



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:

<http://dspace.flinders.edu.au/dspace/>

Speech delivered by Adam Graycar:

"Community corrections"

to the Queensland Department of Correctional
Services, Cairns, June 8, 2000

© Australian Government

This speech is made available under the CC-BY-NC-
ND 4.0 license:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>



Community Corrections

**Queensland Department of Correctional Services
Cairns**

June 8 2000

Adam Graycar

Director

Australian Institute of Criminology

GPO Box 2944, Canberra 2601

phone: 02-6260 9205

fax: 02-6260 9203

e-mail: adam.graycar@aic.gov.au

On any day last year, there were 19,390 Community Corrections clients in Queensland. According to the Productivity Commission this involved an annual recurrent expenditure of \$21.8 million, just 10 per cent of the total recurrent expenditure for corrections in Queensland. In the 5 years from 1993-4 to 1998-9 the Community Corrections population has risen by 28% (from 15,147 to 19,390 - daily average) while at the same time the prison population has risen by 123% (from 2259 to 5044 - daily average). (SCRCSPP).

Two things stand out immediately. You are in a growth industry - a 28% increase in customers would be the envy of many businesses. If, however, the prison population had grown by only 28% (and assuming that all the remainder became Community Corrections clients) the Queensland Government would be saving somewhere in the order of \$80 million per year in recurrent costs, not to mention the large capital outlays.

Unlike prison which is a punishment exacted against freedom of movement and association or a fine punishment exacted against money, a community sentence is a punishment exacted against time and energy, but also has potential for enormous positives.

The history of probation is often traced back to Boston in 1841 when a John Augustus thought that some who came before the court would have a better chance, and do better if they did not end up in prison. He worked to develop rehabilitation programs outside of prison when he undertook the supervision of men, and at a later date, women and juveniles. He provided bail for the temporary suspension or postponement of sentence, assistance in finding housing, employment, and counselling. He conceived probation as a way of providing practical measures to help offenders stay out of further trouble. His philosophy was that the probationer knows 'right' from 'wrong' and is less likely to engage in 'wrong' behaviour if being watched. Implied are either tangible or intangible rewards or punishments for appropriate or inappropriate behaviour (Sieh 1993; Lipchitz 1986).

Augustus worked only with those he thought had the greatest prospect of rehabilitation and were the least likely to continue to engage in criminal activities – to make the best use of his limited resources. He was a risk taker and a risk manager, he was criticised at the time for what was perceived as allowing offenders the opportunity to commit further crimes.

After Augustus' death in 1859, various prisoners' and children's aid societies continued to supervise those on probation. After its early philanthropic stage, probation was taken over by the state and paid officers replaced volunteers. Probation was introduced because it was seen as filling a social need, based on practical experience, rather than on legal doctrines. It was hoped everyone

involved would be concerned with the isolated and immediate problems of an individual living in a rapidly changing society.

Well, rapid change is what we see all around. Australian social structure and economic life is undergoing change, the like of which we have not seen before. Old industries which used to offer lifetime secure employment are collapsing. Occupations are becoming obsolete, and the new replacement industries and occupations are more technological and less labour intensive.

The globalising economy is driving the restructuring of Australia's economy. This is creating winners and losers. Among the losers will be a cohort of young angry males, unemployed, and quite probably unemployable, living for the moment, with no prospects for the future. Its members will seek gratification when and where they can obtain it. The community doesn't really know how to deal with them - but whatever options are proposed, there will be a central place for skilled community corrections people.

Like everybody else, your skills and practice will have to adapt to, (and sometimes drive) changes in social and economic structure. You can't assume that the correctional work you practice today will be what you will practice tomorrow.

The pace of change is quite central to our difficulties. Problems evolve with frightening speed. By the time the alarm bell sounds it is almost too late for corrective action. We need desperately to sharpen our ability to see ahead. I sometimes feel we're like a person driving at 100 kilometres per hour in a Canberra fog that only permits us to see 20 metres ahead. In a horse and buggy, 20 metres is fine, but at the wheel of a complex piece of technology, with somebody on your tail its a different story.

