
PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK

Follow-up Review of Department of Corrections

APRIL 2014

State Services Commission, the Treasury and the Department of the
Prime Minister and Cabinet

**Performance Improvement Framework
Follow-up Review: Department of Corrections**

**State Services Commission, the Treasury, and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
Wellington, New Zealand**

Published: April 2014

ISBN: 978-0-478-40982-6

Web address: www.corrections.govt.nz and also available at www.ssc.govt.nz/pif

Crown copyright 2014

Copyright / terms of use



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 New Zealand licence. [In essence, you are free to copy and distribute the work (including in other media and formats) for non-commercial purposes, as long as you attribute the work to the Crown, do not adapt the work and abide by the other licence terms.] To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/nz/>. Attribution to the Crown should be in written form and not by reproduction of any such emblem, logo or Coat of Arms.

CONTENTS

Agency Response	2
Executive Summary	4
Four-year Excellence Horizon	6
Performance Challenge	8
A Ensuring a high level of compliance with sentences and orders	8
B Substantially reducing rates of reoffending – subsequently defined by Government as a 25% reduction in reoffending by 2017	8
C Delivering improved Value for Money within a fixed sector Budget	8
Has Corrections made enough progress on, and is the anticipated course and speed on the PIF review nine critical areas sufficient to achieve, the reducing reoffending goal?.....	10
1 Intervention with more offenders and broaden and strengthen integration	10
2 Better targeting, including earlier in the offender life cycle	11
3 Better assessment of reoffending risk in the prison system	11
4 End-to-end offender case management	12
5 More staff engagement	12
6 Better integrated, one team approach	13
7 Outcome relationship contracting with providers	14
8 Improved sector relationships	14
9 Sharing the story.....	15
Matters arising from the CEO focus areas not covered above that may impact success	16
1 Progress with both ensuring sentence compliance and reducing reoffending	16
2 Progress on improving staff safety	16
3 How the organisation design has progressed, especially the reduction in tiers and the extent to which this has helped address communication flows	17
4 Work on staff engagement	17
5 Effective contracting with private sector providers’ progress with developing alternative models for contracting elsewhere in the public sector	17
6 How can government agencies and other partners from the private and voluntary sectors work more effectively in cross-cutting reintegration/rehabilitation issues such as accommodation and mental health?	18
Additional recommendations/emphasis arising from our field studies and interviews.....	20
Learning organisation	20
Availability of drug and alcohol intervention	21
Improving the collective impact of sector collaboration	22
Holistic approach to intervention	23
What might the next performance challenge be?.....	24
Conclusion.....	25

AGENCY RESPONSE

The Department of Corrections (Corrections) has undergone significant transformational change since the initial PIF Review in September 2012. The Executive Leadership Team welcomed the opportunity for Dr Murray Horn and Dr Mike Pratt to undertake the Follow-up Review in late 2013.

The report is a balanced and fair assessment of the Department's transformation and achievement. The Executive Leadership Team would like to thank the Lead Reviewers for their insightful and useful review.

The Lead Reviewers engaged with both staff and external agencies to compile the report and have captured the complexity and depth of the Department's activity well.

Corrections is on track towards achieving the Government's goal of reducing re-offending by 25% by 2017. By the end of 2013, Corrections had achieved an 11.7% reduction in re-offending. This transformation has been realised while keeping the public safe. For the first time on record, there have been no escapes from New Zealand prisons for over 20 months.

While Corrections is now operating in a more cohesive environment and with greater purpose, the organisation is committed to continuing to lift its effectiveness and cost efficiency. We acknowledge the areas for future emphasis that the Lead Reviewers have set out in their report.

We agree that successful integration initiatives need to be scaled quickly and the issues relating to areas like housing and health addressed to remove constraints. Corrections is focused on enabling offenders to access the services they need to live offence free. In October 2013, we launched the 'Out of Gate' service that connects prisoners to key reintegrative services such as accommodation and employment. Corrections is also working with housing and health providers to ensure the availability and access to services for offenders is appropriate and proportionate to the needs of this population.

An important initiative for Corrections in 2013 was expanding the availability of, and access by offenders to, drug and alcohol programmes. Corrections has increased the number of places available for offenders to participate in alcohol and drug interventions (by 230% in prison and 120% in the community) and has implemented a broader range of interventions to more effectively match the varying level of need within the offender population. We plan to expand these programmes and interventions even further in 2014.

Effective collaboration to achieve common goals across the Justice Sector is critical to achieving enduring change. To support this, Corrections has contributed \$87 million over four years from productivity savings to the Justice Sector Fund, enabling the Justice Sector to invest in activities that support the wider Justice Sector's highest priorities. Collaboration with the Sector continues to increase and will remain a key area of emphasis for the Department.

Corrections is increasingly taking a multi level approach to organisational learning. For example, individual cases are regularly reviewed using a multidisciplinary team approach and from a systems perspective, our projects and programmes always include a lessons learnt assessment following design and implementation. We are committed to developing mechanisms to enable all of our staff to access the rich data that we have about offenders and what works to reduce reoffending.

We recognise that taking a more holistic approach to offenders, especially those with multiple needs, is important. Corrections is working increasingly closely with a range of Non Government and Iwi agencies to respond to the needs of these offenders.

The Lead Reviewers commented that “it is timely at this point to contemplate the next performance challenge”. We agree and the new areas of emphasis identified by the PIF Lead Reviewers will form the basis of a range of actions that we will implement in the coming year.

Christine Stevenson

Acting Chief Executive

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In undertaking this Follow-up Review the Lead Reviewers considered “is the Department on track to meet its performance challenge and fulfill its Four-year Excellence Horizon given anticipated course and speed”.

It seems probable that the 25% reduction in reoffending target will be met by 2017. An 11.4% reduction has already been achieved overall in the first two years, and one region has achieved 22.2%. Progress has been made on all nine critical areas from our PIF Review, with good to very good progress on most. Based on both progress to date and intentions for future action, the Department of Corrections (Corrections) is on track to meet its performance challenge and achieve the Four-year Excellence Horizon goals. This gives us confidence that recent reductions in reoffending will be sustained and that further progress by the Department and its partners will be sufficient for the reoffending target to be met in 2017, or close to it.

