

## CHAPTER 6: COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

### INTRODUCTION

Primarily, the role of community corrections is to administer community based sentences imposed by the courts. This includes probation, prison-probation, community service, fine option orders, and the post-prison programs of home detention, parole, release to work and other forms of leave of absence. This role encompasses the supervision and management of adult offenders in the community and accounts for 87 per cent of all offenders for which QCSC is responsible. Apart from parole, the post-release options referred to above are responsibilities assumed by community corrections since the establishment of the Commission. Community Corrections also provides advice to the courts and pre-release assessment of offenders in prison. Other responsibilities of community corrections include responsibility for the secretariats of regional community corrections boards and administration of all community corrections centres and residential institutions for offenders within the community.

The daily work of community corrections officers includes field work, interviewing offenders, administration and report writing, supervising community service workers and preparing assessment reports for courts and community corrections boards concerning breaches of community supervision orders. A further component of the work of community corrections officers is referral and program development to meet offender needs.

Different levels of supervision may be applied by community corrections officers. At its most intensive level of supervision, direct intervention, offenders may be required to attend meetings with the community corrections officer weekly, or twice weekly. However, less intensive supervision, or surveillance, requiring less frequent interviews or attendance to a group counselling session, may be applied depending on the assessed level of risk to the community.

Throughout Australia, and in a number of other countries, the community corrections area is at a watershed in its development. The effectiveness of the traditional mode of service delivery, supervision based on one-to-one counselling with both a legal and a social work client-focussed orientation, is increasingly questioned. The QCSC has started the process of transition of community corrections though many community corrections officers are disturbed by this re-orientation of the field. They are concerned that the direction represents

a compromise with the professional standards of their work. The reforms represent significant and difficult changes in both the culture and work practices of community corrections. The change requires that the direction and process of reform is clearly enunciated and strategically planned by management.

In November 1993, in what may be considered a first stage of this process, the QCSC produced the results of a comprehensive internal review (QCSC Community Corrections Review) into the workload management of community corrections.

The major issues identified in this PSMC review in respect of community corrections are:-

- . Community Corrections organisational structure
- . Resources
- . Workload management

## **COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE**

Currently, community corrections operates through five regions, five regional community corrections board's secretariats, 31 area offices, two Commission community correction centres and ten community contracted centres or accommodation sites for offenders.

An organisational restructure in October 1991 provided for regional managers to report directly to the Director-General. Regional managers were advised and supported by the new position of Director, Operations Support (Community Corrections) which replaced the position of Director of Community Corrections contemplated by Kennedy and defined in the corrective services legislation. In July, 1992, the Director, Operations Support (Community Corrections) position was abolished. Representation at the QCSC Executive has since been maintained by regional managers attending executive meetings on a rotational basis.

## **ISSUES**

- . Executive representation
- . Adequacy of regional/Area Structure

## Executive representation

The lack of executive representation for community corrections is of critical concern, both to officers within QCSC and external stakeholders.

Almost all community corrections staff, some Commission staff from other areas and external stakeholders argued the need for a Director of Community Corrections with operational knowledge and line authority. External stakeholders have no clear line of communication to the QCSC on community corrections issues. For example, regular and useful meetings formerly assured between the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate and the former Director. Further, in having to consult with five regional managers, instead of one person, difficulties arise as, frequently, different opinions and responses are obtained.

The absence of a position at central office with responsibility for the professional management of community corrections has not assisted the process of role clarification in the field. Providing professional leadership, and developing and communicating a more clearly delineated role for community corrections will be core responsibilities of a Director (Community Corrections). The creation of this position was addressed in Chapter 4 above.

## FINDINGS

- . Community corrections supervises 87 percent of offenders and is a major focus of Commission activity.
- . There is strong argument for re-establishment of Director of Community Corrections, particularly among community corrections staff.
- . Significant stakeholders, such as members of the Judiciary, also point to the need for a Director of Community Corrections.