In recent decades our world has changed. We have all seen technical changes of astounding, stunning and overwhelming consequence. We can find technical solutions to many of our problems. We can think the unthinkable and do the undoable - yet are we a lot better off? We can do magic on our computers, investigate the mysteries of space, we can communicate in ways never dreamt of before. We have learned brilliantly the means of accomplishing scientific and technical advance. When we look at our present capacity to solve problems it is apparent that we do our best when the problems involve little or no social context. We're skilled in coping with problems with no human ingredient at all, as in the physical sciences or in the technologies. We can send people to the moon, and automatic robots to explore Mars, yet we can't find jobs for our young people; or appropriate accommodation for people leaving prison. We can fill our cities with glitzy and expensive office blocks which remain empty, yet we can't provide sufficient early childhood interventions which will reduce criminality; we can grow anything - we can increase the protein yield in our crops and grow more crops per hectare than ever before, and poppies to turn into

heroin, yet we can't feed most of the world's 15 million refugees or even prevent our farmers from going broke. We can build jails that work on smart cards, yet we don't do too well at stopping the revolving door.

The task you have before you is to help structure a safer community by providing offenders with opportunities to stop offending. The downside is that you don't control all the variables that go into achieving the result

There are 4 themes I want to cover today - 4 themes which shape your work and your practice - 4 themes you need to understand clearly in order to do your jobs.

1. Community Corrections is a growth business which is under great community and political pressure, and operates within a context of social change
2. Community Corrections can help the State's economy
3. Community Corrections is a risk management exercise with very high stakes
4. Community Corrections involves significant professional challenges for practitioners

Before delving into these four issues let me pose three questions for you to ponder on.

- Who is your client - the offender or the community?
- How do you help someone who may have no interest in being helped?
- If you had the power to change something in probation and parole that would achieve better results, what would it be?

1. Community Corrections is a growth business which is under great community and political pressure, and operates within a context of social change

The **context** is as follows:

- Communities are feeling enormous social and economic strain (even though most economic indicators are looking good)
- A feeling of exasperation and outrage at those who breach the bounds of civility
- Governments seeking more cost-effective human services practices, including contracting out and privatisation

These are shaped by the relative commitments to

- prison
- non-custodial alternatives and
- crime prevention

I want to draw your attention to the last point, because you, as community corrections people know the clientele better than anyone else, and your skills and knowledge can be used tremendously in crime prevention.

Queensland stands out from all other jurisdictions in its correctional growth rates. As indicated earlier Community Corrections have grown by 28% in the past five years - no other jurisdiction is anywhere near there. NSW, South Australia, and Tasmania have seen growth of around 4.5%, while Victoria, WA and NT have seen declines. At the same time Queensland's prison population has risen by 123%, NT was next with 39% and other jurisdictions are much lower than that. In Queensland, this represents an annual 17 per cent average increase in prisoner numbers. Mark Lynch (2000) of the Criminal Justice Commission puts this against a backdrop of:

- 2 per cent increase in the adult population
- 4 per cent increase in recorded crime
- 3 per cent increase in offenders proceeded against

Historical analysis of crime and incarceration rates reveal no clear relationship between the two. But criminality is a serious concern, and proactive action to reduce crime is on the policy and practice agenda.

How do we reduce the level of criminality in the community? Expanding the horizon a little, crime prevention will be a significant area of activity - probably not seen as your core business, but crucial within a wider professional vision which will allow you better to serve your clients and the community.

There are two significant issues that will ensure that you are in a growth business:

- the growth of incivility
- the demographic boom among the Aboriginal population

Let me provide a little more context for a moment.

Crimes of course differ. Three types of crime must be distinguished.

First, there are crimes that harm people. Mostly these have been in criminal codes over the years, e.g. homicide, assault, theft, rape, robbery, burglary, etc. These are usually the crimes that citizens fear most, and often associate with the notion of increasing crime. These are also the ones which receive significant media attention.

Second, are activities that frighten, annoy or offend people. Many of these are the victimless crimes or perceptions of dangerous or unsafe behaviour that could affect a bystander. Sometimes these are what might be called lifestyle crimes - smoking dope - buying and selling suspect goods in suspect markets.

Third are the 'new' crimes, those which have surfaced in recent years, associated particularly with organised crime, drugs trafficking, money laundering, computer crime, crime against the environment.