The chief executive officer (CEO) asked us to focus on six areas. Some of these overlapped with our original recommendations and are addressed in our assessment of progress in these areas. However, the CEO’s questions brought a different emphasis to three areas:

- a Improving Staff Safety: staff and prisoner serious harm incidents are not trending down and this is of concern; a new plan has been put in place, based on no tolerance of violence, and this seems a promising development; more assurance is required that the different operating model at Mt Eden Corrections Facility (MECF) will meet the same, or better, safety standards (without undermining the value that a different operating model can provide).
- b Assessment of the organisation redesign to unite Corrections’ efforts: the strategy-based design and implementation of the new structure have been exemplary; further consideration may be valuable as to whether there are one or two too many tiers within the system at the supervisory layer; this may be inhibiting communication, empowerment and innovation.
- c Improving collaboration in cross-cutting integration and rehabilitation issues like housing and mental health: while progress has been made, these are critical to be able to scale successful integration initiatives and a lot more work needs to be done in both areas.

There are a number of areas where more progress would help bring forward achievement of Corrections’ performance challenge – especially in reducing reoffending – and leave it better placed to meet the next set of challenges ahead. The PIF Review identified staff engagement as a weak area and although some progress has been made, and there are some very promising new initiatives under way, this area needs more attention. Moreover, the current multiplicity of approaches to risk classification (including security classification) need to be harmonised and re-examined to ensure they are not overly restrictive of offenders accessing the programmes they need.

There are also some new areas of emphasis arising from this Follow-up Review:

- a We concluded our Four-year Excellence Horizon recommendation in the PIF Review report with “Within four years we expect the Department will have moved beyond the discontinuous change mode of operating with organisation learning and continuous innovation embraced as the norm”. Major structural change has now been completed and a new operating model established. Corrections is far more innovative and this is well distributed throughout the organisation and in its relationship with its partners, as evident throughout our field studies and interviews and reflected in the Staff Survey. However, organisation learning still operates quite traditionally. To become a learning organisation, much more development is needed to integrate qualitative and

quantitative data to answer key questions, such as reasons for disparity in regional performance and effectiveness of various packages of interventions on different offenders. Information about offender achievements and reoffending should be much more available to frontline staff, to assist in motivation, learning and innovation.

- b Successful integration initiatives need to be quickly scaled and the problems identified in cross-cutting areas like housing and health addressed so they do not become constraints on this process.
- c Continuing to expand the availability of, and access to, drug and alcohol programmes.
- d While there are good examples of effective sector collaboration on the ground, these need to be more common and enduring and that requires that common goals are supported by greater commonality in agency operating models, eg, in targeting effort on those individuals and families where the payoff is likely to be greatest.
- e Taking a more holistic approach to offenders; especially those with multiple needs.

The excellent progress towards reduced reoffending is encouraging. It is timely at this point to contemplate the next performance challenge. Corrections' financial constraints are likely to become more, rather than less, challenging as the economy improves and this will require a continued focus on extracting the financial benefits of reduced offending to reinvest in its effectiveness. Moreover, adding even more value from Corrections' efforts should see further reductions in reoffending go hand in hand with a greater emphasis on reducing the harm that reoffending causes, especially, by more focus on diverting younger offenders from a life of crime and reducing the seriousness of that offending.

FOUR-YEAR EXCELLENCE HORIZON

Context

At the time of our PIF Review a new purpose, vision and values had been promulgated and was starting to get some traction. A significant cost-reduction exercise had recently been completed and a major restructure was designed and implementation commenced shortly after our report was submitted. Eighteen months on it is remarkable to experience the extent to which these major initiatives have been embedded and embraced. It has been a text book example of effective organisation transformation.

In our report we noted that the prison population and community-based sentences had stabilised over the previous three years and were starting to decline. The decline did not eventuate to the extent anticipated. However, it is expected that as the reduction in reoffending targets are met, further significant reductions may be possible. This means that the cost savings achieved by Corrections and the extensive organisation change initiatives have been accomplished against a backdrop of a higher than anticipated number of offenders.

During the period since our last visit a programme of facility closures was implemented, the Contract for Service with Serco to operate MECF was bedded in and a Public Private Partnership (PPP) at Wiri, based on design, build, finance and operate, was conceived and commenced. A serious fire and prison riot at Spring Hill Corrections Facility and the relocation and upheaval consequences of the Christchurch earthquakes were both managed extremely effectively, testing Corrections' crisis management and communication capabilities to the fullest extent.

Despite these several challenges, substantial progress has been made on all our recommendations and the extent of development across all aspects of the business has been truly remarkable. Perhaps the most powerful aspect of the changes we have observed is the comprehensive commitment of Corrections' people to the reduction in reoffending performance challenge and the positive attitude towards innovation and continuous improvement. We are confident in the ability of Department staff and the leadership team to deliver on the Four-year Excellence Horizon.

In the subsequent sections we revisit progress, and anticipated pace, momentum and accomplishment regarding the nine recommendations for excellence in our prior report.

Philosophy

In our report we wrote:

The primary epistemological base adopted by Corrections is behavioural psychology with interventions based on theories of criminogenic behaviour. This has tended to produce a:

deficits-based approach, and to lead towards a lesser emphasis, or less coherent emphasis, on the contextual factors that lead to positive behaviour, such as employment, social connections and an appropriate place to live. The strategy and process for successful integration are less well defined than they are for rehabilitation and vary throughout the organisation.

In the next four years, throughout Corrections and related entities, excellence will necessitate the complete implementation of 'end-to-end' offender-centric case management from the earliest stage of a person's offending. There will be a coherent approach to behavioural and positive strengths- based offender engagement and a greater emphasis on successful reintegration of offenders into the community.

