

# Breaking the Cycle: Tasmanian Corrections Plan 2010-2020

## Summary of feedback

# Breaking the Cycle: Tasmanian Corrections Plan 2010–2020

## Summary of Feedback

This paper provides a summary of the submissions received in response to the Breaking the Cycle Discussion Paper. It also incorporates key comments and concepts from the various consultations held in the course of the Breaking the Cycle project thus far. The feedback is broken down into sections matching the six outcome areas identified in the Discussion Paper, followed by a section on additional themes which emerged in the process of analysis, and then a section regarding the priorities identified by various stakeholders.

In commenting on topics raised in the Discussion Paper, some submissions gave only a general opinion one way or another, while others gave detailed reasons for their position. In many cases this included valuable feedback regarding the fine detail of proposal implementation. This summary aims to note whether the feedback received was, on the whole, supportive or opposing; unanimous or divided; and any significant caveats or implementation concerns raised by stakeholders which might affect the decision to proceed on particular proposals.

### I Sentencing options

The idea of expanding sentencing options was generally supported. Stakeholders who are involved in the running of the justice system were very supportive of increasing the range of sentencing options, and particularly of the focus on non-custodial sentencing options. Broad support for increased sentencing options were expressed by Probation Officers, Magistrates, the CPSU, Tasmania Police and many non-government service providers. Comments included:

“Sentencing options, including more diversionary programs or pathways to fit a restorative process will deliver more effective and acceptable outcomes.” -Salvation Army

“The Department’s experience working with the Department of Justice to implement and support the Court-Mandated Drug Diversion [CMD] initiative has provided considerable insight into the potentially positive community outcomes that may be realised from alternative sentencing and bail options.” - Tasmania Police

Where concerns were raised about particular options, they fell into the following major categories:

- the impact on the providers (for example, periodic detention would involve increased entries and exits to the prison, which could impact on staff workloads);
- the potential risks of poor implementation (e.g. insufficient resources, inadequate assessment of offenders for suitability);
- that they might not be sufficiently rehabilitative (e.g. home detention by itself has no inherent rehabilitative value); and
- that they might not be, or might not be seen to be, sufficiently punitive / deterrent.

Particularly, Tasmania Police emphasised “the need to consider the safety of the community in the short-term whilst offenders are addressing their risks / needs through receiving services aimed towards behavioural change.”

Many stakeholders shared the sentiments of the CPSU, who wrote that it is “essential that sufficient resources be made available to implement any new sentencing options effectively.”

With regard to the particular sentencing options raised in the Discussion Paper:

**Periodic detention** and **home detention** were both supported in theory, as a way of enabling offenders to serve a sentence without losing employment and while maintaining contact with family.

Concerns:

- Suitability criteria for these options would need to be clearly defined and carefully assessed.
- It was still seen as important to provide rehabilitative services to these offenders.
- An appropriate location for periodic detention would need to be chosen (the existing remand centres were not thought to have capacity for this).

Responses to the idea of **Court-Ordered Parole** were mixed. Concerns were raised about the timing of assessment of suitability for parole, and the need to retain the denial of parole as a sanction for misbehaviour while in prison. Importantly, it was felt that the benefits of this proposal (increased clarity about release dates) had, to a large extent, already been achieved through the work of the Parole Board Secretary. Therefore this item is not considered a high priority.

There was extremely strong support from a wide variety of stakeholders for **alternative forms of bail** similar to CMD, where a convicted offender is given an opportunity to address criminogenic or other issues prior to final sentencing. Both the Salvation Army and Anglicare chose this as one of their highest priority items:

“In summary, our concerns are that diversionary programs for people with drug and alcohol issues, gambling problems or mental illnesses are made available; [and] that these programs be backed by appropriate resources, including within the wider service system, so that people can receive all the support they need“ - Anglicare

Probation Officers also supported this option, particularly on the grounds of enforceability. Under these programs, the onus can be on the offender to show that they are fulfilling the terms of their order, rather than on the Probation Officer to prove lack of compliance. Also, the threat of imprisonment gives a strong incentive for compliance by the offender.

Alternative forms of bail also fit in well with the therapeutic jurisprudence framework, in which the authority of the judicial officer is deliberately brought to bear as part of the rehabilitative process. A Probation Officer recalled an offender saying “I can’t let [the Magistrate] down”.

It was noted that this approach can work well for acute social problems e.g. homelessness, mental illness, ABI, substance misuse<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Comorbidity Project Officer.

The success of the Court-Mandated Diversion program was mentioned by many stakeholders, and many submissions referred to it as a potential model for other diversionary programs.

Types of diversionary activity suggested included:

- addressing alcohol misuse (various stakeholders; note that CMD does not currently cover alcohol issues)
- addressing gambling issues (strongly supported by Anglicare)<sup>2</sup>
- educational activities (Salvation Army, Hobart Community Legal Service)
- “lifestyle-based personal development programs” (Salvation Army)
- Army Reserve or related activities
- various programs to be undertaken within Community Corrections (see section 3)
- employment-related activities (see the Wise Employment submission regarding their award-winning “Make It Work” bail intervention in Victoria)

The expansion of existing diversions was recommended. It was suggested that CMD be expanded to address alcohol misuse, and include the Supreme Court.<sup>3</sup> It was also recommended that the Mental Health Diversion (MHD) list<sup>4</sup> be expanded to include acquired brain injury (ABI) and intellectual disability (ID).<sup>5</sup> Advocacy Tasmania wrote: “the ID/ABI cohort is not merely a fringe group within the prison population – it is a core group that requires a significant commitment of planning and resources.”

Diversions can address otherwise unmet needs. Anglicare note that “for over half the offenders referred to the program [in its first year], CMD has been their first ever opportunity to confront their need for treatment and to gain support to deal with their addiction-related issues”.

Note that Tasmania Police also have existing diversionary programs, such as the Community Respect Order (see below) and the Illicit Drug Diversion initiative.

Concerns:

- Diversions generally require offender consent. However, the threat of prison as an alternative sanction can encourage those reluctant to seek treatment to participate.
- As discussed below, effective monitoring and breach procedures are essential to effectiveness and community confidence.
- Community safety concerns must be balanced with the rehabilitative benefit.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Anglicare suggest people convicted of offences committed to support a gambling habit as being highly suitable for diversion, because: most of offenders’ crimes are not violent; many have no prior convictions; many are employed; and most have had no previous treatment.

<sup>3</sup> Comorbidity Project Officer.

<sup>4</sup> Anglicare cited the 2009 evaluation of the MHD list: “the program had been ‘largely successful’ in achieving its objective of offering a more therapeutic approach for mentally ill defendants, reducing recidivism and improving coordination between the criminal justice system and health service providers.”