To prevent and reduce crime there are different approaches we can follow - they are not mutually exclusive - they need to be taken together.

A **law enforcement** approach brings into play the activities of police, courts and corrections.

A **developmental** approach works from the basis that law enforcement and corrections come into play more to *deal with* offending, and less to *prevent* offending. The aim is to work cross-sectorally to turn potential future offenders into good citizens. If they grow up to be offenders they cost the community big bucks, in everything from the law enforcement and corrections costs right through to the long term social security costs. Investing in appropriate developmental activities - family support, primary health care, early childhood supports, education and training, is more likely to turn them into productive taxpayers.

Cost benefit studies have demonstrated that dollars spent in early intervention, maternal health, pre-school enrichment, remedial education, truancy reduction, family support are likely to be good crime control investments.

Not only that, but they are likely to produce a variety of side benefits. All things being equal, the higher the aggregate level of educational achievement, the greater the labour force productivity, and the better our economic competitiveness. Why not aim for productive tax paying citizens rather than long term welfare recipients?

Of course, none of this comes out of your budget, but there is an opportunity for Community Corrections to feed into a larger whole of government approach.

Turning to the two key issues of incivility and demographic boom among the indigenous community, we can observe first, that indicators of incivility, such as

broken windows, litter, abandoned motor vehicles, and general disrepair, communicate a message that no one is in control of a location and that no one cares

This in turn tends to invite behavioural incivility, which have been dubbed “soft crimes”, such as disturbing the peace, public drunkenness, loitering, and rowdyism, which reinforces the message that predatory criminals and louts can move in with little worry of being challenged. If the community cannot keep an offensive individual from annoying passersby, real villains could believe that they can have an open go.

It must be pointed out, however that 100 years ago inner city life was worse both in the level of predatory crime and disorderly behaviour, though our tolerance level is probably lower today.

There is however, a genuine concern about incivility as a broad based response by many people in a competitive and uncertain environment. This incivility will not necessarily turn into crime, but proactive responses will strengthen our community, and be part of our crime prevention arsenal.

There is a particular problem with Aboriginal youngsters. Civility is difficult to instill within a culture of exclusion, one in which education, health, housing and employment deficiencies make prospects bleak. Today an Aboriginal youngster is 21 times more likely to be incarcerated than a non-Aboriginal youngster.

If patterns stay the same, the looming demographic boom of Aboriginal teenagers will mean an explosion of Aboriginal youngsters in juvenile detention. (53% of the Aboriginal population is under 15 years of age). We know that police lockups and juvenile detention centres are not the places to learn civility. This will not come by imposition from outside, but will only come within an environment of mutual support and respect in individual communities.

There are two types of approaches to deal with incivility and disorder - a law enforcement approach, and a remobilising communities approach. This is very much on the agenda with Aboriginal communities. Community groups attempt to control disorder and crime through activities that make people aware of opportunities to join in community and crime prevention activities and develop support systems and role models. This needs to blend with local economic and physical development. Recognising that police alone cannot solve deep-seated problems that result in disorder and crime, local labour market programs, attacks on homelessness, control of alcohol sales and consumption in prescribed areas, emphasis on community mental health and designing out disorder through local planning regulations can all be utilised as appropriate.

But these will not attack the root causes. We need to consider other investment strategies. We know that the criminal justice system is a very expensive means

of social control. We also know that it is far from being the most productive means of social control.

All of this is against a backdrop of public opinion which sees community corrections (probation) is seen as a 'slap on the wrist'. It is unlikely that alternatives to imprisonment will be funded on any large scale as long as public opinion accepts incarceration as the only real sanction for crime. It is not hard to make the economic case for the validity and financial benefits to the taxpayers of these programs.

We must remember that criminal sanction is the cost that society attaches to crime to make it unrewarding to offenders. To be an appropriate and effective cost for crime, criminal sanction must be:

- proportionate to the crime;
- unpleasant enough to deter criminals
- a real and credible means of protecting the community (Fallin 1990).

This highlights my first question to ponder who, in this environment of growth, is your client - the offender or the community?