We have been heartened by the extent to which these fundamental paradigmatic changes have been grasped and implemented. In particular, the focus on integration of offenders into the community has been made real through policy and structure changes and programmes such as Out of Gate, targeted at prisoners with less than two-year terms. The Department is only part way into the journey towards true end-to-end offender-centric case management but it has begun.

The dominant paradigm remains risk and the treatment of risk, both terms being routinely embedded in our interview discussions. There is a multiplicity of risk assessments, a continuing emphasis on programmes rather than more holistic offender-centric interventions and a tendency to collect quantitative aggregate data, rather than the development of information at a more offender-centric and qualitative level. By contrast, the dominant paradigm at MECF run by Serco tends towards 'better lives'. The risk of Corrections' approach is an underplay of the dynamic positive factors that can reduce reoffending; the risk of the Serco approach is an underplay of risk and the potential consequences for staff, and prisoner and community safety. Whilst proponents of both paradigms will argue their cases we believe the best approach for the future lies in resolving this apparent paradox with the power of AND, ie, building on both Corrections' and Serco's approaches.

Operating model

It has been heartening to experience the development of the offender-centric case management model in prisons, with a much stronger flow between custodial, rehabilitation, reintegration and probation. The greater support and availability of programmes for people with shorter sentences is a welcome development.

The change towards a judgement model based on mandatory standards and operating guidelines in Community Probation Services we observed at our last visit is now well embedded and significant progress has been made along these lines within Prisons. We were pleased to note that dynamic risk assessment has been introduced into prisons using the SDAC-21 tool.

Another area of significant and successful transformation has been in working closely with justice sector partners, health, mental health and education services, Child, Youth and Family (CYF) and Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ), and both private providers and community organisations. Positive feedback on working with Corrections from outside providers was in marked contrast to our earlier experience.

In our report we noted, "In four years we would expect to see rehabilitation and integration as being widely understood as everyone's job, and an enhanced emphasis on the importance of integration". This has already been achieved in less than two years. The challenge now is to ensure that the significant differences in performance throughout the system are brought up to the level of the best.

Change capability

We concluded our report, "Within four years we expect that Corrections will have moved beyond the discontinuous change mode of operating with organisation learning and continuous innovation embraced as the norm. This will be enabled by the innovative use of information technology".

Corrections has moved beyond discontinuous change. A new and more effective philosophy, purpose, vision and values, organisation design, and operating model are all in place providing clear direction for the future. Innovation and continuous improvement are embedded as a way of working to a far greater extent than is typical within the public service. The challenge now is to inform this transformation process, with rich organisation learning based on real-time quantitative and qualitative information and analysis that are widely accessible – to become a learning organisation. We make further comment on what this will involve in subsequent sections.

PERFORMANCE CHALLENGE

The 2012 PIF Review defined the performance challenge Corrections needed to meet to play its role in maintaining the integrity and improving the performance of the justice system as having three elements:

- a ensuring a high level of compliance with sentences and orders
- b substantially reducing rates of reoffending – subsequently defined by Government as a 25% reduction in reoffending by 2017
- c consistently improving value for money within a fixed overall justice sector budget for the four years to 2015.

The challenge was to create a virtuous cycle: to reduce cost in line with expected reductions in crime to release resources to reinvest in further reducing crime and reoffending and so on.

A Ensuring a high level of compliance with sentences and orders

The impressive transformation of the community probation service, under way at the time of the PIF Report, was largely completed in April 2012. The resulting professionally supported application of discretion to better respond to individual circumstances has resulted in a 26% reduction in the volume of breaches going through the Courts (this does not contribute to the reoffending target). Rather than automatically breaching an offender, probation officers are more likely to find ways of both making it easier for offenders to comply, eg, more flexible community work arrangements, and encouraging offenders to comply, eg, more meaningful work that helps build skills, with their sentence and orders requirements. This is a very strong improvement in ensuring sentence compliance in the largest offender group.

Sentence compliance and safety in prisons has continued to improve on most measures except serious assaults on prisoners and staff (although the latter did fall in 2012/13). There were no prison escapes in 2012/13; a steady reduction in unnatural deaths (to three in 2012/13); and a stabilisation of low levels of self-harm (to seven in 2012/13 from the low 30s at the end of the last decade). The number of positive general, random drug test results has been a little over 4% in the last two years (from over 10% in 2008/09) and the number of justified complaints has also fallen.

B Substantially reducing rates of reoffending – subsequently defined by Government as a 25% reduction in reoffending by 2017

Our conclusions on this element of the Performance Challenge are summarised in the Executive Summary and supported by the detailed assessment in the rest of this report. In a nutshell, our view is that, on the basis of what has been achieved so far and intended future action, it is probable the 25% reduction by 2017 will be met and we are confident that if not met by 2017 it will be met soon after.

C Delivering improved Value for Money within a fixed sector Budget

The reduction in reoffending, and the reduced harm that represents, is a significant increase in value from Corrections and its justice sector colleagues. At the same time, the budget for the Department's output expenses has remained reasonably static in nominal dollar terms, ie, a total increase of less than 2% across the three years from 2010/11 to 2013/14).

The Expenditure Review under way at the time of the PIF Review identified a number of initiatives that would generate substantial savings that would allow Corrections to absorb future cost pressures and free up resources for reinvestment in reducing reoffending. This exercise has been well managed, including controversial initiatives like prison closures in the face of the prison muster being higher than forecast at the time. Those initiatives have by and large delivered what was expected.

A subsequent expenditure review programmed for next year has been brought forward to ensure that the pace of investment in new initiatives aimed at reducing reoffending can be maintained within the overall budget envelope. While Corrections is still scoping these initiatives, it has proven its ability to manage what was a more demanding savings challenge.

HAS CORRECTIONS MADE ENOUGH PROGRESS ON, AND IS THE ANTICIPATED COURSE AND SPEED ON THE PIF REVIEW NINE CRITICAL AREAS SUFFICIENT TO ACHIEVE, THE REDUCING REOFFENDING GOAL?

