting and the outcome of incident enquiries be subject to review as part of the Directorate’s ongoing quality assurance process and during performance management reviews with Community Corrections staff.

10.2 Ensuring continuous improvement

To deliver a quality service that continues to be aligned to evidence based practice and demand, Community Corrections should implement continuous improvement mechanisms to monitor performance and outcomes and to develop strategies for improvements. The suggested elements to support continuous improvement are:

- key performance indicators;
- evaluation and performance monitoring mechanisms; and
- robust information technology and data systems.

10.2.1 Key performance indicators

Establishing and monitoring key performance indicators will provide a snapshot of Community Corrections’ performance against a number of indicators that will lead to enhanced service delivery and outcomes for offenders. Key performance indicators by their very nature should focus on variables that are easily measured and provide an indication of whether the service is meeting basic targets.

It is recommended that key performance indicators should be established in relation to:

- time taken to respond to court and Parole Board requests;
- per cent of offenders who have IMPs within a given timeframe and who are able to address goals within a given timeframe;
- number of offenders whose criminogenic risk levels reduce during the course of an order;
- number of offenders who breach orders or who complete an order and reoffend within two years; and
- time taken to complete a CSO.

The above examples are indicative only and could be further developed once decisions have been made about introducing improvements to the Community Corrections and CSO models.

Key performance indicators should be reported on and monitored through an appropriate information technology data system.
10.2.2 Evaluation and performance monitoring mechanisms

For any type of service, ongoing evaluation and performance monitoring is important to monitor performance over time, against agreed indicators or measures and in line with practice standards. Evaluation and performance monitoring should have two main purposes:

1. As a continuous improvement tool. Ongoing monitoring to assesses the efficiency, effectiveness, and other aspects of service delivery to identify what is working well and areas where improvements are needed, at both a statewide and regional level. The focus should be on future planning and continuous improvement in service delivery to meet changing needs and to remain in line with contemporary practice.

2. As an input into maintaining an appropriate level of accountability. This involves specifying what services are required to be delivered and measuring how well they are being delivered in terms of levels of service (quantity), quality, efficiency and effectiveness. The purpose of this is to ensure that Government funds are being spent efficiently and effectively. Regional offices should be held accountable for delivering offender management against agreed standards and must report on their performance against these requirements.

Evaluation and performance monitoring should focus on:

- the extent to which the service is meeting its intended objectives or desired outcomes, including reducing offending, achieving compliance and responding to courts and the Parole Board;

- service delivery performance, including:
  - the efficiency and quality of service delivery,
  - levels of intervention and offender management (matched to risk),
  - appropriateness of service,
  - links with other stakeholders; and
  - performance against practice standards; and

- program capacity to deliver services and achieve desired outcomes.

It is suggested that a framework be developed to inform monitoring of performance at a statewide and regional level, to inform performance assessment and evaluation activities, and ultimately to inform service improvements and maintain an adequate level of accountability for performance. The framework should have the following components:

- regular performance measurement against a defined set of key performance indicators – at a statewide and regional level – covering outcomes, and outputs and services, and capacity. This should be conducted by the SPC in conjunction with Team Leaders;
• periodic, in depth performance assessment, analysis, or evaluation on specific areas (such as CSOs), activities (such as assessments), or the Community Corrections service as a whole. This process will be the basis for continuous improvement planning;

• less frequent external audits, perhaps every three years or so, to form the basis of a service improvement plan; and

• regular reporting of results of performance monitoring and evaluation – both within Community Corrections and publicly.

The development of the framework should also guide the monitoring of any improvements to the current model that are implemented as a result of this (and other) projects.

10.2.3 Robust information technology and data systems

Quality assurance must be supported by robust data systems to provide information and support accountability. Strong data collection is important to:

• inform decisions about service planning delivery;

• monitor the performance of services;

• ensure that outcomes for offenders and community stakeholders are being achieved; and

• ensure the best use of resources.

The current OIS system should be used to capture and provide required data and information, as outlined by guidelines developed by the Directorate. This may include the identification of a core set of data items, which should provide the base level of information required for planning, performance monitoring, evaluation and accountability.