<sup>5</sup> Advocacy Tasmania, Comorbidity Project Officer.

<sup>6</sup> Note that Tasmania Police support electronic monitoring on bail; a proposal for this is currently in development.

**Dealing with young adult offenders through the Youth Justice system** was supported in theory, but it was thought that this option was unlikely to be used, i.e. that there are very few offenders for whom this would be a desirable option. (Note that Tasmania Police already have a related option in place: the Community Respect Order (CRO), a diversionary option for offenders 13-25 years old, under which police supervise young offenders in carrying out community work.) In fact, some stakeholders felt that there might be more benefit for the converse proposal: dealing with certain difficult juvenile offenders under the adult system.

Other issues which arose under this topic included:

- There was considerable discussion about the value of clear and effective **breach procedures** and compliance enforcement. Without meaningful and enforceable breach procedures, community-based sanctions can lose their impact on the offender and the respect of the community.
- **Communication between corrective services and the judiciary** (see section 4) is crucial so that the required corrective services can be provided. For example, if an offender is put on bail prior to sentencing to allow them to participate in a program, it is essential that the program be offered in the allotted time. There needs to be a mechanism for those who carry out the orders to provide feedback on capacity and issues which may arise.<sup>7</sup>
- Several stakeholders felt it would be desirable for Magistrates to be able to “tailor-make” sentences to suit individuals.
- The Hobart Community Legal Service expressed concern at the idea of police officers, or any other segment of the justice system, gaining too many discretionary powers.
- Several stakeholders mentioned the idea of “**prison as a last resort**”.<sup>8</sup> A previous manager of the Integrated Offender Management Unit wrote: “the Sentencing Act 1997 [should] be amended to stipulate that imprisonment may only be imposed as a last resort, that it is being imposed for reasons provided by the act and that the sentencing authority explain the reasons why the person is being imprisoned rather than an alternative sentence being imposed.” Advocacy Tasmania referred to “the principle of restraint” as per the Tasmanian Law Reform Institute’s review of the Sentencing Act.

## 2 Community engagement

While this outcome area did not attract as much response as high-profile areas like programs and services and sentencing options, the responses that were received were very supportive.

**Community communications**, i.e. engaging with and educating the broader community regarding the role of corrective services, was broadly supported.

The Salvation Army expressed a wish to contribute to “a plan which can make positive cultural change across our community”, while Advocacy Tasmania mentioned the value of changing perceptions to address barriers to employment (perceptions of offenders, criminal

---

<sup>7</sup> As an example, Anglicare cited the evaluation of CMD, saying that there were higher than expected referrals to individual counselling and lower than expected participation in group counselling.

<sup>8</sup> Salvation Army, Advocacy Tasmania.

record). Offenders were concerned about the impact of adverse media attention on their reintegration.

It was noted that community confidence in corrective services is regularly eroded by “bad news” stories, e.g. instances of offending while on bail or community-based orders. The Red Cross wrote: “There is a need to overcome the media’s attention on individual offences and sentencing outcomes, and educate the community about the importance of rehabilitation and reintegration in order to ensure community safety over the long term.” The Hobart Community Legal Service wrote: “[t]he broader community needs to accept the theoretical underpinning of the rehabilitative approach” and “the community needs to be convinced that these new approaches are **‘not soft on crime, but smart on crime’**”. The Red Cross suggested that this could be done not only through media relations, but also through direct communication and outreach.

**Community Justice Panels** were supported by a number of stakeholders, including the Salvation Army who are eager to be involved in a pilot scheme. Tasmania Police compared this proposal to their existing District-level crime prevention and community safety groups, and suggested that CJPs could be modelled on these or that community justice functions could possibly be incorporated into these existing groups. The importance of clear definition of the role and selection and training of panel members was emphasised by several stakeholders.<sup>9</sup>

**Mentoring** was strongly supported by a number of non-government service providers. Wise Employment have a successful vocational mentoring program<sup>10</sup> already running in NSW, while the Red Cross are planning to implement a mentoring scheme as part of their Prisoner Support Program, focusing on transition support. Advocacy Tasmania approved of mentoring, “especially with people with intellectual disabilities and / or acquired brain injuries.”

**Victim-Offender mediation** was also supported by many stakeholders, particularly by members of the general public; however, it was felt that this should be on a case-by-case basis.

As pointed out by many stakeholders, there are significant risks in these proposals for community involvement in the justice process: volunteers and panel members would have to be carefully screened, trained and supervised. However, there is also the potential for positive and meaningful outcomes from this type of approach.

Other issues which arose under this topic included:

**Restorative justice**, as a general principle, was seen as having potential benefits for victims (who may feel a sense of justice having been done), the community (likewise), and the offender (who may better perceive the effects and consequences of their actions). The concept of restorative justice featured heavily in submissions from members of the general public. It was also supported by Tasmania Police, who use a restorative approach in their work with youth (Community Respect Orders and the Early Intervention and Youth Action Units).

Comments included:

---

<sup>9</sup> Including the Hobart Community Legal Service and inmate submissions.

<sup>10</sup> Straight For Work (S4W)

“[a] tangible restorative effort by offenders can be seen by community as ‘tougher on crime’ than incarceration or other sentences which can create a recidivist culture ... returning value to those offended against ... offenders are more able to understand ‘cause and effect’ in regard to their crimes” - Salvation Army

“restorative justice processes would contribute towards community understanding of criminal understanding and sanctions” – Red Cross

Also, the way in which sentences are worded and reported have important effects on **community perceptions**. “Members of the general public and those directly involved in the aftermath of a crime do not look at a sentence of ‘ten years with a non-parole period of six years’ as being anything other than ‘He [sic] will be out in six years’.”<sup>11</sup> Community-based sentences can be perceived as a soft option. It is important to enforce – and be seen to enforce – compliance in order to combat this perception. The theme of **compliance** and **enforceability** is also discussed in section 7.

Victoria’s **Neighbourhood Justice Centre** was cited by several submissions as a model which addresses offender needs in a holistic way within a therapeutic jurisprudence framework.

### 3 Programs and services / rehabilitation and reintegration

This outcome area attracted the most comment. Much of this came from the organisations (government and non-government) which carry out this work.

The expansion of **programs and services** to address the criminogenic needs of offenders was broadly supported<sup>12</sup>, with the caveat that such services must be appropriately resourced and not to the detriment of other essential aspects of corrective services, such as providing safe and secure containment of prison inmates.

Types of programs and services that were suggested include:

- Programs addressing drug and alcohol misuse (numerous stakeholders, see below)
- Educational and vocational services (numerous stakeholders, including offenders, see below)
- Programs addressing problem gambling (Anglicare)
- General offending programs (CPSU)
- Life skills and decision making (Bethlehem House, CPSU, offenders)
- Art programs (Access Arts Aotearoa, Comorbidity Project Officer)
- Gardening and other environmental programs (Comorbidity Project Officer)
- The U-Turn program (several submissions from members of the general public)

Additionally, Advocacy Tasmania pointed out the importance of providing programs suitable for offenders with intellectual disabilities or acquired brain injury.