1 Intervention with more offenders and broaden and strengthen integration

To make a substantial reduction in reoffending, Corrections had to supplement its focus on rehabilitation of high-risk, long-stay offenders in prison with:

- a programmes that address the needs of a much wider group of offenders; especially those on short stay, remand and community-based sentences. For example, with shorter programmes delivered in the community, as well as in prisons
- b more emphasis on delivering the housing, employment, health and social connections that are so critical in ensuring that offenders transition to more productive lives with less, and less serious, offending after they have served their sentence.

Corrections has made good progress in both areas. It is identifying offender needs earlier and has increased and extended the range of interventions so it can address the needs of a much wider proportion of the offender population.

Corrections has also increased the scope of integration initiatives that have been effective and launched a number of new initiatives. For example, the numbers on the release-to-work programme have increased from 465 in 2010/2011 to 646 in 2012/2013, with a target of 865 for 2013/2014. Incentives for private providers are also being increasingly aligned to outcomes, rather than being just paid for providing services or capacity (although this is yet to reach the traditional rehabilitation programmes run in prisons). So, for example, skills providers have a stronger incentive to ensure that offenders on their programmes actually end up in jobs. There are more integration initiatives focusing on linking offenders to services near the time of their release. The new Out of Gate service uses justice sector funding to provide support to short-serving prisoners prior to and post release. This includes navigation to access existing local services. The Out of Gate contracts incentivise the provider to help offenders build on and develop relationships with family/whānau, employers and social sector agencies. Fifteen percent of the contract value is at risk and will be paid if the offender is not reconvicted. This will be assessed at six months and 12 months post release. Offenders who are released from MECF are referred to the Out of Gate service by Serco staff.

While most of these integration initiatives are relatively new, we are confident that they can make a real impact on reoffending as they are refined and scaled up. However, much more needs to be done to improve access to appropriate housing and community-based drug, alcohol and mental health programmes to prevent these factors constraining the ability to scale effective integration initiatives managed by Corrections (see discussion of CEO focus area: cross-cutting issues, page 19). Housing and community-based services have already been identified as problem areas and some interdepartmental work has commenced to help address them. However, progress needs to be accelerated to avoid these constraining efforts to scale up Corrections' integration initiatives (like Out of Gate).

2 Better targeting, including earlier in the offender life cycle

The PIF Review suggested Corrections could better ensure the right offender received the right intervention at the right time. It has made important progress on this front in a number of areas. Corrections has increased both the range of interventions available and the range of offenders it targets for intervention (including in remand); it has improved and extended case management, allowing more tailoring to individual needs; and it has increased the capability of its own staff to do more with more offenders. It has also adopted a dynamic approach to risk assessment in prisons (see below).

However, there is more to do in one of the main areas highlighted in the PIF Review: combining what it knows about offenders with information from agencies like Ministry of Social Development (MSD) and Police to identify those offenders likely to generate the most harm over their lifetimes and focus more effort earlier in these offenders' life cycles. This should be even easier now that the social sector agencies – especially MSD – are paying greater attention to this sort of 'investment approach'. It should also be more important because other agencies are likely to accept that these offenders should be prioritised for housing and community-based health services. Moreover, given that most of the actuarial cost to society is concentrated in a relatively small proportion of the population, these offenders and their families may well be priority 'clients' for the other social and justice sector agencies – making it easier for Corrections to enlist the support of these agencies in helping prevent reoffending.

3 Better assessment of reoffending risk in the prison system

There has been a successful transition from sentence management, which focused on sentence compliance, towards offender-centric case management within the prison system, focusing on the needs of the offender to reduce the potential for reoffending. Case management now includes the assessment of dynamic risk using the SDAC-21 evaluation tool. A further development that will be valuable should be enhanced theoretical and operating synergy between static and dynamic risk assessment. In our report we recommended, "the extant risk of reoffending assessment tool (RoC*RoI) used within prisons needs to be supplemented and developed to incorporate dynamic risk assessment". In fact, the new dynamic tool SDAC-21 is additional.

DRAOR is a tool used to assess the 'dynamic' risk of community-based offenders. It focuses on an individual's likelihood of reoffending and the risk of harm to the community. It is different from SDAC-21 by virtue of its community focus.

We encountered a large array of risk assessments during our site visits and interviews. The static RoC*RoI used in prisons is complemented by the dynamic risk assessment SDAC-21. Once released on probation, DRAOR would be used to assess the dynamic risk of offenders in the community. While in prison, a different system would be used to identify security risk classification and this in turn would affect availability of access to various programmes. Several different risks assessments are associated with various rehabilitation and integration programmes.

While we acknowledge the different context of each of these tools, we feel that there is risk of inefficiency and confusion, and that this bias towards multiple risk assessment mitigates against offender-centric case management. We believe there would be value in developing a more integrated system of risk assessment, with core and additional contextual risk assessment focused on the offender.

4 End-to-end offender case management

Case managers now work at all prison sites and with both remand and sentenced prisoners. This is a significant change from the sentence planning system, which was on its way out when we did our original review. Case managers now provide complete support for the prisoner, where previously there would have been sentence planning, parole assessment reports, social workers, release-to-work coordinators and reintegration case workers all engaging (or not) with offenders. The purpose is to reduce reoffending and increase public safety through leading the multi-disciplinary approach to offender management. Engagement is based on risk, need and responsivity principles. The model is a good illustration of the shift in philosophy towards risk and need that we advocated in the Four-year Excellence Horizon section of the PIF report.

The interface with probation and prisons is significantly enhanced, with clear responsibilities of case managers and probation officers. Probation officers now engage with prisoners before release, and the working relationship between case managers and probation officers seems effective. We experienced a Reflective Practice session in regard to one offender about to be released. It involved the case manager, probation officer, local Police, CYF and service providers in a way that illustrated effective end-to-end offender case management.