## Adequacy of regional/area structure

The provision of community corrections services throughout the State is organised into five geographical regions in which several area offices, large and small, are located. During the current review, a number of staff suggested that some regional office functions, such as human resources management (pay and leave) could be centralised to save positions. Others suggested that instead of regional managers, there could be two or three senior management

positions either in central office or in the field reporting to the Director. However, there was not a consistent view among staff as a number saw significant value in retaining regional managers and support staff. Additionally, some saw merit in amalgamating smaller area offices whilst others were adamant that larger ones should become smaller in order to work better with the relevant local communities.

It has also been indicated by the QCSC review of community corrections that the geographical boundaries of the five regions do not equate with statistical districts or align with other statistical collection units which would allow comparison with government or other agencies. It has often been the practice to move boundaries to accommodate caseloads rather than transfer resources to account for caseloads. The community corrections review recommended projects be undertaken to examine the need for the current number and location of area offices and to rationalise regional and area office boundaries. These recommendations are supported.

## FINDINGS

- . The number and size of regional and area offices require investigation
- . Regional and area geographical boundaries may need to be redefined. Regional boundaries are not aligned with statistical districts so as to enable comparison with government or other agencies.

## RESOURCING FOR COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

In 1988, Kennedy acknowledged that the Probation and Parole Service had been 'operating under difficulties' in terms of resources. Throughout this Review widespread concern has been registered that the level of resourcing to community corrections in terms of funding, staffing and other resources is inadequate.

## ISSUES

- . Funding levels
- . Staffing levels
- . Other resources

## FUNDING LEVELS

QCSC funding of community corrections has often been assessed by comparing the level of funding to the former Probation and Parole Service. The total expenditure for the Probation and Parole Service in the 1987/88 financial year was \$4.838m. If compared to the total expenditure for community corrections in 1992-93 of \$16.3m, there has been an apparent major injection of support of 237 per cent. However, such a comparison does not take into account the many extra services provided by community corrections in addition to those inherited from the Probation and Parole Service.

If the expenses not previously the responsibility of the probation and parole service are deducted from the total community corrections expenditure, and setting aside salary expenses, it appears that discretionary expenditure has increased by approximately \$200,000. (See Table 17). Anecdotal evidence suggests that funding constraints exist particularly in relation to programs, staff training, and standards of supervision. The provision of programs by community corrections offices appears to depend largely on the generosity of community agencies providing programs and courses at reduced or no cost.

**Table 17: Community Corrections Comparative Operating Costs 1988 and 1993**

	1987-88	1992-93
Total expenditure	\$4 800 000	16 300 000
Salaries	\$3 400 000	\$11 700 000
Balance for operations	\$1 400 000	\$4 600 000
Overhead costs for new activities*	nil	\$3 000 000
Balance (discretionary expenditure)	\$1 400 000	\$1 600 000

\* Non-salary costs not incurred in 1987-88 including: accommodation rental; contracts; community corrections centres; and community corrections boards.

The increased expenditure on salaries cannot, however, be overlooked. The nature of community corrections work is largely labour intensive and increases in staffing levels have occurred (see next section). Salaries have also increased considerably since 1988 mainly as a result of award changes settled through the Industrial Commission. Salary levels now probably more truly reflect work value. The extent to which budgets over salaries have kept

pace with increased staffing levels and workloads needs to be closely examined by the Commission.

## FINDINGS

- Expenditure on parole and probation was \$4.8m in 1988. In 1992-1993, expenditure on community corrections amounted to \$16.3m. Community corrections is responsible for an increased range of services.
- Funding increases for community corrections over the life of the Commission have provided limited additional discretionary budgets for field officers.

## STAFFING LEVELS

Statistics included in the National Corrections Management Information 1991-92 show that, as at 30 June, 1992, Queensland community corrections staff supervised the highest number of offenders per staff member, namely one staff member per 76 offenders, in Australia. These statistics include community custody staff and offender numbers.