The provision of increased **programs within Community Corrections** was rated as a top priority by several core stakeholders.<sup>13</sup> The Salvation Army suggested that expansion of

---

<sup>11</sup> Submission from a member of the general public.

<sup>12</sup> By TasCOSS, Tasmania Prison Fellowship, and other stakeholders, including inmate submissions.

<sup>13</sup> Anglicare, Salvation Army; also TasCOSS, Hobart Community Legal Service, Comorbidity Project Officer, Parole Board member.

programs in Community Corrections might then allow the Tasmania Prison Services to work more intensively with a reduced population. Community Corrections staff were also strongly supportive of this option.

The idea of **providing programs to involuntary participants** attracted mixed responses. For example, the Hobart Community Legal Service oppose compulsory programs. However, they and various other stakeholders felt that a certain level of coercion or pressure was acceptable. It was recognised that working with reluctant participants could require different approaches and skills from program facilitators, and that appropriate training and materials would have to be provided.

Increasing **seamlessness** of service delivery between the prison and Community Corrections, including the **compatibility** and **modularisation** of programs, was broadly supported. Hobart Community Legal Service suggested that programs commenced in prison could be continued in transitional accommodation or periodic detention.

The offering of **maintenance programs** by Community Corrections, to support and reinforce treatment gains, was also supported (see “transition and reintegration” below).

Future employment prospects were a central concern for prison inmates, and **vocational education** was seen as a key to this. The Salvation Army stated: “Opportunities to build offender vocational capacity become positive investments in community capacity building when effectively applied.”

The Integrated Offender Management Unit submission provides a well-developed vision targeting prisoner employment outcomes. They suggest funding a full-time employment consultant in TPS “to develop pathways into work with existing employers, Job Services Australia vacancies and reverse marketing and community work as this often leads into employment”. With this in place, they envision “a pathway to employment starting with PEaT [the Prisoner Education and Training Unit] doing work readiness and resume, EC [the Employment Consultant] doing reverse marketing, Case Coordination creating S42 [leave] for work experience and [the future] Probation Officer being involved in the transition and stitch[ing] it all together into a sentence plan that also acknowledges the whole person, addressing the other segments of accommodation and transition services or whatever is required.”

Many stakeholders supported the idea that vocational programs should be aimed at industries experiencing skills shortages to enhance employability. The IOM Unit submission suggests: “Create **prison industries** that are relevant to the job market or commercial niche markets as pilots; look at any of the well developed NZ Prison Industries for comparison.”

Non-government organisations also emphasised the importance of linking with employers and following through with both education and employment support after release. The Salvation Army’s existing STAR (Special Training and Reintegration) program aims to achieve this. The Salvation Army recommended “[l]inking with complementary or continuing training post-release”, as a requirement of release where possible. Similarly, Wise Employment cited their Straight For Work (S4W) program already running in NSW, which combines vocational support and mentoring pre- and post-release (see also Section 2).

Given the importance of employment prospects, and thus vocational education, to prisoners, the CPSU submission argued that vocational education and prison employment should be focused on lower security-ratings to give inmates more incentive to behave well in prison. This and other feedback emphasise the importance of **prisoner classification**. The rewards and sanctions associated with classification are an important motivation for inmate behaviour. Stakeholders felt that was crucial that classification be accurate, fair and transparent.

Most comments regarding **prisoner education** focused on practical skills: either vocational education or basic skills such as literacy and numeracy. The Salvation Army pointed out the importance of early assessment: “Issues of literacy / numeracy or vocational training gaps ... should be identified early in an offender’s relationship with the Justice system ... Clients should be able to receive assistance early and effectively ... their needs should be addressed as quickly and compassionately as possible.”

Eligibility for services was a significant concern. The provision of programs and services for **remandees** was supported by stakeholders including the Tasmania Prison Fellowship, the Hobart Community Legal Service and Wise Employment. In Victoria, the WISE “Make It Work” program offers support to people on bail, including interventions and transitional support. The TPS Programs Unit note that they could provide short motivational programs which could be appropriate for remandees.<sup>14</sup> The Tasmania Prison Fellowship also argued for the extension of programs and services to **inmates on short sentences** (e.g. less than 6 months), as these are a large proportion of the (flux) population of the prison.

Several sub-groups of the offender population were identified as requiring more or more tailored programs and services. Chief among these were offenders with **mental health** and **disability** issues. TasCOSS, Anglicare, and Advocacy Tasmania all identified this as a key area. Many submissions emphasised the high level of need for mental health services, including treatment for **substance misuse**, in the corrective services population. The Inter-Agency Working Group on Drugs wrote that “prisoners with substance use issues ... represent the largest ‘special needs’ group in the Tasmanian prison system”<sup>15</sup> and further, “40% of people in Tasmania’s prison system associate their offending with alcohol or illicit drug use.”<sup>16</sup> Anglicare wrote: “...improvements in the treatment of mental health and substance abuse needs would be likely to result in reduced recidivism ... significant resources are required in this area, but this is justified by the level of need.”

Some stakeholders suggested expansion of services to a wider range of clients. The Comorbidity Project Officer noted that mental health services are often restricted only to high-risk or urgent cases, not less “severe” cases such as depression, anxiety, and PTSD. WISE Employment suggested that disability should include non-permanent impairment.

---

<sup>14</sup> “[T]he Programs Unit is able to deliver a choice of three short (ten sessions, 20 hours) non-criminogenic programs. These programs do not directly address criminogenic need but may address motivation to change (any) behaviour or directly address substance use. ... the participants do not talk about the circumstances surrounding the crime they are currently convicted of or charged with. It is the experience of the Programs Unit that many remandees wish to access such programs. Not being able to provide such programs to these inmates sometimes means we do not run the programs [at some facilities] for lack of numbers.”

<sup>15</sup> IAWGD cite “Supply, demand and harm reduction strategies in Australian prisons: Implementation, cost and evaluation” released by the Australian National Council on Drugs (ANCD) in 2006.

<sup>16</sup> IAWGD cite “The establishment of a Drug Court Pilot in Tasmania”, Tasmanian Law Reform Institute, 2006, research paper No.2, Victor Stojcevski.

The issue of **comorbidity**, particularly of mental health and substance misuse issues, was discussed at length by many stakeholders. TasCOSS wrote: "... given that individuals suffering mental disorders have a much greater likelihood of alcohol or drug dependency and that these issues cannot be easily isolated from each other during treatment, both of these services need to be offered to all inmates in an integrated manner, as a priority."