Whereas end-to-end case management theory and practice is well developed, end-to-end offender information is not. Information sharing between prisons and probation is now in place (it was not at our last visit) but access is not easy because of different formats. Electronic information into other agencies is in its infancy. In the Reflective Practice meeting we participated in, much reliance was placed on individual knowledge, yet the offender was well known to government agencies having been in CYF or Corrections' care for a long time. While we recognise the value of individual first-hand knowledge, there is risk in this lack of shared information. The equivalent of a business CRM (customer relationship management) system is needed. Not only will this enhance efficiency, it will improve the ability to provide offender-centric services and reduce risk through enhanced information sharing.

5 More staff engagement

The weakest area identified in this PIF Review was staff engagement with Corrections, versus engagement with their work. Turning this around still represents a huge opportunity for Corrections.

The 2013 Staff Survey is telling a similar and very clear story. The weakest areas of the Survey – and the biggest gaps with State Sector benchmarks – point to the need to lift basic management skills of frontline leaders. There were concerns about the inability to deal effectively with poor performance (with the related idea of holding people accountable for conduct breaches actually declining since the 2011 Survey), and about recognising and rewarding good performance. The biggest gaps with the State Sector benchmark are in the areas of reward and recognition, my line manager and my team. Tellingly, scores on both visible leadership and engagement are lowest at the lowest level in the hierarchy, ie, tier 7 and tier 8. The Survey's key recommendations are to help tier 4 managers see where their units fit and build the basic management skills of frontline leaders:

“The behaviours and effectiveness of frontline leaders have a widespread impact on the workforce. The 2013 Survey results reveal the need to up-skill these leaders in basic management capability ...” (page 12)

Corrections has recently undertaken a number of initiatives aimed at improving its leadership capability. For example, the visible leadership initiative, which covers 800 staff, and the well designed and carefully targeted emerging leaders programme. Changes to the operating model in prisons, especially the roll out of the Right Track programme, and a stronger regional focus on responding to the Survey should all help.

However, given the size of the opportunity and the apparent correlation to performance, these changes on their own may not be sufficient and will take some time to bear fruit. Some of the suggestions in the PIF Review need to be given more weight. In particular, an increased focus on raising expectations on management to manage, provide managers with the support to lift their performance and then hold them more clearly accountable, including for lifting staff engagement. Managers will need to work harder to overcome some of the difficult features of the work environment, like shift work. Now that the new structure has been established, it is a good time to see if it is possible to reduce the number of supervisory tiers, which helps two way communications up and down the hierarchy (see the CEO focus, part 3, page 18).

6 Better integrated, one team approach

In our PIF report we wrote, “Reducing reoffending should be the business of everyone in the Department and the structure needs to encourage an integrated approach to this task”. We are impressed that this principle has been fundamentally embraced within the organisation design and the operating model and, most importantly, within staff attitude. There is active cooperation and collaboration across Corrections, including between prisons and probation.

We recommended:

“Getting this integration right needs to be informed by the people on the ground who must make it work day in and day out. ... In particular, solutions should be offender centric, with case management being delivered as seamlessly as possible from pre-sentence through to post-release. Common mandatory requirements should be kept to the minimum to protect safety and security, with scope for case officers and managers to tailor interventions based on dynamic risk assessments to better meet the situation of individual offenders”.

We are pleased to report that we experienced excellent progress on this recommendation.

However, there remains large differences in performance and staff engagement across the various sites. The next stage of development of ‘One Team’ should be towards collaboration for shared learning to reduce this variation and bring the lower performers to the level of the best. We were encouraged in this regard by the recent development of the ‘Well Functioning Site’ review that focuses on site-specific reviews, benchmarking and shared learning.

7 Outcome relationship contracting with providers

The PIF report noted that while Corrections had a strong capability managing third party custodial services, its relationship with community-based providers "... is still transactional and needs to become more relationship based and focused on building mutual capability and on delivering outcomes [rather than services or capacity]".

Corrections has made substantial progress in addressing this area and is firmly on the right track. There has been an increasing emphasis on outcome-based and alliance-style contracting, ie, engaging early with providers to understand what they can do and how best to structure the relationship so that both parties work together to achieve the desired outcome. For example, Corrections is open to changing its practices where those constrain the provider's ability to achieve the desired outcomes: like reduced reoffending, increased offender employment, offender educational achievement and so on. Corrections has sought innovation, learnt from its providers, and adopted useful ideas more widely across its network, eg, the Out of Gate initiative. Corrections has been prepared to engage a new set of provider partners when required to facilitate the move to a more innovative, outcomes-based contract, with an alliance operating style.

There are some lessons in here for other State Sector agencies. We have been particularly impressed with Corrections' management of the Wiri PPP: in particular, its willingness to properly resource the engagement up front and maintain the same team from bid specification, through negotiation and into the early stages of operation.

Looking forward, we support the aim of managing more of provider relationships on this outcome-based and alliance-style approach and to gradually increase the proportion of provider payments dependent on outcomes being delivered, ie, sharing more of the outcome risk with providers when appropriate. That will encourage innovation in both provider and departmental practice.

The next step is to look at incorporating more of this approach into the programmes delivered in prisons, notably the drug and alcohol programmes, and to increase the emphasis on outcomes in programmes delivered by Corrections' own staff, who are genuinely interested in the outcomes of the work they do but receive little regular feedback on what happens to offenders once they leave prison.

In the section below on improving staff safety we explore the tension that can be created by the different roles Corrections has to play with respect to some providers (MECF in this case) and suggest how these tensions might be eased.

8 Improved sector relationships

Sector relationships have improved since the PIF Review but still have a long way to go before the benefits of collaboration are fully realised in terms of collective impact.

It seems reasonable that there is a correlation between reduced reoffending and reduced crime and this is the pattern that appears to be emerging across various regions. While it is not clear whether the actions of Police or Corrections have had most impact, it is reasonable to assume that part of the success in reducing reoffending is the result of the justice sector agencies pulling in the same direction.