A comparison of pre and post QCSC staffing levels is even more difficult than funding given the expanded tasks that officers are now required to perform. Nevertheless, in Table 18 an attempt is made to compare numbers of field staff, as well as the numbers of offenders. In order to compare field staff, excluded from these figures are community corrections positions which perform duties not previously performed by the Probation and Parole Service; staff belonging to community corrections boards; and numbers of management (other than Probation and Parole Service area supervisors and QCSC area managers) and administrative staff have been excluded from both community corrections and Probation and Parole Service figures.

**Table 18: Comparison of Field Staff numbers pre and post QCSC**

	1987-88 (Probation and Parole)	1992-93 (QCSC)	Percentage Increase
No. of field staff	101	189*	87 per cent
No. of offenders administered	8 594	16 077**	87 per cent

\* At 30 June, 1993, the staff establishment of community corrections consisted of 86 senior management or administrative support positions and 197 field positions. For the purposes of comparing pre-QCSC staffing numbers, field positions associated with community corrections centres (not previously performed by the Probation and Parole Service) have been excluded.

\*\* Community custody statistics in respect of the number of offenders supervised as at 30 June, 1993 have been excluded, in order that a direct comparison can be made.

Increases in numbers of field staff and offenders seem to have kept pace if viewed in isolation (see Table 18). However, the accompanying increase in the number of orders made, shown in Table 19, also has had impact on the workload of community corrections staff. The QCSC review notes that "workload should not be measured purely on the basis of caseload numbers but rather by a more sophisticated analysis of caseload based on the relative difficulty of cases involved." Staff and management are clearly at loggerheads on workload assessment. This issue will require the early attention of the Director (Community Corrections).

The QCSC Review identifies two broad streams of staff within community corrections: community corrections officers with tertiary qualifications who are involved in the caseloads requiring personal intervention; and community corrections supervisors below the tertiary level who are primarily concerned with surveillance and supervision caseloads. Understanding this type of distinction is essential if an analysis of increases in orders is to be meaningful. It also provides a useful framework for assessing work practice refinements.

**Table 19: Growth in orders Supervised Staff Category**

	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	% Increase Orders 1988-93	% Increase in Staff 1988-93
Orders Supervised by CCOs*	4 212	4 774	6 035	7 203	8 546	8 258	96	76
Orders Supervised by CCSs**	5 012	5 782	7 910	10 337	13 801	17 043	240	200
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9 224</b>	<b>10 556</b>	<b>13 945</b>	<b>17 540</b>	<b>22 347</b>	<b>25 301</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>87</b>

\* Probation; Prison/Probation; Parole; Good Behaviour Bond; I/S Commonwealth Parole; I/S Commonwealth Probation; Home Detention; Release to Work; Other.

\*\* Community Service Order; Fine Option Order.

## FINDINGS

- Simple comparisons between increases in field staff numbers and increases in orders made are misleading.
- There needs to be recognition that a number of alternative measures such as offender numbers and types of order categories as well as staff classifications can be employed to help determine appropriate staffing strategies.

## OTHER RESOURCES

Appreciation was expressed by staff for the increase in technical equipment (such as word processors, fax machines, mobile phones) supplied to community corrections when the Division was part of QCSC's formation.

One particular area of concern which remains, however, is the extent of computerisation. Originally it was intended that the Correctional Information System (CIS) be extended to all regional and area offices throughout the State. However, due to economic factors, only regional offices and approximately 16 out of the 31 area offices will be able to utilise the system by the end of December, 1993. Unattached area offices must forward written data

to regional offices for inputting. This is time-consuming for staff and results in data processing delays. While installation to all community corrections offices is apparently planned, it is estimated that in excess of \$1m will be required for this purpose.

Increased computerisation of community corrections, including access to CIS, would allow greater flexibility of work practices, reduce the amount of time spent by all staff on administrative tasks (which currently accounts for 15 per cent of correctional officer time), and improve the efficiency of community corrections operations.

## FINDINGS

- . Approximately 50 per cent of community corrections area offices are not connected to CIS
- . Lack of access to computerised databases has a negative impact on efficient work practices.

## WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT IN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

The PSMC Review was assisted by an internal review of community corrections which was conducted by the Consulting Services group at central office. The QCSC community corrections review, a draft of which was produced for comment in November 1993, has been thoroughly designed, researched and documented. The research conducted included an examination of interstate and overseas trends, previous reviews, legislation, the policy and procedures manual and annual reports. Staff and external stakeholders, including the judiciary, police, offenders and community agencies were interviewed and a small sample of community corrections work sites were visited to examine systems.

Various issues in respect of both the QCSC review and the current Review undertaken have emerged from that examination. These include workload analysis, workload trends, the linking of workload to resources, case management and flexible supervision work practices, effectiveness measures, and possible future trends.

### Workload analysis

Research was conducted into the various methods other corrections agencies use to examine workload. Total caseload numbers were examined initially, then a means of categorising

cases by applying an objectively determined risk assessment was investigated. Additionally, statistics from a daily activity log completed by community corrections personnel over a four week period were studied. It was found by the QCSC review team that the major workload impact was in the areas of community service, fine option orders, transfers to community corrections centres and release to work areas. As well, the breach workload was found to be a concern in terms of time spent and it was proposed that simplification of the breach procedure be investigated.

The variability of caseloads in each office was also examined by obtaining averages based on data collected. Those offices outside one standard deviation from the average were categorised as either under or overworked (or alternatively over or understaffed). The statistical method used has been examined and was considered quite sound in most areas. It was noted however that comparisons between offices were not standardised for sampling error. The PSMC Review subsequently standardised ratios to an office size of four and found some variation in results. In addition, it is considered that interpretation needs to be a little more conservative in the absence of qualitative assessment. A cut-off of two standard deviations would be more acceptable to highlight extreme cases. On this basis, fewer offices are realistically suggested as under or overworked. It should be pointed out that the community corrections review did raise the point that caution should be exercised in interpreting the results as the data obtained was over only a one month period.

There is a natural assumption in this type of study that the state average is a 'normal' workload, yet Queensland has the highest ratio of offenders to field staff in Australia based on total caseload numbers. Accepting that the workload could be high, it is possible that 'under-worked' may mean 'working to capacity' and overworked may mean 'severely overworked'.

The QCSC review also noted that 42 per cent of the work time of a community corrections officer and 54 per cent of that of a community corrections supervisor is taken up by case work interviewing. Only 3 per cent or less of the working time of such officers is directed towards program development, delivery and evaluation despite the emphasis placed on this activity by the QCSC. While the community corrections review is unclear on this point, it has been reported also that much community corrections supervisor time is directed towards coordinating community service order placements. Currently, many community service orders are worked at sites which enable the placement of individuals only. A re-focussing of the program to large scale projects can reduce the amount of work involved in running this program.

The QCSC review makes mention of Intensive Correction Orders, not all predictive data was taken into account when considering resourcing requirements. Expected increases in fine option orders as a result of administrative problems with the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 were not considered. Officers reported a backlog of warrants for outstanding fines which are only now being actioned by court registries. One office reported the backlog in one court to be 3,500 and at least 25 per cent of these is expected to result in fine option orders being made. It was clarified on many occasions to the PSMC Review team that the paperwork on an order for ten hours work is equivalent to that for an order for 200 hours.

Other variables which should be factored into workload assessments are distance travelled, the average time and offender is resident in a particular geographical area, prosecutions conducted, and varying lengths of orders and work performed within custodial centres. Revised reporting requirements for officers over the past five years should also be analysed. These would be better considered in accordance with expected standards rather than based on operations performed within the four week review period.

## FINDINGS

- . The QCSC review of Community Corrections was generally well researched and thorough in approach. Careful interpretation of results of that review will be required.
- . On the basis of the workload study, insufficient time is being allotted to program development and evaluation initiatives.

### Workload trends

Workload has significantly increased particularly in the area of Community Service/Fine Option (CSO & FOO) cases. Table 19 shows the number of admissions to new orders over the years 1988 to 1993. The figures indicate an overall increase of 240 per cent in these combined areas, the greatest increase being in fine option order admissions (365 per cent), with marked increases in the latter years. On current trends these figures are likely to continue to escalate. According to the community corrections review, community corrections Supervisors, whose main duties involve supervising community service orders and fine option orders, have increased in number by 75 per cent since 1989 (excluding part-time and casual supervisors).