Advocacy Tasmania noted that **Acquired Brain Injury (ABI)** is common among offenders, quoting US research which found a prevalence of 83%, compared to 15% in the general population, and similar research in NSW which also found higher levels of multiple injuries (43% with 4 or more injuries). They also wrote that offenders with **intellectual disabilities (ID)** are more likely to have offending patterns of minor but repeated offences, survival crime, addiction-related crime, anti-social behaviour in public, impulsive behaviour; and less serious offences. Furthermore, it was suggested that offenders in these categories (ID and/or ABI) need more support for carrying prison-learned skills into the community (see transition issues below).

Other issues raised include:

- Tasmania Prison Fellowship cites "the need for inmates to access secondary health care services (e.g. counselling and support groups)" for various reasons.
- The Salvation Army refer to "social phobias" (created by incarceration) affecting the ability to participate in group programs, and affecting employability.

Although it was not mentioned in the Discussion Paper, TasCOSS feel that **migrant and refugee** involvement in the criminal justice system is an emerging issue in Tasmania. "[C]ultural differences between established Tasmanian society and some migrant communities are significant, particularly around gender and family violence issues". They recommend the ensuring or expanding the provision of plain English documentation and interpreters, and suggest "actively engaging migrant communities in an offender's rehabilitation" and providing increased cultural awareness training to staff (see Section 5).

The idea of specifically targeting **young adult offenders** also generated some interest, but there was a suggestion that the existing procedures might adequately assess and target this group, without requiring specific programs or procedures.

Many stakeholders commented on the importance of **early intervention**.<sup>17</sup> Hobart Community Legal Service say "many criminogenic needs could be addressed by better funding and management of existing institutions (for example schools and hospitals)." Tasmania Police cited their existing work through their Early Intervention and Youth Action Units and Police in Schools.

Both Tasmania Police and Youth Justice expressed interest in **Multi-Systemic Therapy**. Tasmania Police commented: "It appears that MST would complement the IAST [Inter-Agency Support Team] Program. Similar to MST, recent informal consideration has been given to developing the IAST model to include whole-of-family case coordination rather than focusing solely on the referred youth." The interest of these primary stakeholders in such an initiative indicates a valuable opportunity.

---

<sup>17</sup> Tasmania Police, Salvation Army, Hobart Community Legal Service, and submissions from inmates and members of the general public.

Several stakeholders, including the IOM Unit, wrote in favour of **strengths-based case management** and the **Good Lives Model (GLM)**. The Comorbidity Project Officer noted that this approach was compatible with restorative justice and therapeutic jurisprudence.

Several stakeholders recommended **holistic approaches** to clients with **complex needs**: (WISE Employment referred to their Make It Work program, and the Salvation Army to the original proposal for X-Cell).

The idea of **integrated assessment and case planning** across corrective services ("**one plan**") – see also Section 4) was broadly supported, by key stakeholders such as Probation Officers, the IOM Unit, Parole Board, the Salvation Army and many others.

The IOM submission suggested: "Each individual should have one plan, an IFP [Individual Forward Plan] devised by a MTT [Multidisciplinary Treatment Team] Practitioner & the offender, that identifies both criminogenic and non-criminogenic needs that have been identified as a result of comprehensive Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) assessment and biopsychosocial assessment or extensive information gathering from other recent assessments. The 'One plan' should be placed on CIS/OIS Joist [internal information system] and viewable by all stakeholders. "

Regarding **custodial case management**, the IOM submission said this requires appropriate training, physical facilities, and cultural change / buy-in from staff: "If an individual does not want to undertake case management or does not believe in principles of motivational interviewing it may be argued they will undermine the process."

Interestingly, there was little comment on the existing Hayes Prison Farm. However, the idea of providing a **low-security prison / reintegration centre in the north or north-west** generated significant positive comment (see "regional service provision" below). The CPSU submission noted that an **open prison** could also be used as a transition centre for inmates approaching release (see below). It cites the following as important features of an **open / low-security prison**:

- Meaningful work, preferably with vocational training outcomes.
- Placement in an open prison should be an incentive for good behaviour.
- As above, appropriate prisoner classification is very important.

**Transition and reintegration** received extensive comment, particularly from the staff and NGOs who are involved in this work. The following were seen as important issues on this topic:

- **Accommodation** was seen by many stakeholders as the most crucial issue for prisoners approaching release. The Salvation Army cited "the large increase in the number of people seeking affordable housing, support and rehabilitation services over the past 18 months", and wrote: "there is an unmet need for emergency

accommodation, transitional and long-term support in Tasmania.” Certain high-needs groups were identified: Advocacy Tasmania wrote “The ID / ABI cohort struggles to cope with transitional arrangements and it is important that the accommodation options allow individuals to settle into a secure environment as quickly as possible”, while Anglicare mentioned the need for accommodation for people exiting drug & alcohol treatment services. Inmates also rated this as a high-priority issue.

- **Program support / continuity** was noted in the Bethlehem House submission: “A real issue is the availability of suitable programs on the outside, which is the real test when the person is subjected to community temptations.” In a similar vein, the Salvation Army noted the value of **continuing education** after release from prison.
- For those prisoners who are released onto parole or another community-based order, a **handover** meeting with Community Corrections staff in advance of release was seen as highly desirable, and fits with the general idea of **seamless service provision**<sup>18</sup> (see “Integrated and accessible service delivery” below). The IOM Unit suggested that Community Corrections “share the same partnerships developed by Integrated Offender Management pre-release into the post-release period of supervision ... using the reintegration website as a central database”.
- The attitude and involvement of the wider community was seen as an important factor. The Salvation Army wrote: “The community should then, actively participate in the reintegration processes of offenders at all levels. Satisfaction of the fundamental offender needs for employment, accommodation and transition is achieved with engagement of employers, landlords and the wider community.” An inmate wrote: “[it is] important that people released from the system are not ... made to feel like pariahs.”
- **Section 42 leave** was seen as valuable for employment and training<sup>19</sup>. However, the CPSU noted that increased leave and / or **staged release** involve increased entries and exits to the prison system and must be appropriately managed (see “periodic detention” above), and that inmates must be appropriately screened for such privileges.

The IOM unit submission provides a detailed vision of a **co-ordinated reintegration service**: “Ideally the following processes would be joined seamlessly:

- Pre-release IOM programmes as part of the journey, leading into ↷
- vocational education and training leading into ↷
- reintegration-phase activities such as S42 and community-based employment or training coupled with Community Corrections being involved pre-release ↷
- and non government organisations partnering pre-release into ↷
- lead case-managed Employment/Accommodation/Transition services ↷
- all combined into a One-Plan concept with multiple players imputing to the same chronological electronic document in CIS which is shared resulting in ↷
- better coordination, linkages, timing and RNR [Risk-Needs-Responsivity] in action hopefully assisting inmates’ re-entry back into the community in a continuum of reintegration using a strengths-based model.”