Despite the community always wanting to up the ante and seek harsher retribution and punishment, the research does give us an idea of what does work in Community Corrections, but I'll come to that later.

2. Community Corrections can help the State's economy

Crimes like homicide, assault, burglary, theft, etc. cost Queenslanders about \$2 billion a year, that's \$5.5 million a day. The cost of the criminal justice response is about three-quarters of a billion dollars, that's around \$2 million a day. So all in all, very conservatively, crime costs the Queensland community \$7.5 millions a day, every day, 365 days a year – and these are 1996 figures (Walker 1997).

These are only the monetary costs. The human and emotional costs are horrendously incalculable. There can be no argument that investment in crime prevention will yield significant benefits, and pursuing a tough line of locking up many more offenders is not good economic sense, though it may have political resonance, and be part of an important risk management strategy.

While incarceration in prison has virtually no redeeming features, the community must be protected by way of the incapacitation of offenders who will continue to commit serious crimes at a high rate and who are not at the end of their criminal careers. It is clear that the most serious continuing offenders such as serial rapists should be incapacitated.

Corrections in Queensland incur recurrent costs of about \$216 million per year. Victoria spends 25% more than Queensland per prisoner per day, and double per day on Community Corrections as Queensland. Queensland has 18% of Australia's population, 26% of Australia's prisoners and 35% of Australia's Community Corrections clients. Victoria, on the other hand has 25% of Australia's population, 14% of the prisoners, and 13 % of the Community Corrections clients. If Queensland had Victoria's imprisonment rate it would save in recurrent costs, somewhere in the order of \$100 million per year.

As probation and parole workers you will be performing a valuable function for the state economy by keeping lower risk offenders out of prison. Your human service skills will be tested to the full as you grapple with issues over which you have only a very small amount of control.

3. Community Corrections is a risk management exercise with very high stakes

You are professionals, working in an industry whose major focus is risk management. Your professional skill should get you to pick winners, and your main tools are assessment and intervention. Of course, many of the factors that affect your practice are beyond your sphere of influence.

There is growing evidence that alternatives to long term confinement are just as effective as prison for many offenders. The problem is getting public support for these alternatives, and seeking that support can be a political risk because the public favours longer prison sentences as the main solution to crime prevention. Changing public attitudes depends on a skillful marketing strategy.

In an effort to gain public, legislative and judicial support, alternatives to prison must be:

- perceived as reasonably safe;
- address the public's desire for punishment
- offer opportunity for positive change by providing treatment and employment skills (Fallin 1990).

All of these involve judging risk.

There are numerous risk factors associated with criminal activity. Age, gender and early criminal involvement are some examples. In comparison to others, young males who began criminal activities at a young age are higher risks for future criminal activities. But these "static" characteristics such as age, gender and past history, while predictive of recidivism, cannot be changed in treatment. Instead, the "dynamic" or changeable factors should be the target of treatment programs.

Research has revealed some dynamic factors that are also criminogenic: attitudes, cognitions, behaviour regarding employment, education, peers, authority, substance abuse and interpersonal relationships that are directly related to an individual's criminal behaviour.

In a recent examination of predictors of adult recidivism, it was found that antisocial cognitions, values, and behaviours (dynamic, criminogenic factors) along with static factors (history, age, gender, race) were the strongest predictors of recidivism. This provides support for the proposal that these changeable factors should be targeted in treatment. In contrast, self-esteem, depression and anxiety were relatively weak predictors of recidivism. These characteristics are commonly targets of treatment despite the fact that they appear to have little association with recidivism (Sherman et al. 1997).

Recidivism: Community corrections have fewer return customers. Various studies show that around one third of community corrections clients reoffend whereas for prison clients it is closer to half. However, the comparison cannot be made as simply as that. Generally, the people who go to prison have longer and more complex criminal careers - they are badder!

Research suggests that high-risk offenders are likely to reoffend less if they receive higher levels of supervision, however, this might conflict with the worker's objective of facilitating justice. Disadvantaged groups of offenders might effectively receive higher penalties (through higher levels of supervision) because they share risk characteristics such as homelessness and lack of family support. This results in higher penalties for social disadvantage –a clear injustice (Trotter 1999).