Staff, Magistrates and other community stakeholders have reported concern that the standard of supervision in the community has dropped considerably. Many reports from community organisations and staff indicate that existing community service projects cannot be adequately supervised and that there is little time available to procure and establish new projects. A lack of confidence by the judiciary in the integrity of community sentencing options may prompt a reversion to custodial penalties being imposed.

Claims also have been made that more serious offenders are being supervised in the community than was the case some years ago. A comparison of orders made in the years ending 30 June 1988 and 1993 expressed as a percentage of the total in Table 20 shows only slight increases in offence category apart from a considerable increase in orders representing drug and motor vehicle offences but a decrease in property theft and property damage offences. Furthermore, the review of community corrections examined current cases applying the standard high, medium and low risk rating. It was found that 21 per cent represented high risk, 37 per cent were medium risk and 42 per cent were low risk. Unfortunately, comparative data on high risk cases by risk type in previous years is not available.

Although these results are not conclusive, it is acknowledged that the community corrections area is managing prisoners much earlier in their sentences than was previously the case, this suggests that the risk factor has increased. There was a total of 1057 releases on home detention and leave of absence (including Release to Work and transfers to community centres) in the year ending 30 June 1993.

Table 20: Offence Trends

Most Serious Offence	1 July 1987 to 30 June 1988	1 June 1992 to 30 June 1993	Increase/Decrease
	Percent of Total	Percent of Total	
Homicide	0.35	0.42	+
Assault <sup>1</sup>	9.5	9.7	+
Robbery/Extortion	1.3	1.5	+
Drugs	13.0	19.3	+
Property offences <sup>2</sup>	43.8	27.8	-
Property damage	4.47	3.7	-
Motor vehicle/traffic	21.9	29.9	+
Good Order	5.1	5.8	+
Other	0.35	1.6	+
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	

<sup>1</sup> includes Sexual and other offences against the person.

<sup>2</sup> includes Theft, Break and Enter and Fraud.

## FINDINGS

- There has been significant increase in workload particularly in the supervision of community service and fine option cases.
- Significant stakeholders, in particular the judiciary, are concerned that the standard of supervision in community correction has declined.
- Community corrections are supervising prisoners earlier in their sentences which suggests the risk to the community is greater

## Linking Workloads to Resources

While the community corrections review indicated an increase in staffing was required for community corrections coordinators/community corrections supervisors (CCC/CCS), it concluded the number of community correctional officers (CCO) was adequate and the number of administrative staff was excessive. However, the recommendations were made on the understanding that additional staff below the degree level at the CCC/CCS level would be made available to supervise the surveillance caseload which includes offenders on probation and parole.

It was suggested by the community corrections review team that extra positions at the CCC/CCS level could be offset against positions saved in a review of administrative positions. However, claims by staff that there was insufficient administrative support in both Area and regional offices were prevalent during this review. It was noted in the community corrections review that 15 per cent of community correctional officer's time and 16 per cent of CCC/CCS time was taken up in administrative duties. A thorough examination of this aspect by a proposed project team is suggested to ensure that valuable officers' time is not taken up by duplicating the duties of administrative staff.

Divergent views have been expressed to the PSMC review team as to what indicators best reflect the work requirements of community corrections officers and supervisors so that appropriate resources can be provided. It is clear that workloads are continuing to escalate within community corrections. The danger is that without either increased staff numbers or increased flexibility in work practices the standard of supervision may decline and the expectations of the Courts and the community will not be met. If the system loses credibility the Courts will be increasingly attracted to the imprisonment options. It is, therefore, of critical importance that the Commission develop an appropriate methodology to accurately assess 'work value', develop work strategies and practices to best utilise resources for maximum effect and monitor this on an ongoing basis.