---

<sup>18</sup> CPSU, TasCOSS, IOM Unit.

<sup>19</sup> IOM Unit, inmate submissions.

Offender **self-determination** was supported in theory<sup>20</sup>. The Salvation Army support self-determination within a case-managed model. Advocacy Tasmania supported “consumer engagement” and suggested the DHHS “Your Care, Your Say” framework as an example of how to do this. Anglicare recommend “consumer and carer participation” in creation of both individual case plans and higher-level policies.

**Prisoner committees** were seen as potentially risky by operational staff (CPSU submission). The Organisational Development Unit note the need for clear policies around such an initiative. The Comorbidity Project Officer wrote: “prisoner committees are only a form of self-determination if they are consulted properly about issues that are important, and act as an opportunity to give feedback on things that affect daily life in prison.” She also noted that **peer support** has worked well in other jurisdictions (England and Wales).

#### 4 Integrated and accessible service delivery

This outcome was strongly supported as a general theme by a wide range of stakeholders, including TasCOSS, the Salvation Army, Advocacy Tasmania, the Red Cross, and the National Council of Women Tasmania, as well as internal and inmate submissions.

The importance of **co-operation between branches of government** was seen as highly desirable, for example by developing the links between branches of corrective services. A particular example was the enhancement of transition procedures between CC and the IOM for prisoners being released onto community-based orders. Relationships with Youth Justice, the Courts, and Police deserve further development.<sup>21</sup> The Mental Health Diversion was put forward as an example of successful co-operation across key stakeholders, even in the absence of permanent funding. Shared / integrated planning was strongly supported (see section 6)<sup>22</sup>.

The idea of a **whole-of-government approach** to corrections was supported by stakeholders including the Salvation Army and Advocacy Tasmania. However, Tasmania Police commented: “If the Plan is to be based on a whole-of-government approach ... relevant agencies will need to be appropriately resourced, as with the *Safe at Home* project.”

The development of **multi-disciplinary treatment teams (MTT)** for offenders with complex needs was supported by many stakeholders.<sup>23</sup> The IOM Unit commented: “The establishment of Multidisciplinary Treatment Teams (MTT), comprised of social workers, psychologists, mental health & Alcohol & Other Drug (A&OD) specialists to work with offenders across and through the correctional system should improve both rehabilitation and reintegration outcomes ... This approach would minimise some of the both systematic and systemic problems currently experienced by current compartmentalisation practices. ...

---

<sup>20</sup> Advocacy Tasmania, Salvation Army, Comorbidity Project Officer, Anglicare.

<sup>21</sup> TasCOSS, Anglicare, National Council of Women Tasmania, Parole Board member.

<sup>22</sup> TasCOSS, Advocacy Tasmania.

<sup>23</sup> E.g. IOM Unit, Comorbidity Project Officer, Hobart Community Legal Service.

risks of service duplication, contra-indicated approaches and or presentations due to lack of information, over-assessment and under-servicing”.

The IOM submission also provided a vision of how MTTs could work:

“A MTT that carried out a range of front end through to offender exit services would need to have capped case loads. The services would include:

- Assessment,
- Brief interventions including Motivational Interviewing (MI),
- Design & or revision of case plan,
- Carry primary/lead worker responsibilities or refer on as appropriate,
- Maintain on over sight of the case, and
- Contributing to or designing the reintegration plans.

... Potentially units could be formed in and outside the Prison complexes and provide service across Correctional agencies.”

It was noted that MTTs will require the development of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). The Hobart Community Legal Service cite the need for clear definition of roles to avoid offenders becoming caught in a “cycle of referral”.

The Comorbidity Project Officer stated that the most important complex needs which could be addressed in this way are mental health and substance misuse, but that other significant areas of need include intellectual disability and sexual abuse.

The importance of **communication with the judiciary** was noted by many stakeholders<sup>24</sup> as a general issue, and particularly in respect to the introduction of new sentencing options. Several stakeholders mentioned CMD as a positive example of how the judiciary and legal practitioners could be consulted and informed about an initiative’s development and implementation.

The judiciary’s perceptions were particularly important. Advocacy Tasmania wrote: “Changes to sentencing practice, then, will require the development of services that inspire the confidence of the courts as legitimate alternatives to existing sentencing practices.” This confidence was seen to involve both the reasons behind the initiatives and the capability of the justice system to deliver the new services, thus including not only consultation and information at the time of introduction, but ongoing feedback processes and evaluation results. Anglicare wrote that the 2008 evaluation of the first year of CMD “recommended that priority be given to maintaining magistrates’ belief in the benefits of the program and to building support amongst defence counsel and police through providing regular feedback on the achievements and directions of the program to the court community.” In a similar vein, the Hobart Community Legal Service suggest providing “circulars to [legal] practitioners” to keep them informed of developments in sentencing and other issues in corrective services.

---

<sup>24</sup> TasCOSS, Advocacy Tasmania, Anglicare, Hobart Community Legal Service, and direct consultation with Magistrates and Probation Officers.

Effective **collaboration with non-government service providers** was recognised as of crucial importance.<sup>25</sup>

The importance of **formal arrangements** such as Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) was mentioned by several stakeholders<sup>26</sup>, including the IOM Unit and Organisational Development Unit who would be responsible for developing such arrangements in the Prison context.

Non-government service providers such as the Red Cross expressed interest in being involved in **case conferencing** along the lines of the MTTs discussed above. The Salvation Army discussed “practice partnerships”: “... once they have matured, practice partnerships can provide significant individual and systemic outcomes ... This has been the experience of the Salvation Army’s Xcell, STAR and TSMP programs that have been working successfully with the Tasmanian Prison Service for several years to achieve good support outcomes for ex-prisoners who are at risk of compounding their level of disadvantage on release”.

Not surprisingly, questions were raised as to **who decides what programs and services to provide**. Anglicare pointed out that NGOs would like to have a say: “presently the Department determines what is ‘rehabilitative’“. On the other hand, the IOM Unit wrote: “Based on our current philosophy and taking the Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) approach (to addressing criminogenic need) the ‘best practice’ and perhaps ‘only effective’ response is Evidence Based Practice (EBP). NGOs providing services to the Justice department will need to develop or redefine their working partnerships with the Justice department to increase their understanding of RNR to ensure that those clients with the greatest need are targeted. It is suggested that NGOs that don’t operate from a recognised EBP platform should have their activities and services limited and / or directed to provide a welfare type and or complementary treatment service that is tailored to individual risk & or need.” Given that the Department of Justice is ultimately responsible, the final decision must remain with the Department.