The Directorate should be responsible for ensuring that the OIS, and other information technology (IT) systems in the future, is fit for purpose and that all staff have appropriate training in using the system. To ensure that data and information is accurate and complete, Team Leaders should have responsibility for ensuring that all staff maintain up to date records.

10.3 Workforce development

Community Corrections has in place a number of structures to support workforce development, including Professional Supervisors in the regions, the Program Coordinator at the Directorate and arrangements for local induction, conducted by the Regional Managers and Professional Supervisors. The concepts and principles underpinning these structures are sound - to create an effective, competent workforce.

However, in practice, pressures on time and resources, varying attitudes and differences in practice across the state have reduced the impact and effectiveness of these structures to provide
quality support for staff. In addition, although there is a Professional Supervision framework, there is no overall strategy that underpins and draws together all elements of workforce development.

A consequence of this is that some crucial workforce development activities are not receiving the attention they deserve and there is inconsistency and no clear standards for induction, orientation, training, development or supervision across the state. In particular, there is limited capacity within the current model for professional development and training to consider and embed evidence based practice within delivery of corrections services in Tasmania.

To address this, it is proposed a statewide Workforce Development Strategy and framework be developed. This strategy should articulate Community Corrections’ commitment to the following:

- workforce planning and forecasting;
- attraction and recruitment of quality staff with appropriate qualifications or experience;
- professional learning and development including induction, ongoing training, professional supervision; and
- retention strategies that provide a framework for reward and recognition.

An underpinning framework should be developed to set out how Community Corrections will implement and achieve the Workforce Development Strategy objectives. The proposed Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit will play a key role in implementing a number of strategies as described in section 9.6.

Elements of a workforce development strategy are predominantly described in relation to Team Leaders and offender managers.

### 10.3.1 Workforce planning and forecasting

A key element of workforce development is ensuring that Community Corrections has a workforce that is able to deliver responses to a required standard. This includes ensuring that there are sufficient staff to meet demand placed on the service and that staff have the appropriate skills and competence to deliver required responses.

It is suggested that the Workforce Development Strategy articulates how workforce planning will be undertaken to ensure that the workforce will be able to continue to meet demand in the future. This will require consideration of strategic directions and policies, the type and number of orders, trends in offending behaviour and offence types and any changes in sentencing behaviour as a result of changes to legislation or philosophy. Key to this will be embedding workforce planning into the organisational business planning processes.
10.3.2 Attraction and recruitment

A community corrections service should be staffed by a workforce with the knowledge, skills and competencies to work safely and flexibly with community based offenders with a range of criminogenic and other needs. Attracting, recruiting and retaining suitable staff and equipping them with required skills will be important to enable Community Corrections to achieve its aims and objectives and to effectively manage offenders in the community now and in the future.

A clear, centrally led recruitment approach, linked to organisational priorities and strategic directions, will be important to:

- enable integrated, strategic service improvement planning over time and consideration of the staff required to deliver the service to the required standards;
- meet the growth in demand in terms of number and location of community based offenders by ensuring that there are appropriate staff in place to meet these needs.
- enable consistency in the recruitment process to ensure that candidates are of equal standard; and
- allow consideration of vacancies and applications at a statewide level to ensure that resources are allocated according to changing need, not based on historical staffing arrangements.

10.3.3 Qualifications and experience

All staff working with offenders should have qualifications and/or experience that is appropriate to the roles they are employed to do, and aligns to the Award the position is under (see section 8.2). Staff should also be able to demonstrate competence in a range of specified tasks they undertake.

Under the proposed new model, it is suggested that all Community Corrections staff\(^{20}\) have either satisfactorily completed an appropriate course of study at a recognised tertiary institution\(^{21}\), including a TAFE, or can demonstrate appropriate relevant experience to undertake the role.

Appropriate courses of study might include, but are not limited to, courses in social welfare, social work, criminal justice, criminology, law, social science, psychology or other related areas.

Appropriate relevant experience may include previous experience as an offender manager in another jurisdiction, experience and/or vocational qualifications in related sectors, such as youth

---

\(^{20}\) This includes the Statewide Operations Manager, the Senior Practice Consultant, Team Leaders, Senior Offender Managers, Offender Managers and Offender Managers- CSOs (as described in the report on the CSO Scheme Review).