## FINDINGS

Divergent views exist within the Commission as to what indicators best reflect the work value of the volume of orders attended to by community corrections.

- There is an urgent need for the QCSC to develop a strategic planning process that incorporates meaningful work value criteria and that these are linked to increased flexibility in work practices.

### **Case Management and Flexible Work Practices**

The results of the QCSC review indicated that there is great scope for better management of cases within community corrections, largely through better management of intervention and surveillance in cases. The community corrections review indicated that the workload defined as 'surveillance' cases varied between 20 per cent and 70 per cent between offices. Clearly, there is inconsistent interpretation of which cases require active intervention and more consistent guidelines are required. A proposal for how offender management should be organised was put forward and basically involved specialist community correctional officers in the assessment/case management, intervention and programs/counselling phases and community correctional officers below the tertiary degree barrier involved in the supervision/surveillance of cases.

The model proposed by the QCSC review, however, is a variation of other methods used and/or discussed over many years and is relevant mainly to larger area offices. The supervision/surveillance discrimination model is now accepted as a legitimate work practice mechanism for better management of cases and officially endorses practices that are already unofficially occurring.

There is scope for further refinement of the current case management system to better utilise resources. Additionally, the recommended model provides flexibility in the method of supervision. It is similar to one utilised by the Chermside office of community corrections since its opening in August, 1993, and whilst staff report that the procedures are working satisfactorily, they consider a further six months is required before it can be adequately evaluated.

The QCSC has placed more emphasis on intervention by referral to group programs instead of one-to-one intervention. While most community correctional officers agree that there is value in program intervention as a supplement to one-to-one intervention, some are not convinced that offenders placed into programs as a substitute for individual contact, is as efficient or effective as is envisaged. It was reported that senior management underestimate how much work is involved in developing and implementing programs and there is a failure to understand that some offenders are not suited to programs, are disruptive in groups, just

do not turn up, and cannot always be successfully breached for failure to attend, all of which in turn, increases workload.

The counter argument offered is that some officers are resistant to change and wish to protect their work practices by insisting that one-to-one intervention is the most appropriate method of supervision. As there is conflicting evidence which can be selectively used to substantiate either supervision method, the PSMC review encourages an open and flexible approach to work practice refinements by utilising both options provided that standards of supervision and community expectations are not compromised.

Many offices, large and small, have encompassed the use of programs and to their credit, have been innovative in making the best use of available resources. While most programs are developed on an ad hoc basis, some regional managers have organised the development of core programs for implementation in some or all of their area offices. The community corrections review recommended as part of their proposal that there be a central office responsibility for the functional area of programs, in terms of the standards for development, delivery and evaluation. This proposal is supported.

Nevertheless, it is true that group programs in smaller area offices or larger geographical areas are often not practical. Problems of low numbers of specific types of offenders in an area, lack of transport and suitable facilities, were some examples given. Others such as placing offenders with different types of sex offences into one group for a sex offenders program were also cited. While these instances are acknowledged they need to be worked through on a case-by-case basis.

## FINDINGS

- . The proposed model for community corrections management of cases is currently being trialled but is yet to be evaluated.
- . The executive of the QCSC has emphasised the role of group programs instead of one-to-one intervention in community corrections where appropriate.
- . Field staff dispute the extent to which programs based supervision decreases workload.

There is uncoordinated development of community corrections programs and in some more remote areas it is impractical to operate with a programs focus.

### Effectiveness measures

In the community corrections review, long-term (within five years) and in-program (period of order) recidivism became the measure of effectiveness for each community corrections program. The results suggested:

that if community corrections were to view their success only in terms of the short-term success factor, they would misinterpret the impact of re-offence on the community. Many of those offenders who do well in the short-term appear to do poorly in the longer term. This is especially true of home detainees, transferees to community corrections centres and offenders on LOA. Other offenders fare poorly in both the short and long-term, notably prison probationers.

It was determined by the community corrections review team, in an examination of long-term recidivism, that prisoners on leave of absence have an exceptionally high rate of re-offence/breach. Home detainees have the second worst achievement rate over the long term.