Non-government organisations commented on the difficulties associated with short-term **funding models**, and the potentially negative effects of competition for funding on co-operation. The Red Cross noted the difficulties getting funding for unusual / cross-disciplinary projects, such as their “Keeping It Together” program. They also mentioned the need to know each others’ work to avoid program duplication and to facilitate effective referrals. The Salvation Army added “the regulatory burden on non-government agencies needs to be streamlined”.

**Information sharing** was strongly supported<sup>27</sup>, contingent on the consent of the offender. The IOM Unit wrote: “Information should be shared on ‘a need to know basis’ and of being in ‘best interest in the client’, when these two principles can be argued and consent obtained then information may and should be shared.”

---

<sup>25</sup> Organisational Development Unit, Integrated Offender Management Unit, Bethlehem House, Advocacy Tasmania, Salvation Army.

<sup>26</sup> Organisational Development Unit, Comorbidity Project Officer, Advocacy Tasmania, Salvation Army.

<sup>27</sup> E.g. Red Cross, Advocacy Tasmania, IOM Unit.

The proposal of having a single plan for an offender (“**one plan**”) and the provision of “client-centred services” was widely supported. The IOM Unit submission discusses this extensively (see also “integrated assessment and case planning” in section 3). The Salvation Army suggested that the system “wrap services around an individual”, while the Hobart Community Legal Service supported a “single, coordinated system” and a “centralised gateway service”. They suggested that the system “should be akin to the case management process used by the Family Court.”

The IOM mentioned the **information technology** aspects of the “One Plan” concept: “Within Justice CIS/OIS provides a useful and under-utilised platform for the sharing of information. ... Benefits would be seen and efficiencies had by simply displaying what assessments have been done, when and by whom. ... This assessment information could be displayed & include but should not be limited to PSR, LSCMI, Static & stable, Parole reports, and Case plan.”

Other issues discussed include the following:

Providing **training to mainstream service providers** regarding working with offenders was supported. The Red Cross suggested: “This training could be delivered by non-government organisations, perhaps with the involvement of trained volunteer or paid ex-offenders.”

Maintaining connection through **forums** or workshops was supported (Red Cross). A number of forums have been held in the last year, on topics such as women’s issues, reintegration and comorbidity.

The provision of a corrections **newsletter** was suggested (Comorbidity Project Officer). Note that staff newsletters for TPS, CC and the Department of Justice as a whole already exist.

It was suggested that the **relationship with UTAS** be further developed for the sake of research and evaluation, particularly with the Criminology Research Unit, Applied Social Analysis Initiative & student researchers (Comorbidity Project Officer).

## **5 Workforce development and support**

This is a highly contested area with significant current issues. For example, many Community Corrections staff have strongly resisted the changing of their positions from the “Professional” to the “Administrative and Clerical” stream. Industrial issues within the TPS also confound this issue. These pressing issues make it difficult to gather feedback on longer-term workforce issues.

Most comments on this topic came from internal stakeholders, but a few external submissions explored the issues.

Regarding **recruitment**, Tasmania Police commented that their creation of a dedicated recruitment unit has had a positive effect on both the number and quality of applicants. Advocacy Tasmania agreed with the suggestion that workforce capacity should be seen as a sector-wide issue.

Various initiatives were suggested or discussed **roles** and **working conditions**. Several suggestions addressed the flexibility and variety within roles, with potential to benefit staff and increase organisational resilience. The TPS Organisational Development Unit suggested:

- A “one-industry” award for corrections (CC & TPS, operational and admin);
- Part-time and flexible working hours;
- Civilianising non-core functions such as gatehouse, control room, and transport;
- Rotation of COs between facilities; and
- Inter-agency (and interstate etc) secondments, dependent on skills & training.

The development of a “community of practice” between CC and IOM was supported by several stakeholders.<sup>28</sup> The IOM Unit submission also discussed the tension between therapeutic and coercive aspects of roles, and suggest that staff could be “streamlined into a preferred role where possible”.

**Mandatory qualifications** for entry-level staff was not supported by the TPS Organisational Development Unit. They cited the situation of Correctional Officers, who currently need to be working in the industry to take the appropriate qualification. Many Probation Officers supported their role being under the professional award, which requires a tertiary qualification, despite the fact that this excludes some otherwise suitable candidates. While no other stakeholders supported mandatory qualifications per se, both the IOM Unit and Advocacy Tasmania commented on the value of a tertiary education in developing “critical and reflective thinking”. However it could be argued that these qualities could be listed in selection criteria, giving the opportunity for people who do not have degrees to demonstrate these qualities. Advocacy Tasmania argued that qualifications should be listed as *desirable* rather than *required*.

**Training and development** for staff were strongly supported. Particular training topics recommended included: motivational interviewing; concepts from intelligent policing and community crime prevention; mental health first aid; conflict resolution; strengths-based rehabilitation; how to recognise and deal with ID / ABI; and cultural awareness training on migrant and refugee issues.<sup>29</sup> The IOM Unit pointed out the need for training to support the transition to custodial case management.

The value of training in the implementation of new initiatives and in cultural change was emphasised by several stakeholders<sup>30</sup>.

**Shared training** between various parts of the corrections system was also strongly supported.<sup>31</sup> The IOM Unit wrote: “A training calendar relating to a range of EBP [evidence-based practice], introductions to RNR & GLM, Case Conferencing & working with offenders should be regularly rolled out across the state to justice staff and NGOs and government organisations that offer services to the Justice Department.”

**Supervision and mentoring** arrangements for staff were also supported by the CPSU and other stakeholders.

---

<sup>28</sup> CPSU, Comorbidity Project Officer, Organisation Development (with caveats).

<sup>29</sup> Anglicare, Advocacy Tasmania, Red Cross, Comorbidity Project Officer, TasCOSS.

<sup>30</sup> E.g. Advocacy Tasmania.

<sup>31</sup> By Organisational Development Unit, IOM Unit, Comorbidity Project Officer, Probation Officers, & others.

## 6 Integrity and governance

This topic attracted less attention than the more operational issues in sections 1-4. However there was still a significant level of interest.

Regarding **oversight mechanisms**, a few stakeholders felt that more oversight was desirable<sup>32</sup>, but the absence of response to this question in many otherwise lengthy or detailed submissions (Salvation Army, Anglicare, TasCOSS and others) would seem to indicate a fair level of satisfaction with the status quo. Advocacy Tasmania wrote: “there is significant scope for synergies across these various mechanisms” [Ombudsman, Prison Visitors, Mental Health Official Visitors, the Commissioner for Children]. The Hobart Community Legal Service mentioned civil liberties, and wrote that “the Office of the Ombudsman ... [should] be redefined in order to act as an oversight mechanism.” They also proposed that “legal aid could be given additional funding or use existing funding to run Supreme Court appeals in appropriate cases.”