\(^{21}\) This is the current “essential qualifications” requirement outlined for Probation Officers and Professional Supervisors in the Statements of Duties.
justice, policing and prison, or experience of working with offenders and other challenging populations in community based services, such as drug and alcohol services.

In addition, it is suggested that all staff working directly with offenders should also demonstrate the following:

- knowledge and understanding of criminal justice issues and Community Corrections policy and practice or the ability to obtain that knowledge within a reasonable timeframe;
- qualification and/or experience that involves an assessment and casework (offender management or similar) component;
- knowledge and understanding of principles of offender management and criminogenic risk factors;
- an understanding of the importance of linking offender management to assessed risk and needs and to individual planning;
- up to date knowledge of research and evidence related to offender management and reducing recidivism;
- high level engagement and communication skills, particularly with challenging and vulnerable adults;
- well developed report writing skills; and
- the ability to develop flexible approaches to complex problems.

These areas may be developed further as part of professional development and ongoing training, described in sections below.

10.3.4 Professional learning and development

The objectives of professional learning and development are to:

- maintain a workforce that is capable and competent and operating in line with good practice;
- support staff to effectively undertake their roles and improve skills to progress in their careers as desired and against an agreed professional development plan;
- to contribute to staff’s professional development by ensuring the acquisition of new and the strengthening of existing skills, knowledge and attributes required for practice and career development; and
- provide focused support to Senior Offender Managers working with high risk clients.
Learning and development should be targeted at individual staff, to address individual areas for development, as well as at the workforce as a whole, to ensure that staff learn and retain skills and knowledge that enable contemporary service delivery.

It is proposed that learning and development is delivered through a number of approaches:

- during induction, ongoing and specific training conducted by the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit;
- contact and learning from peers during team meetings; case conferencing, joint working (for example, joint working of higher risk offenders) and informal discussions related to individual cases;
- formal supervision arrangements with supervisors; and
- (for some staff) independent study and development outside of Community Corrections, for example through studying for postgraduate qualifications.

Professional learning development requires active involvement from staff. Proposed changes to Community Corrections model are underpinned by a strong professional culture which encourages a high level of professionalism from staff. In the short term, this will be reinforced and encouraged by the SPC, to help this culture become embedded in the organisation.

10.3.4.1 Staff induction and orientation

An element of workforce development is induction, orientation and initial training to support new starters entering Tasmania Community Corrections. This is important as a significant finding of the review was that induction of new staff is currently ad hoc and inconsistent across the state and can be a low priority, depending on other demands on staff time.

It is proposed that a comprehensive “beginning practice” program be developed to provide induction and orientation to Community Corrections and to provide training on basic practice skills. A “beginning practice” program should:

- include an overview of the role of the offender manager and how this links in with wider corrections services in Tasmania;
- include generic elements that relate to Tasmania Community Corrections and offender management in general and are common across all regional areas. This could include topics such as understanding legislation, conducting assessments, report writing, building rapport, policies and procedures, and OHS issues;
- be supported by an ‘induction pack’ comprising all relevant Community Corrections documentation, including protocols and procedures and service guidelines should be provided and explained;

---

22 This is the name of the induction and orientation program used by Tasmanian Child Protection Services.
- describe roles and responsibilities and the processes and procedures for managing offenders;
- provide training on basic practice skills, including:
  - use of the Offender Information System (OIS);
  - assessments and report writing to develop skills to allow the new starter to become familiarised with the tools and templates; and
  - procedures and etiquette at court;
- provide opportunities to shadow other offender managers on assessments and supervision sessions and on home and prison visits; and
- include input from other organisations and services that work with offenders, e.g. courts, police, drug and alcohol.

The “beginning practice” program should be tailored to each region to support the new starter to work effectively in the local context. This might include familiarisation with local community based services or courts, for example. Induction and orientation should also be supported through supervision, mentoring and on the job training, including shadowing of more experienced staff.

To be most effective and resource efficient, induction and orientation should be tailored to the level of previous experience and knowledge that new starters have. For example, staff who are entirely new to offender management may require considerable support throughout an induction period, which should be linked to professional development and training described later in this section. In contrast, offender managers arriving from other jurisdictions may already have experience of managing offenders but will still require initial support around the context, structures and delivery of offender management in Tasmania.