Research of this nature is considered valuable as a measure of effectiveness and its continuance is encouraged to assist in planning and development strategies. Additional projects recommended such as the redesignation of case management plans to better reflect offenders needs and provide objective standards and behaviours against which behavioural change can be gauged will be of assistance in the measure of effectiveness.

Further, the QCSC review also highlighted a number of problems with respect to inconsistency in program development, evaluation and use of research as a basis for decision making. Based on their research, they suggest better targeting of programs and being more specific about the intended outcomes should reduce re-offending and therefore, improve effectiveness. A project to identify and develop core offender programs was recommended with a suggestion that these programs be regularly monitored, updated and evaluated.

A well trained and well managed workforce can also substantially enhance the effectiveness of the services provided by community corrections. Comments made earlier in this report in respect of training and development opportunities for Commission staff certainly apply to community corrections staff.

## FINDINGS

The QCSC intends to continue research into effectiveness of community correction supervision and has established a program of review.

A well trained and well managed workforce can enhance the effectiveness of the services provided.

## Future Directions

A number of different supervision strategies have been considered pre and post establishment of the QCSC. These have included among others, supervision on a fee for service basis, electronic monitoring of offenders, and attendance centres. Inquiries and/or projects have been undertaken in relation to some of these initiatives, e.g. electronic surveillance in respect of offenders on home detention. Furthermore, an additional sentencing option under the Penalties and Sentences Act, the Intensive Correction Order, is intended to be introduced by the Commission.

The review of community corrections traversed these options in terms of alternative resource management strategies. They recommended that projects be initiated to undertake a feasibility assessment of electronic monitoring and introducing an offender supervision fee. In respect of the Intensive Correction Order, they concluded:

The review of the literature does not demonstrate that it is much more than another sentencing option and a 'net widener'. Victoria indicated that their attendance centres, not a greatly different concept to Intensive Corrections Orders, were very costly in terms of labour but not that effective. The research shows that intensive use of well targeted programs works better than intensive supervision.

It was recommended by the QCSC review that procedures be put in place to monitor the success of intensive correction orders.

On the surface, it appears that resources are being utilised to repeat projects already rejected and conversely, that other initiatives are being under-investigated before acceptance. Adequate planning, co-ordination and investigation are central to the consideration of new initiatives.

## FINDINGS

- . Projects on supervision alternatives in respect of the future direction of community corrections require better co-ordination, planning and investigation

## RECOMMENDATIONS

50. The Director (Community Corrections) report to the executive on the appropriate size and locations of area and regional offices by 30 September 1994. Where possible, boundaries should be aligned with statistical districts.
51. By 30 September 1994, in order to provide a structured and coordinated framework for the provision of community corrections services, the Director (Offender Development):
  - . develop a programs profile for delivery at area office level and ensure adequate assessment of proposals and likely resource implications;
  - . establish a process to ensure research, consultation, trial and evaluation guides the development of community corrections operations;
  - . commence a rolling program of research into the effectiveness of community corrections programs and supervision strategies, including assessment of alternative supervision methods, the results of which will be used in planning and development of service delivery.
52. By 30 September, the Director (Community Corrections):
  - . review and update supervision standards;
  - . determine the duties required to be discharged by different categories of staff; and
  - . ensure consistent standards of intervention are applied throughout community corrections.

53. By 30 March 1994, the Director (Community Corrections) evaluate the proposed model for community corrections case management currently being trialled at a Brisbane North area office (Chermside).
54. By 30 September 1994, the Director (Community) Corrections develop a model for the resourcing of offices which can also be used in the negotiation of budgets. Development of a model will include:
  - . a comprehensive system measuring the workload of community corrections;
  - . identification of workload trends and the impact on future workload of factors such as legislative changes;
  - . identification and assessment of the differing resources required in providing various types of supervision; and
  - . assessment, negotiation and ongoing, regular evaluation of staffing levels.
55. A phased implementation timetable be prepared by the Information Technology Section for the further extension of CIS to area offices and presented to the executive by 1 July 1994.