There is a paradox in the research. One study by (Andrews et al. Cited in Trotter 1999) found that high-risk probationers who received intensive supervision reoffended at about half the rate of other offenders. In contrast, low-risk probationers who received intensive supervision offended at twice the expected rate. Similar outcomes were found in a study with juvenile offenders. A study with parolees also found lower offence rates among high-risk offenders who received supervision but not among low-risk offenders who received supervision.)

So there's the rub - focus your attentions on high risk clients, because the pay-off is better. It is not easy as a risk management strategy. Effective programs will target offenders who are at sufficient risk for recidivism so that this reduction is measurable. Many offenders however, are low risk for future recidivism. Treatment programs that provide intensive services for such offenders will show little reduction in future criminal activities because few of these offenders will recidivate anyway.

One of the most important principles in understanding our practice is to assess the evidence about what works, and what does not work.

What works?

A study by Trotter published in 1995 supports the view that recidivism in Community Based Corrections can be reduced by up to 50% through the implementation of appropriate supervision practices and programs. When the approach to supervision addresses the causes of the problem it was found to work. It is generally agreed that criminal offending stems from personal and social deprivation, and a sense of alienation in individuals, which leads them to see a criminal lifestyle as an acceptable one. Trotter found that programs that include high levels of problem solving, pro-social modelling and empathy produced lower recidivism rates.

Apart from the most effective crime prevention tool - early intervention in families, and family support, the research provides evidence that crime in the community is reduced by rehabilitation programs with particular characteristics.

There is now substantial evidence that **rehabilitation** programs work with at least some offenders in some situations. Interventions most likely to succeed are structured and focused, use multiple treatment components, focus on developing skills (social skills, academic and employment skills), and use behavioural (including cognitive-behavioural) methods (with reinforcements for clearly identified, overt behaviours as opposed to non-directive counselling focusing on insight, self esteem, or disclosure);

Also

- Prison-based therapeutic community treatment of drug-involved offenders;
- Incapacitating offenders who continue to commit crimes at high rates.

Incapacitating offenders who will continue to commit crimes at a high rate and who are not at the end of their criminal careers is effective in reducing crimes in the community. Lock away the really bad eggs. However, locking up those who are not high-rate, serious offenders or those who are at the end of their criminal careers is extremely expensive, and probably counter-productive.

Also important in determining whether a treatment program will be effective is the therapeutic integrity of the program or the need for effective programs to be delivered as planned and designed. Poorly implemented programs, delivered by untrained personnel, where offenders spend only a minimal amount of time in the program, can hardly be expected to successfully reduce recidivism.

What Does Not Work?

Studies of poorly implemented rehabilitation programs given to low risk offenders using vague behavioural targets were not be effective in reducing crime. Nor were programs that emphasised characteristics such as discipline, structure, challenge, and self esteem that are not directly associated the offender's criminal behaviour.

Rehabilitation programs that did not reduce the recidivism of offenders:

- Emphasised specific deterrence such as shock probation and Scared Straight;
- Used vague, nondirective, unstructured counselling.

Studies demonstrate little evidence that continuing the policies of the past several decades emphasising the increased use of incarceration will have a major impact on reducing crimes at this point in time. As incarceration rates grow there appear to be diminished returns (e.g., reduced impact on crime rates) because lower rate offenders are being locked up. This has profound implications for community corrections.

Community restraints without programming and services were not effective in reducing the recidivism rates of offenders. There is now an extensive body of research examining the crime prevention effects of community sanctions designed to restrain offenders while they are in the community.

Unless they are combined with rehabilitation, programs like Intensive Supervised Probation or parole (ISP); home confinement; community residential programs; urine testing were not found to be effective in reducing the criminal activities of either adult or juvenile offenders, nor were correctional boot camps using the old-style military model or juvenile wilderness programs.

Less promising targets for reducing future criminal behaviour are those that target such noncriminogenic factors such as self esteem, depression and anxiety. These are relatively weak predictors of recidivism and will not be particularly successful in reducing recidivism. While factors such as self-esteem may be correlated with criminal behaviour, changing them will not necessarily reduce future criminal activities. That is, criminals may have relatively strong self-concepts but they may continue to commit crimes. In order to be successful, treatment must address factors that can be changed (e.g., dynamic factors) and that are directly related to an individual's criminal behaviour (Sherman et al. 1997).