The purpose of induction and orientation for experienced and inexperienced new staff is also slightly different. For experienced staff, the purpose is to enable them to manage offenders in Tasmania. Induction and orientation for inexperienced staff goes further, to help them develop initial skills to be able to work safely with offenders and be a valuable member of the team.

For logistical reasons, it is suggested that Team Leaders conduct induction and orientation in the region that the new member of staff joins. Other offender managers may also be involved in a number of elements.

In the future, statewide induction programs may be considered if an influx of new starters creates the demand for this. Statewide inductions have the benefits of relieving resource pressures on staff in regional offices, ensuring induction is of a consistently high quality and creating networking opportunities for new staff. However, statewide induction will only provide a general introduction to Community Corrections. Further reinforcement, including on the job training, shadowing and familiarisation with the local context, will still be critical at a regional level.
10.3.4.2 **Ongoing learning and development**

Learning and development is important for staff at all levels of their career to maintain skills and motivated workforce. While initial training and induction is crucial to support new staff to operate safely and to add value to the organisation and to stakeholders, ongoing learning and development is essential to ensure that:

- all staff understand the changing context and environment (including procedural) in which they work;
- staff are equipped with and maintain skills and knowledge to undertake their role and are supported to acquire skills and knowledge to demonstrate required competence; and
- offender management in Tasmania continues to be in line with contemporary best practice, that provides effective, efficient response to offenders and to the community.

It is recommended that learning and development be based on the following topic areas.

- **Practice requirements**: This training should be provided on tasks and structure/operation specific topics. It should be available to all new staff, and periodically for other staff as a refresher, or as changes or new procedures or tools are implemented. These training programs/courses could include:
  - training on Community Corrections processes, protocols, procedures and guidelines to ensure staff are able to operate appropriately and to consistent standards;
  - workshops on improved techniques for conducting some tasks and activities, such as report writing, developing IMPs and conducting joint case working. This may be based on feedback from other stakeholders or on findings from internal reviews and audits; and
  - sessions on the operation and delivery of services by partner organisations, such as courts and police, to inform Community Corrections work.

- **Professional skills**: Training in various soft skills should be provided to equip staff to be able to effectively manage offenders. This training should be offered to all staff as part of professional development and might include, for example, topics such as:
  - setting goals and outcomes;
  - positive reinforcement and modelling behaviour;
  - effective communication (e.g. tailored to support engagement with difficult clients to conduct effective assessments);
  - responding in culturally appropriate ways (with Indigenous offenders and those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds);
- presentation skills (e.g. tailored to presenting prosecutions in court); and
- supervision of staff (for Team Leaders).

- **Topic - specific** training: This training should introduce and provide practical application of conceptual and theoretical areas. This is important to ensure that the Community Corrections workforce has up to date, contemporary knowledge of effective responses to working with offenders. This training should be based on the latest research available from Australia and internationally and should include topics such as:
  - understanding offender trends, evidence based practice, new approaches in offender management and “what works and how these apply to the Tasmania context;
  - recognising triggers and changes in offending risk; and
  - responding to and managing specific needs of high risk offenders.

In the longer term, joint learning and development opportunities may be considered across Community Corrections and the TPS. In addition, there may be opportunities to explore learning and development that could be shared with other professional groups. An example would be conducting training on managing aggressive clients that would be useful for staff from community organisations who work with community based offenders.

Some learning and development may also require input from other organisations and services that work with offenders, e.g. courts, police, drug and alcohol services. Professional trainers with knowledge and understanding of corrections and the Tasmanian context should deliver all learning and development elements.

### 10.3.4.3 Frequency and location of training

It is recommended that Community Corrections staff, in direct consultation with their Team Leader, should determine participation in learning and development programs. Courses should be selected that are consistent with professional development needs and goals of individuals and across the service. It is suggested that Team Leaders provide formal, biannual feedback to the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit on the professional development needs of their staff to inform development of Learning and Development opportunities.

It is recommended that Community Corrections staff should have access to a minimum of four days learning and development a year relating to professional skills and specific topics, linked to individual Professional Development Plans. Learning and development for practice requirements should be provided as needed and should be mandatory.