Indeed, the degree of collaboration between these agencies on the ground was much more developed than was evidenced at the time of the earlier PIF Review and in some areas, like the Hutt Valley, has developed to the point where it is likely to be self-sustaining because it is helping these

agencies achieve their individual and collective goals day-to-day. Moreover, in this particular case, other agencies (like MSD) and private providers (like the Out of Gate providers) are working closely at the local level and on an offender-centric basis. The next step is to ensure that learning from locations, like the Hutt Valley are shared and adopted more widely across the country.

We are also seeing substantially more engagement between the justice sector agencies and the social sector agencies: like MSD, Ministry of Health (MOH) and Housing New Zealand (HNZC). For example, the relationship with MSD and HNZC was almost non-existent at the time of the original PIF Review; these agencies are now working with Corrections in developing policy that will help address the problems associated with finding appropriate housing for offenders on release from prison. However, as the section below on cross-cutting housing and health issues suggests, these agencies have much further to go before we see the required degree of collective impact.

9 Sharing the story

A new work programme on telling the story commenced in July 2013. A plan was launched at the leaders' forum in August. The objectives are to shift public perception and increase understanding in regard to the reduction in reoffending rationale and success, to emphasise the commitment to enabling offenders to safely return to the community and enhance understanding of the role and contribution of probation. The core strategy is to engage all Corrections' staff as storytellers and ambassadors. Our experience on site visits and interviews was that this is likely to be very effective as key messages were widely shared, understood and communicated by staff.

A further pillar of the plan is to identify current stakeholders and actively engage with them to tell the story. A nice example of this was the engagement with Chef Martin Bosley through the 'Wellington on a Plate festival'. This is an annual event in which Rimutaka Prison participated for the first time in 2013. Martin Bosley was persuaded to train prisoners to prepare and serve meals at Rimutaka Prison and the Staff College at three events – 60 stakeholders and two groups of 75 and 80 members of the public. The dinners were hugely popular with excellent feedback. Initially resistant, the experience changed Bosley's perspective and he is now an advocate for rehabilitation and is keen to be involved in next year's festival. The idea could perhaps be extended to other regions and food events. It is an excellent example of celebrity advocacy and sharing the story through direct experience. The intention is that the stakeholder engagement project will become business as usual, with targets factored into planning and performance management.

Other initiatives include the development of a customer relationship database for stakeholder engagement, due to be live in March next year, and the national development of communication collateral with local content. Regional communications advisors have been appointed and media strategy developed. The recent TV 3 Campbell Live feature on Corrections was a positive story based on a confident approach of enabling Campbell to go anywhere and talk to staff, who consistently, and without prompting, shared the reduce reoffending message.

Corrections has a crisis communication plan and system, which was tested during the 2013 Spring Hill riot. Effective communication throughout this serious and high-risk event helped ensure that positive lessons were learned and the public were reassured by an effective response.

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CEO FOCUS AREAS NOT COVERED ABOVE THAT MAY IMPACT SUCCESS

1 Progress with both ensuring sentence compliance and reducing reoffending

This is covered in the Performance Challenge section on page 8.

2 Progress on improving staff safety

Staff safety has been identified as an important focus area for Corrections. The number of serious assaults on staff is significantly higher in the last two years than in the previous three and the number of serious assaults by prisoners on prisoners increased in 2012/13 from the prior year, which was high relative to the previous three years. This is cause for concern.

An Expert Advisory Panel on Staff Safety has been appointed and a staff safety plan 'Keeping Each Other Safe' was launched at the August 2013 Corrections Leaders Forum. The vision adopted is to create an environment where staff and offenders can interact without violence. There is also a focus on broader health, safety and wellbeing functions within the plan. A staff safety week was held in October 2013 to highlight plan engagement.

Initiatives include Safety in the Community, Staff Working in High Risk Areas, New Corrections Officers, Personal Safety Guidelines, Physical Readiness Assessment, Post Incident Support, Anti Violence Campaign, Equipment Review, Probation, Duress, Communications and Home Visit Practice. The plan is comprehensive and is based on co-creation with key Corrections' leaders and staff representatives and outside technical experts. Although implementation is recent, there seems to be good engagement and we witnessed the impactful 'we don't tolerate violence' suite of posters widely in evidence in the sites we visited.

We met with advisory panel members and key staff involved in leading the safety project. The thought, commitment, care and 'one team' working was evident and exemplary; except for one aspect.

We asked the assembled experts about safety at the private providers – currently MECF and in future Wiri. While Corrections' Safety Expert Panel has a Serco representative, the department's role and responsibilities in ensuring compliance was not clear. The consensus seemed to be that Corrections' safety considerations did not apply and that this would be something dealt with through contracting. We don't think this can be the complete answer for a number of reasons:

- a At the heart of the notion of the nation state is 'the legitimate use of force'. Offenders have a right to expect that when the State uses force to impose sentences on them they can expect an appropriate level of safety. Corrections contracts and monitors the work of its outsource partners and ultimate accountability for safety therefore would seem to us to rest with Corrections.
- b MECF is managed on behalf of the New Zealand Government. While there is an explicit clause in the Serco contract to run a safe prison, it behoves Corrections as a monitor to ensure this is the case. A key piece of reasoning to support the implementation of PPP contracts within Corrections was the potential for innovation: ie, the ability to learn from Serco's different operating model. Closer interaction on safety principles and standards could be mutually beneficial.

We understand that it may be inappropriate for Corrections to impose its safety system on Serco, as this could inhibit the innovation and cost-effectiveness considerations that prompted the contract in the first place. On the other hand, this does not obviate the obligation of the leadership of Corrections to ensure Serco is operating a safe prison.

We recommend that Corrections' safety principles, policies and plans be discussed with Serco with a view to shared learning and that Serco be asked to provide explicit information on how it addresses safety risk for staff and offenders, both in theory and in practice.