What are needed in the future are high quality studies with experimental assignment of subjects to programs with different rehabilitation components focusing on participants with varying characteristics.

4. Community Corrections involves significant professional challenges for practitioners

Challenges that face you fall into at least three categories

- Challenges for **you** as practitioners
- Challenges for practice
- Challenges for achieving outcomes

Challenges for **you** as practitioners

The practice agenda is very crowded. One tension that will always be there is that between therapy and punishment, and this goes to the core of your practice.

People who work with involuntary clients have a dual role: a legalistic or surveillance role; and a helping, therapeutic or problem-solving role. Probation officers have to carry out the requirements of a court order, and report to a court about the progress of the probationer. Simultaneously you must work towards the rehabilitation of the offender by assisting with problems which may be related to the offending behaviour. But how do you help someone who has no interest in being helped, such as an offender reluctantly visiting a probation officer (Trotter 1999).

What happens when an offender ignores the conditions on which punishment was suspended? This is not an unknown situation, and it will face you regularly. Who is your client - the offender or the community? At a philosophical level, there is no difficulty in reconciling care and control, but in terms of sustaining a productive personal relationship with the offender there can be some difficulty.

Your professionalism, backed by training will help you structure your practice which will have a high prospect for success if you ensure that you always maintain

- Client Focus
- Optimism
- Tolerance and Impartiality
- Learning
- Mutual Respect
- Cooperation
- Justice with Dignity
- Honesty and Openness
- Accountability

The accountability issue is of fundamental importance. As professionals you are entering the lives - in many cases the very intimate feelings and behaviours of people who are both sinners and sinned against. There are four sets of accountabilities that you must never lose sight of:

- your accountability to the community
- your accountability to your clients
- your accountability to your colleagues
- your accountability to your employer.

Challenges for practice

There's some pretty poor philosophy around in the community's attempts to deal with criminal justice matters. The more punitive approach - the lock'em up and throw away the key approach will give the community as a whole more problems than it can handle. A part of your professional practice is to bring together offenders, their families and service organisations.

When we focus on probation and parole there is a role conflict between the control and care functions of probation, and managing the inherent tensions between each has always been difficult.

There also professional tension between counselling, group work and community work. There is a strong focus in many places at present on cognitive skills approaches - focussing on the dynamic rather than the static features I mentioned earlier.

Cognitive skills approaches, for example, combine moral persuasion with practical support and skills. They stand apart from both commonsense counselling and more clinical approaches in that they place emphasis on

- getting the offender to confront his/her offending and recognise the harm s/he does
- identifying the factors which underlie offending, and getting the offender to recognise these
- teaching the offender new skills to avoid the circumstances which lead to offending
- providing material help towards that end.

Trends that are emerging at present within community corrections also include those which focus on **restorative justice** approaches. Restorative justice aims to denounce crime, reform the offender, prevent crime through community involvement, help victims, make good the suffering caused by the crime, and to keep the costs of administering justice to a minimum.

The simplest practice is that of Community Service Orders. Surprisingly it is only in the last 25 years that western societies have renewed the use of, even though they have been around since the Middle Ages. Now, they are not 'forced labour in chain gangs' but still seek to use the potential and skills of an offender for the benefit of the community (Klaus 1998).

Challenges for achieving outcomes

Most empirical work in corrections rests on the assumption that the purpose of corrections programs is to reduce reoffence rates or to divert offenders from prison. However, in reality there are often competing objectives, eg. a probation officer may have as one objective helping clients to become more law abiding through rehabilitation. However, the probation officer also has an objective of supervising a court order. An example of the conflicts in this role is that officers may be involved in directing clients to community work where they are required to work with other offenders and this may increase the likelihood of reoffending through contamination.

The probation officer may also be required to administer a punishment. The client, the courts, the community and the probation officer may see probation as involving in part a level of deprivation of the offender's liberty, and this may not be consistent with the rehabilitation objective.