Availability of learning and development should be consistent across the state, but should also be planned to respond to demand. In practical terms, it is suggested the Statewide Learning and Development and Programs Unit staff visit each region to conduct mandatory training and training that is required by the majority of staff in a region. Other training should be located based on demand across the state. Provision should be made to allow staff to travel to attend training, where necessary.
10.3.5 **Professional supervision**

Professional supervision is crucial to ensure that staff, individually and collectively, are able to deliver safe, quality services. Broadly, supervision aims to provide guidance and support for day to day activities and tasks as well as enabling individual staff to identify and achieve professional goals. Professional development, through supervision, is often guided by an individual Professional Development Plan, which may include individual performance measures that are linked to organisation wide strategic and operational plans.

While this section focuses on describing suggested approaches to supervision and professional development for offender managers, the principles and approaches should be applied for all Community Corrections staff.

Supervision is a two way process between supervisor and supervisee. In the new model, it is proposed that Team Leaders provide supervision and support professional development of all regional staff. The overall aim of supervision is to ensure that offender managers are able to respond to courts, the Parole Board and offenders in a safe, consistent way, in line with legislated requirements and against agreed standards. In order to provide a high quality offender management service, staff require:

- professional and emotional support;
- case specific guidance and advice; and
- professional development opportunities.

The objectives of supervision are to:

- ensure that staff understand and are equipped to undertake their roles and responsibilities and assessing competence for assessment and report writing tasks;
- ensure that offenders are managed safely and in line with the aims and objectives of the organisation and within the principles of offender management;
- ensuring that standards and service outcomes are being met;
- discuss specifics of individual cases, to review performance, give feedback and identify any lessons to be learnt and applied to future cases;
- identify and address work related stress factors that may impair effective service delivery. This might include reviewing caseloads;
- support staff working with highly complex and challenging individuals, in situations that may be confrontational and potentially risky;
- establish a developmental and supportive environment and relationships that promote competent practice and work satisfaction; and
• identify areas for learning and professional development needs, facilitating supports to address these and monitoring impact this has on performance.

Supervision of staff should occur both formally (scheduled) and informally (unscheduled). Formal supervision involves regular one on one meetings that address the above. Informal supervision of staff occurs on a daily basis and may involve providing immediate direction and advice or live supervision (e.g. joint case management).

10.3.6 Supervision for new staff

Being new to either offender management or Tasmania Community Corrections, new staff will require additional supervision input. It is recommended that, during the first six months of starting at Tasmania Community Corrections, new staff are provided with the following supervision:

• more frequent, regular meetings with the Team Leader to monitor work and to provide an opportunity for discussion;

• a specified number of contacts (telephone calls and face to face meetings) with the SPC;

• some shadowing and/or joint working with SOMs or the Team Leader to ensure that processes and procedures are understood and followed appropriately by the new starter; and

• preparation and debriefing sessions with the Team Leader after first few key milestones, e.g. first interview with an offender, first time in court.

It is suggested that the nature and extent of this higher intensity supervision is agreed between the new staff member and the Team Leader, and is based on the new starter’s previous experience and demonstrated aptitude and ability during the first six months.

10.3.7 Retention

As for many health and human service sectors, the retention of competent staff should be a key focus of Community Corrections. In the context of the new model, a number of elements are introduced that should lead to improved retention of staff, including:

• an improved career pathway for offender managers that recognises increased skills and knowledge and provides opportunities to manage increasingly complex cases;

• a stronger induction and orientation package to support new staff and provide them with the skills and support to be able to work safety and effectively; and

• more structured learning and development opportunities to enable professional development.
The proposed Workforce Development Strategy should consider how effective these elements are in retaining quality staff and how improvements can be identified and implemented over time.
11 Partnerships and collaboration

Addressing criminogenic risk factors and reducing reoffending cannot be the sole responsibility of one organisation. To achieve aims and objectives, the Community Corrections Service as a whole, and offender managers as professionals, need support from and links to a range of other stakeholders. Creating these partnerships requires identifying key stakeholders and establishing partnership arrangements, as illustrated in Figure 11.1 below.