The idea of a **prison inspectorate** generated some curiosity as to details. One submission supported the WA model of independent prison inspectorate.

It was noted that the **healthy prisons model** would impact on TPS policy and compliance units. The Comorbidity Project Officer suggested that the indicator-based model could be supplemented with qualitative data or case studies.

As discussed above (Section 5 “training”, Section 3 “custodial case management”), **change management** was seen as an important area.<sup>33</sup> Particularly, stakeholders argued that:

- Staff **consultation** should be carried out as a matter of course (CPSU); and
- New initiatives should be accompanied by appropriate **training and support** for staff (CPSU, Red Cross).

Anglicare noted this as one of their highest-priority items, writing: “It will also be important to extend cultural change initiatives right across the criminal justice system, including to Tasmania Police, the courts and legal fraternity.” Tasmania Police noted that they have a dedicated change management officer.

**Data collection, research and evaluation** attracted quite a high level of interest, largely associated with the need to assess the effectiveness of corrective services. Comments and suggestions included:

- “There should be a **research base** to specific standards sets ... that demonstrates the cost/benefit impact on client outcomes in the short, medium and long term” (Salvation Army)
- “**Information sharing** for research purposes should also be considered. There are many examples where Justice could and arguably should be collecting, collating and analysing information for research purposes.” (IOM Unit)
- Tasmania Prison Fellowship suggested that NGOs could carry out valuable **data collection**. Another stakeholder suggested that where data was collected from

---

<sup>32</sup> Comorbidity Project Officer, Advocacy Tasmania, Hobart Community Legal Service.

<sup>33</sup> E.g. CPSU, Red Cross, TasCOSS, IOM Unit, Anglicare.

stakeholders, they should be provided with feedback regarding what the data was used for, and on any outcomes.

- **Evaluation** was seen as very important. Tasmania Prison Fellowship expressed interest in “the effectiveness of ... programs in terms of measurable outcomes”. The Comorbidity Project Officer suggested the use of mixed method data and formative evaluation, and in strengthening the relationship with UTAS.
- Advocacy Tasmania supported demonstrating the link between initiatives and the evidence base, working to anticipate demand, and keeping abreast of developments in other jurisdictions.

Regarding specific figures / measures:

- The measurement of **recidivism** was noted as particularly important, despite its problematic nature (Tasmania Prison Fellowship, Advocacy Tasmania).
- The importance of longitudinal studies for program effectiveness was noted.
- Tasmania Prison Fellowship wrote “The project team may find the ratio of referral [to programs] to actual program delivery useful.”

**Strategic planning** itself was raised by several stakeholders. TasCOSS cited the need for “detailed input from ... related sectors in the criminal justice system”. They also wrote: “We would argue for integrated planning between not only the different arms of the criminal justice system, but also appropriate areas in health, education and community services ... [to allow] understanding of the implications of policy decisions in one sector on the resourcing needs of another”. Tasmania Police wrote: “It is recommended that the Plan allow for consideration of external policy through greater alignment of the relevant departmental strategic plans”.

Regarding the strategic plan itself, the Salvation Army suggested a number of possible goals / KPIs. They recommended examining social inclusion indicators developed by the UK and EU, and also the Australian Social Inclusion Board’s **Social Inclusion Principles** (2008). Many of these align well with the Breaking the Cycle feedback, for example:

- Building partnerships with key stakeholders
- Developing tailored services
- Giving high priority to early intervention and prevention
- Building ‘joined-up’ services and whole-of-government solutions
- Using evidence and integrated data to inform policy
- Using locational (sic) approaches
- Planning for sustainability

The Salvation Army also suggested that “Service users should be involved in the consultations and ongoing evaluation about service standards”. Advocacy Tasmania discussed the value of continuous quality improvement mechanisms, and recommended the use of “independent, external monitoring and accreditation.”

## 7 Emerging themes

A number of issues which were not separated out in the Discussion Paper itself are considered worthy of special attention here:

**Regional service provision** was raised by many stakeholders.<sup>34</sup>

The **availability of programs and services to regional offenders** on community-based orders was mentioned as an issue by many stakeholders. TasCOSS wrote: “many of the services discussed in the paper are yet to be offered to the majority of offenders. Transition services for offenders re-entering the community, for example, are only offered to high risk offenders from the South.” Anglicare note that the CMD evaluation found that Magistrates in the NW used the program less “not because of a lack of belief in the program, but because of a lack of funded support services in the local area”. The National Council of Women Tasmania commented on the value of **locally-based initiatives** such as Chance on Main.

The idea of providing a **low-security prison / reintegration centre in the north or north-west** generated significant positive comment. The Red Cross wrote: “establishing a second facility in the North or North-West [could] facilitate strengthening of family relationships for inmates from those areas of the state in preparation for their release.” An inmate submission was enthusiastic about “boarding house style” accommodation for inmates on work release. The IOM Unit suggested reintegration centres around the state, “modelled on a share house concept using master tenancy and Housing Department stock. However the proposed SITS and SHDL model under consideration will probably supersede this idea.” On the other hand, the National Council of Women Tasmania preferred the idea of providing a farm facility similar to Hayes in the North or North-West of the state.

The idea of providing **remand facilities or holding cells in the north-west** was also supported by staff and service organisations from that area.

Advocacy Tasmania stressed the importance of **linkages between prisoners and their families and friends**. They support the use of emerging technologies (e.g. video-conferencing, Skype). The Red Cross provides a number of services which support regional offenders, such as the Red Cross Books and Chats on CD program. Another Red Cross initiative is to provide transport to enable family members to visit children at Ashley Detention Centre. Inmates, both in consultations and in written submissions, spoke about the importance of contact with their families while they were incarcerated.

Issues of **compliance and enforcement** were raised in a variety of contexts.<sup>35</sup> These issues are of great importance to members of the public. They also tie into both community safety and the importance of rewards and sanctions to encourage rehabilitation.

Public objections to community-based sentences often focus on the **risk of re-offending while on a community-based sentence**. One member of the public cited examples of parolees committing further crimes, and wrote: “if [the Parole system] is to work, it MUST work EVERY time.” The Tasmania Police submission also specifically raised this issue,

---

<sup>34</sup> TasCOSS, Red Cross, Probation Officers, Salvation Army, Anglicare, Advocacy Tasmania, National Council of Women Tasmania, and others.

<sup>35</sup> Including by Tasmania Police, CPSU, the Parole Board secretary, Probation Officers, and members of the general public.

writing: “Although alternatives to imprisonment may reduce recidivism in the long term, it is plausible that if offenders who would under the current system be imprisoned are given alternative sentences, then an inherent risk may be an initial increase in crime rates.”