Early in this talk I stressed the importance of crime prevention as an outcome for Community Corrections. Crime prevention always seems to be somebody else's core business, and usually ends up as nobody's. If you put it on your agenda, it will be an important activity in coming to grips with the growth industry you are in as well as helping out with the State's budget! It is not a totally left field idea - in Japan, for example, probation has an explicit crime prevention role.

However, the goalposts will change all the time. They do in every other area, so why should you be exempt!

If you are always aware of the nature of change, as I outlined before, your attainable outcomes will continually change, and you won't be fazed by:

- Changes in laws (different types of community-based orders which will become available, and mandatory sentencing requirements on their use)
- Changes in sentencing (use of community corrections by the courts will change with pressure to reduce recidivism and cut costs)
- Changes in funding (may be reduced or increased depending upon government policy and changes in offender populations)

- Changes in staffing (training of staff may be increased, numbers may increase or decrease, and out-sourcing of corrections in full or in part)
- Changes in client base - numbers and type of offenders (i.e. offending patterns may change in the future - more older offenders, more female offenders, more white collar offenders, all of whom may receive CBOs)
- Changes in service delivery (e.g. electronic monitoring may be used in conjunction with traditional community-based programs and / or services may be out-sourced in full or in part. This may create opportunities for staff to move into the private sector)
- Changes in management, accountability and evaluation of service delivery (management will be reduced to cut costs and programs will be more rigorously evaluated to ensure they are cost-effective).

End comments

Whichever way we look at it there are professional challenges in balancing the interests of the offender and the community while drawing on community resources and facilities outside the criminal justice system.

In the future the role is likely much more to be case manager than case worker

- negotiating access
- broker of services
- bridge between needs of client and resources available in the community
- intermediary between offender and relevant agency
- social resource manager.

How then, can we ensure excellence in our theory, policy and practices? We have to be clear on our objectives, the strategies for achieving the objectives, and on the expected outcomes. As a bureaucrat dealing with policies, I often say that part of my task is to be a problem seeker rather than a problem solver. Seeking the problems is something fundamental to probation and parole. Seeking these problems in a context of change as I outlined earlier will help you identify your aspirations and search for attainable goals.

I raised **three** questions at the outset.

- The **first**, who is your client – offender or community – brings into play the full range of accountabilities of professionals. Your skill will build a bridge between offender and community – risk will be assessed and fact and reason will shape your work.

- The **second**, dealing with people who don't want to be with you, involves delivering things that look tangible rather than things that look fuzzy or that try to scare people. As professionals you can take note of the evidence which says that the more structured and focused treatments seem to be more effective than the less structured and less focused approaches (e.g. counselling). Another point here is to make sure you speak a language that resonates with the offender. Another, is that by keeping an eye on the crime prevention ball you may end up with fewer people who don't want to be with you.
- The **third** question: what would you like to change to achieve better results;
 - Well, I'll leave that one for you.

References

- Fallin, V. 1990 'Gaining Support for Sentencing Options', *Intermediate Punishment: Community-based Sanctions*, Correctional Issues, American Correctional Association, Laurel Md, pp. 1-6.
- Klaus, J.F. 1998 Handbook on Probation Services: Guidelines for Probation Practitioners and Managers, UNICRI Commonwealth Secretariat, Publication No. 60, Rome.
- Lipchitz, J. W. 1986 'Back to the future: an historical view of intensive probation supervision' *Federal Probation*, Vo. 50, No. 2, pp. 78-81.
- Lynch, M. 2000 Criminal Justice Commission, Queensland (unpublished presentation)
- SCRCSSP (Steering Committee for the Review of Commonwealth/State Service Provision) 2000, *Report on Government Services 2000*, AusInfo, Canberra.
- Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P. and Bushway, S. 1997 *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, DC.
- Sieh, E.W. 1993 'From Augustus to the progressives: a study of probation's formative years' *Federal Probation*, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 67-72.
- Trotter, C. 1995 *The supervision of offenders: what works?* Report to the Criminology Research Council on the project "The Capacity of community corrections to reduce recidivism", Dept. of Social Work and Human Services, Monash University, Melbourne.
- Trotter, C. 1999 *Working with involuntary clients : a guide to practice*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, N.S.W.

Walker, J. 1997 *Estimates of the Costs of Crime in Australia in 1996*, Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice, No. 72, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.