3 How the organisation design has progressed, especially the reduction in tiers and the extent to which this has helped address communication flows

At the time of our last visit, the new organisation design had been promulgated and was about to be implemented. We applauded the structural changes as aligned to the strategy of offender-centric end-to-end case management, with a new emphasis on integration, all with a view to a radical reduction in reoffending. Merging Rehabilitation and Reintegration was consistent with this strategy as was the closer interrelationship of prisons and probation. We also welcomed the move towards regionalisation to move managers closer to the sites. This move also reduced the number of tiers, clarified reporting relationships, enabled local empowerment and sped up communications flows. The new leadership team that emerged from the changes appears to us as strong, aligned and committed to the performance challenge, direction and strategy.

A cameo example of the spirit of putting managers closer to the people they manage, was the change at Rimutaka prison in moving unit managers back to the units from the central office area.

The implementation of the new structure was text book in execution. We hope a case study will be written about the process and the learnings to inform other agencies within the State Services where such changes have not always been managed so well.

We believe further attention may be appropriate to the number of tiers, especially at the levels closer to direct offender engagement. We note eight tiers in the Staff Engagement Survey, with the bottom two tiers least engaged. Six tiers or layers should be sufficient for a 9000 person organisation, so there may be one or two tiers too many. Extra tiers can add to complexity, reduce communications flows and empowerment and inhibit innovation and offender-centric judgement based decision-making. As Corrections moves towards standards-based as opposed to rules-based judgement and personal responsibility, the need for multiple layers of supervision recedes and indeed can be both expensive and counterproductive. We recommend this further stage of organisation redesign be explored.

4 Work on staff engagement

This is covered in section 5, page 13, More Staff Engagement.

5 Effective contracting with private sector providers' progress with developing alternative models for contracting elsewhere in the public sector

This is covered in section 7, page 14, Outcome Relationship Contracting with Providers, which also draws out some of the lessons from the Wiri experience and in applying the outcomes-based and alliance-style of contracting to the delivery of social services by private providers (an approach that is probably most mature in the procurement of highway infrastructure by New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)).

6 How can government agencies and other partners from the private and voluntary sectors work more effectively in cross-cutting reintegration/rehabilitation issues such as accommodation and mental health?

Successful integration into the community is more likely if the offender can form pro-social relationships and hold down a job. That often depends on finding stable accommodation in the right place, with access to community health services that are a natural extension of the help they have received to manage mental health and addiction problems while serving their sentence.

Some of the people we spoke to also suggested that lack of suitable accommodation on release from prison may also delay parole, making it difficult to reduce the muster and fully realise the potential savings from reduced crime and reoffending.

Difficulty finding appropriate accommodation and in referring offenders to community-based health services are already a constraint on effective integration of offenders into the community. While they are receiving attention in the inter-departmental process, this will need to be accelerated to avoid housing and community health becoming serious constraints on the ability to scale the Department's integration initiatives.

On the housing side, Corrections estimates that about 650 prisoners have unmet housing needs on release from prison (with no estimate of the status of those on community-based sentences who will be housed, albeit in circumstances that may not be conducive to reducing reoffending). These offenders typically do not meet the current criteria for State housing and, in any event, the State housing stock is not well configured for this group (largely single males who need smaller units). That points to the need to be able to access private- and community-owned housing stock, which will be a lot easier if offenders were eligible for income-related rent subsidies. This will require some policy change, including a reconsideration of the access and prioritisation criteria. This will be administered by MSD from April 2014 and it would make sense to reconsider the current approach to 'housing needs assessment' in the light of a broader investment approach that gives more focus to those who would otherwise impose greatest cost on the community over their lifetimes. This gives extra impetus to the PIF recommendation that Corrections explores adopting more of an investment (actuarial) approach to targeting its interventions (see section 2, page 11, on Better Targeting of Interventions).

Mental health in prisons and to a lesser extent, in probation settings was highlighted as a concern in our original PIF report. There seems to have been an improvement in acute service provision but there is still an unacceptably long waiting list for prisoners with acute mental health needs (it can be three months or more), who therefore have to be cared for within prison. This is not seen to be an appropriate therapeutic environment for someone who is acutely unwell. Further engagement with District Health Boards (DHBs) and the MOH has commenced and increased inpatient services have already reduced waiting lists and times, for example, five new beds have been provided by Capital and Coast DHB). We were impressed with the High Dependency Unit at Rimutaka.

To make up for this acute and ongoing shortfall of beds, we wonder whether an acute mental health facility could be developed by Corrections, with provision of specialist clinicians from the DHBs. We understand that the Auckland East Prison Redevelopment Project will provide for the development of a mental health facility with services to try to reduce the need for prisoners to transfer to inpatient facilities and to support their reintegration to mainstream units and, eventually, the community. The Waitemata DHB and the MOH are fully engaged and supportive of this project.

Corrections identified it was not doing primary mental health care well enough and instigated a number of changes. These include a mental health screening tool on reception, primary mental health training for nurses and the commencement of mental health 101 training for custodial officers. The identification of at-risk prisoners is now a joint health and custodial decision at two pilot sites – Spring Hill and Whanganui – and the plan is to move this approach to all at-risk units. Days in at-risk units and self-harm measures are both going down.

Health and mental health screening applies equally to remand and sentenced prisoners. We sense good progress in this area within prisons but there is need for more work and momentum in regard to getting the right mental health provision for offenders supervised by probation services or who integrate back with the community without conditions the Out of Gate service should help with this for those who avail themselves of the service. Mental health and addiction services are separated at the moment. We recommend that consideration is given to closer integration.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS/EMPHASIS ARISING FROM OUR FIELD STUDIES AND INTERVIEWS

Learning organisation

Corrections is rich with current and historical data about prisoners, offenders managed in the community and staff and site performance. But with the exception of some publications, such as the Offender Volumes Reports, in the past these data have not been effectively converted to comprehensive, accessible and useful information. Information silos have hitherto existed, most notably between the core prisons and probation functions and between Corrections and other agencies with relationships to offenders. This is changing and the policy to enable sharing is in place, although technology, accessibility and analytical issues need to be addressed

A development pathway for the provision of accessible end-to-end offender-centric information exists and there are rich opportunities for enhanced efficiency, as well as more targeted offender engagement and intervention to reduce reoffending.