Figure 11.1: Elements of partnerships and integrated working under the proposed model

To effectively implement a renewed focus on the functions of offender management, it will be important for Community Corrections to engage with and build partnerships with a number of different stakeholders at:

- a regional level to ensure that Community Corrections is able to establish and create constructive working relationships with other relevant organisations and services; and

- an individual worker level to facilitate referrals from Community Corrections to other community based services to support an offender to achieve their IMP goals.

Effective relationships with external stakeholders will bring about a number of benefits to Community Corrections:

- better and more timely information sharing relating to offenders on an order. This will:
  - improve the quality and depth of assessments;
  - enable a more timely response to addressing behaviour that might impact on compliance on an order;
enable more reactive breaching;

- reinforce the purpose and role of offender managers of upholding court and Parole Board decisions and taking punitive action if necessary;

• better understanding of the requirements, parameters and challenges faced by the various professionals who work with offenders and clarity on how this impacts offender management more widely. An example would be better mutual understanding between courts and offender managers about the purpose (and therefore required content) of PSR for specific purposes;

• mechanisms to address challenges and issues that arise, for example changes in sentencing habits that impact on offender management; and

• a positive relationship with mutual respect and confidence.

11.1 Key stakeholders

This section describes the stakeholders who are important to Community Corrections, why these relationships would be beneficial to Community Corrections and offenders and at which level within Community Corrections the relationships should be maintained.

11.1.1 Courts and Parole Board

The courts and the Parole Board are perhaps the most important stakeholders for Community Corrections as the majority of work undertaken by Community Corrections is in response to requests and decisions made by the court or the Parole Board.

Good working arrangements between the courts and Parole Board and Community Corrections are essential to:

• develop common protocols and guidelines relating to both organisations that govern practice and establish agreed standards;

• provide a means for monitoring practice against agreed protocols;

• better manage expectations related to clearer common objectives about the intended outcome of an order and its conditions; and

• create clear lines of communication between the organisations to address concerns and provide feedback.

At a statewide level, working arrangements should be agreed between the Chief Magistrate and Community Corrections. Team Leaders in the regions should be responsible for ensuring that there is a good working relationship between the regional courts and the
11.1.2 Tasmania Prison Service

The Tasmania Prison Service (TPS) should be considered another stakeholder as offenders often move between prison and the community and are managed by staff in TPS and Community Corrections respectively. Links between the two organisations are essential to:

- continue case management throughout an offender’s criminal justice pathway to continue to address risk and reduce reoffending; and

- share information about the offender and outcomes of assessment to maximise resources and lead to a more complete understanding of the offender’s criminogenic risk factors and needs. This is particularly important for prisoners being released on parole as Community Corrections will require information held by TPS to develop a PPR and to be able to most effectively manage the individual in the community.

At an organisational level, partnership between Community Corrections and the TPS will also be beneficial to share practice and learnings about how to work most effectively with offenders individually and as a population.

An option to consider a Directorate of Corrections, incorporating both TPS and Community Corrections is outlined in section 4.1. However, in the immediate term, it is important for the two organisations to agree areas in which partnership working would be beneficial and to establish protocols to determine how this will take place in practice.

This should be developed at a central policy level, but implemented on the ground by the Team Leaders in the South. Working arrangements should also consider how to improve day to day working by Community Corrections staff with prisoners up for parole.

11.1.3 Community based services

Managing offenders to address risks, challenge non criminogenic behaviour linked to offending and to reduce offending often requires the involvement of professionals external to Community Corrections. A number of offenders will either be required, or will volunteer, to attend supports and programs offered by other government and non government services. These might include services or programs for:

- drug and alcohol treatment;
- mental health;
- education, training and employment; and
- financial help, such as debt management or problem gambling.
Partnerships with these services are important to:

- educate and raise awareness about each others services to enable better support of shared clients. For example, offender managers should be aware of the range of services available to be able to make referrals or sign post offenders;

- facilitate joint working if appropriate and if agreed by the client/offender; and

- share information, within the bounds of confidentiality, to support an offender or to minimise the risk they pose to themselves or others. This might include seeking a report from a drug and alcohol services about a client’s regular attendance and progress on the program to include in a PSR for the courts.

It is likely that the type and availability of services and programs will vary across the state. Therefore, it is suggested that working relationships and partnerships with community based services are developed at a regional level and are managed by Team Leaders through involvement at networking forums, for example.