Furthermore, in consultation Probation Officers often raised the difficulties involved in imposing **sanctions for breaches of orders**, such as failure to attend planned community service work or drug and alcohol counselling. They often commented that Parole and CMD orders were easier to enforce than community service orders. Compliance is easier to enforce when the onus is on the offender to prove that they have been complying, rather than on the supervising Officer to prove that they have not. For this reason, Probation Officers strongly supported the development of further “bail alternative” sentencing options, i.e. where an offender has pled guilty and is given the opportunity to address issues in the community prior to final sentencing. The secretary of the Parole Board also mentioned the need for clear enforcement procedures. It is therefore strongly recommended that the ease of administration of sanctions be considered for any new sentencing options, and also that improvements to the enforceability of existing sentencing options be considered where possible.

It is worth noting that the Western Australian Department of Corrective Services’ Strategic Plan 2008-2011<sup>36</sup> specifically names **sentence integrity** as an issue (“K1.4: Uphold the integrity of sentences and orders through enhanced business processes”).

The issue of **cultural change** was raised in a variety of contexts, both within corrective services and in the wider community. It impacts on a wide range of issues: community engagement and communications strategies, and workforce development, but also on small-scale issues such as the way sentences are presented to the offender, the victim, and the community at large.

It is in this area that the ideological tension between different models of corrections (e.g. punitive vs. rehabilitative) is realised. For example, the idea of parole as “reward” or incentive was specifically resisted in the submission of one member of the public.<sup>37</sup> However, those who work with inmates recommend that rewards and incentives to be deliberately structured into prison life.<sup>38</sup> This is reinforced by inmates themselves, who are clearly motivated by the possibility of parole to participate in programs and educational activities.

The importance of cultural change as an aspect of change management within the corrections system was also emphasised by several stakeholders.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au/files/about-us/our-responsibilities/strategic-plan-2008-2011.pdf>

<sup>37</sup> “One of the prime reasons [the offender] is in gaol in the first place is to learn to behave himself, and if he doesn’t, then extra time should be ADDED to his sentence. ... [The offender’s] rehabilitation into society on probation or parole should be AFTER the criminal has served out his full sentence.”

<sup>38</sup> CPSU submission, referring, for example, to the range of employment and education options.

<sup>39</sup> IOM Unit, ex-manager of IOM Unit, Anglicare, inmate submission.

## 8 Priorities

Few submissions specifically identified their highest priorities. However, among submissions that did not specifically identify priorities, in some cases priorities could be inferred. Submissions from particular sections of the Department (e.g. IOM, Organisational Development, Programs Unit), staff (Probation Officers) and organisations which specialise in a particular type of service (Access Arts Aotearoa, Bethlehem House, etc) tended naturally to focus on their particular area of expertise. The priorities inferred from some particularly relevant submissions are listed below:

- Anglicare wrote: “In summary, our concerns are that diversionary programs for people with drug and alcohol issues, gambling problems or mental illnesses are made available; that these programs be backed by appropriate resources, including within the wider service system, so that people can receive all the support they need; and that resources are also directed into promoting and sustaining cultural change within the criminal justice system to ensure that programs are valued and supported. “
- TasCOSS priorities were integrated planning and resourcing, cultural change within the corrections system, the provision of programs and services by Community Corrections, increased regional services, mental health support, and migrant issues. They wrote: “good case management combined with adequate health care, education and transitional services, are crucial for offender rehabilitation. We are of the opinion that the priority for the Corrections Plan should be to extend these services to all offenders as soon as possible, including those in community corrections.”
- Issues of primary concern for prison inmates were education, particularly the availability of vocational courses for their future employment prospects; rehabilitation programs, as these were seen to be important for parole; contact with family; post-release accommodation; and the adverse effects of media attention and the stigma of having a criminal record.
- The submission from the ex-manager of the IOM Unit emphasised the crucial importance of cultural change and staff buy-in to the implementation of new approaches in corrections, and recommended the development of “an organisational orientation that sees the purpose of the prison sentence as a project to reduce risk and maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration.”
- Submissions from the general public tended to focus either on rehabilitation and restorative justice (particularly “paying back to the community” and victim-offender mediation), or on compliance, punishment, deterrence and the need for community safety and certainty.
- The Bethlehem House submission focuses on literacy, programs in the community (including handover / maintenance issues) and living skills, along with relationships between agencies.
- The Inter-Agency Working Group on Drugs naturally focussed on drug and alcohol issues, but also on the extensive overlap with mental health issues and comorbidities. The mental health / drug and alcohol nexus was also emphasised by the Comorbidity Project Officer and a number of service providers.
- The Parole Board member specifically mentioned the following priorities: cognitive behavioural therapy and other psychological services in the prison, programs for low-risk

sex offenders in prison and in the community, and sentencing options to keep non-violent offenders out of prison.

- The Parole Board secretary emphasised enforcement of orders; community communication and education; provision of programs, vocational education / work skills, life skills, and drug and alcohol treatment; and transitional accommodation.
- The Advocacy Tasmania submission was very process-oriented and focused on strategic planning, ongoing stakeholder engagement, quality improvement processes, etc. As to programs and services, they focused on services for offenders with intellectual disabilities and acquired brain injuries.
- The Hobart Community Legal Service focused on the protection of rights, but as to programs and services, identified the following priorities: increased programs and services in Community Corrections; provision of programs and services to remandees; and the flexibility and compatibility of prison programs.

## Submissions in response to Discussion Paper

Submission #	Author / Agency
1	Bethlehem House
2	TPS inmate
3	Ex-TPS inmate
4	Member of the public
5	Member of the public
6	Organisational Development Unit, TPS
7	Member of the public
8	Arts Access Aotearoa
9	Member of the public
10	Member of the public
11	Comorbidity Project Officer
12	TPS inmate
13	Wise Employment
14	Tasmanian Red Cross
15	National Council of Women Tasmania
16	TasCOSS
17	Member of the public
18	Programs Unit, TPS
19	Tasmania Prison Fellowship
20	Salvation Army
21	Integrated Offender Management Unit, TPS
22	Anglicare
23	TPS inmate
24	Ex-IOM manager
25	TPS inmate/s
26	Advocacy Tasmania
27	Hobart Community Legal Service
28	Inter-Agency Working Group on Drugs
29	Parole Board member
30	Tasmania Police
31	Community and Public Sector Union (CPSU)

### Further information

#### Breaking the Cycle Project Team

Phone: 6233 7074

#### Postal address:

Breaking the Cycle Project  
Department of Justice  
GPO Box 825  
HOBART TAS 7001

#### Email:

[breakingthecycle@justice.tas.gov.au](mailto:breakingthecycle@justice.tas.gov.au)