It is also important that individual offender managers in each region have a sufficient knowledge of the external service system that is available to their clients and, conversely, that other professionals working with community based offenders are aware of offender managers. It is therefore recommended that mechanisms are in place in each region to achieve this, for example through:

- rotating representation at networking meetings between a number of staff;

- including a ‘networking’ module as part of the induction and orientation program; and

- encouraging staff to create working relationships with professionals in other services.

### 11.1.4 Tasmania Police

The Police are the front line of response and interaction with people committing or suspected of committing offences. They often know individuals who are repeatedly engaging in offending behaviour and have considerable knowledge of an individual, which may be valuable in initial Community Corrections assessments.

In addition, police are likely to come into contact with offenders on an order who engage in offending behaviour or other activities that breach the conditions of their orders. For example, police may be the first point of contact if an offender visits a family member that their order prohibits them from contacting.

Police also play an important role in monitoring high risk offenders to protect the public and seek and gather a wealth of information on these individuals to effectively manage the risk.
For these reasons, Police hold information that is critical to effectively managing offenders on a community based order and should be seen as a key stakeholder. Engaging and liaising with the Police is important to:

- seek information to inform a comprehensive assessment as part of a PSR or PPR (or, in some cases, a CSO suitability report);
- seek and share information that relates to an offender’s risk; and
- seek timely information on behaviour and activities that constitute a breach of an order.

This will address a number of issues that were identified during the review including that Community Corrections may not hear about an offender breaching an order until they appear in court on another charge. The review also found that information requested from police about pending investigations or previous convictions can delay completing PSRs and PPRs.

To achieve this, it would be useful for individual offender managers to develop working relationships with their colleagues in the Police. However, a precedent for this should be set at an organisational level, with Community Corrections and the Tasmanian Police agreeing terms of reference for partnership working and articulating an intent to work collaboratively where appropriate. It is also suggested that Team Leaders strengthen the relationship on the ground by seeking ways to be incorporated in any relevant networking or partnership forums that involve or are led by the Police.

11.2 Establishing partnerships arrangements

Protocols to govern relationships between Community Corrections and other stakeholders will need to consider:

- referral pathways;
- information sharing, including what information to share and when;
- dispute resolution; and
- collaborative practice arrangements.

Partnerships should be formalised through developing:

- Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs)
- information sharing guidelines; and
- specific purpose guidelines, e.g. relating to the provision of reports for courts.

These arrangements should be agreed in consultation with the stakeholder to whom they relate and should form the basis for regular feedback about the nature and outputs of the relationship.
An example would be that an MOU or guidelines between the courts and Community Corrections informs discussions about how well each organisation is achieving its roles and responsibilities in relation to managing offenders in the community, such as the quality and timeliness of court reports and appropriateness requests from courts related to reports.

Some arrangements may relate to relationships between organisations in a specific region, others may relate to arrangements at a whole of organisation, statewide level.
12 **Next steps**

The review has identified a number of areas for improvement to Tasmania Community Corrections, based on feedback from stakeholders and from comparisons for evidence based practice, and makes a number of recommendations to bring about change. A number of the recommendations relate to significant change to the current structure and model while other suggested changes focus on improving existing features.

To take forward the recommendations a number of steps are required as described under the headings below.

12.1 **Development of an implementation plan**

To support the implementation of recommendations presented in this report, an implementation plan will be developed that outlines actions, timeframes and responsibilities for taking forward change. The implementation plan will:

- consider all areas of governance and operation in which improvements are required;
- state the current context and arrangements and identify the required ‘end point’ as a result of improvements;
- describe tasks and activities required to implement improvements;
- define and consider short, medium and long term goals; and
- identify, in consultation with key stakeholders, who will be responsible for the tasks and activities.

12.2 **Development of a communication and consultation strategy**

Communication with a range of stakeholders will be important to facilitate a number of changes that will be required and to communicate the outcome and impact of changes on all stakeholders. It is strongly recommended that a communication and consultation strategy is developed that identifies key stakeholders, internally and externally to Community Corrections, and describes how stakeholders will be engaged and kept informed of improvements to the service.

The Directorate, with input from the Regional Operations Manager and Team Leaders, should develop the communication and consultation strategy.