We are less sanguine about the development of a learning organisation culture in which insight is systematically developed from information to provide opportunities for innovation and continuous improvement. We encourage greater curiosity about 'why'. For example, there are significant differences in performance and staff engagement across the various sites throughout Corrections' estate. There also appears to be close correlation between staff engagement and performance. To us, this data raises important questions of why and what can we learn about what's working well in the high-performing sites and not so well in the less-performing sites. From this learning we may be able to innovate for improvement. We expected to hear a theory or at least a set of hypotheses about why this pattern exists but we didn't really even hear speculation. We encourage greater curiosity. On the positive side, we were encouraged by the Well Functioning Site benchmark and review initiative, which should provide the context for multi-site performance improvement. We were informed of two recent pieces of analysis examining differences in reconviction outcomes, one looking at between-region and district differences and the other (ongoing) examining differences in recidivism rate reductions between community-managed offenders and released prisoners. More analysis is intended. We encourage both the conduct of this work and sharing widely within the organisation.

Our site visits led us to realise the paucity of reoffending information to frontline officers and their thirst for this information. It is valuable to them in terms of motivational feedback when offenders do well and informational feedback on the circumstances that may have led to further offending. This may in turn lead to practice innovation.

We also were keen to learn of practical research about the effectiveness of offender-centric interventions. Our enquiries pointed to the multi-year research project with Victoria University of Wellington looking at graduates of special treatment programmes. Research and Evaluation also has a research project under way that involves in-depth interviews with a sample of 50 who by age 21 were assessed as higher-risk offenders but who did not go on to commit further crime. This research is intended to reveal 'what went right' and enables former offenders to avoid going on to a long-term offending pathway. While we applaud this kind of analytical research, we believe that in addition a new breed of research, combining qualitative analysis derived from staff with knowledge of offenders as individuals and quantitative data undertaken real time, may lead to Corrections' programme-specific insight or revelations. Qualitative research methods such as focus groups,

appreciative enquiry and case stories may lead to insights that are complementary to those obtained through quantitative/statistical analysis. There are positive developments along these lines. For example, Out of Gate is running survival factor learning.

Much of the research to date, both within Corrections and the literature, has focused on the effectiveness of programmes. As Corrections moves towards a more offender centric and integrated approach to needs provision and rehabilitation and integration intervention, the programme approach may have to be complemented by offender-centric research.

Corrections is some way from being a learning organisation. Changes in technology, attitude, curiosity and methodology will be necessary to accelerate momentum to achieve this element of the performance excellence horizon.

Availability of drug and alcohol intervention

We emphasise the importance of this key aspect of rehabilitation and integration and encourage ongoing innovation and development.

Since our last visit, alcohol and drug interventions for offenders in prison have been expanded to include Brief and Intermediate Support Programmes as well as Intensive eight-week interventions. This expansion has more than tripled the available places for Alcohol and Other Drugs (AOD) treatment in prisons. ASIST screening of all prisoners, in combination with the new programmes, has enabled individuals to be directed to interventions of appropriate intensity to address their level of problematic substance use. Places on AOD interventions will further increase in the next financial year (2014/15) with the possibility of the eight-week intensive treatment programme being expanded to additional sites.

We visited the drug treatment unit at Rimutaka Prison and were impressed by the set up and the commitment of the staff. Staff gave us the impression that there is insufficient availability of drug and alcohol addiction treatment and not everyone gets what they need when they need it. One estimate was that > 70% of offenders have some form of drug or alcohol addiction or misuse problem. Given this significant relationship between alcohol and crime, especially violent crime and the likelihood of reoffending, this issue warrants continuing priority attention, including ensuring that security classifications do not impede appropriate intervention.

A great deal has been achieved since our last visit. More places, and a range of offender-appropriate interventions, are now available and evaluative tools are used to assess offenders at reception in terms of the level of help they may need. This may range from brief interventions by probation officers or case managers that support people to think about their behaviour and make positive change through self-reflection and awareness, through to a full six-month programme run by specialist providers in a drug treatment unit. While not all prisoners will get the treatment they need when they need it, it seems that case managers do work with programme schedulers to optimise the use of time within a sentence. It is important that the many positive new developments, interventions and pathways, together with the roll-out plan, are widely understood by staff.

The more problematic area seemed to us to be the pathways for provision of drug and alcohol service in the community for people released on probation or released without conditions but in need of drug or alcohol rehabilitation assistance. Brief and intermediate AOD programmes delivered by departmental staff are also available for community offenders. Although it varies by region, in most regions the DHBs provide drug and alcohol treatment for only the top few percent of those most in need. Additional funds have recently been assigned to DHBs to fund this provision but it

doesn't seem to be working. It may be better if these funds were assigned to Corrections specifically to meet the needs of offenders, as the return on investment in reducing their dependence while within the care of probation services would be high. There does not appear to be a systematic way in which Corrections can get the drug or alcohol treatment assistance offenders need. The Out of Gate service will provide navigation assistance for the small number of people able to avail themselves of this service but what is needed are better pathways, provision when needed and enhanced information of how to access.

Alcohol and addiction seem to be included in a number of programmes, for example, the Drug Treatment Unit (DTU) and Special Treatment Unit Rehabilitative Programme (STURP). There is commonality; see below for a discussion on whether there can be a more integrated approach to service provision.

Improving the collective impact of sector collaboration

Section 8, page 15, Improved Sector Relationships noted that while real progress had been made, more needed to be done to enhance collective impact and make that more common and enduring.

Part of the increase in effective collaboration we have seen has come from the shared Better Public Services (BPS) goals and the more consistent and coherent messages from Ministers and senior officials that have created an expectation that these collective goals are a priority and will only be delivered by working better together.

Making effective collaboration common and enduring requires that these common goals now be supported by changes in the relevant agencies' operating models. In particular, a 'client-centred' approach needs to be more common place, with an agreed approach to clients who should be prioritised and/or which combination of the various 'interventions' available to each agency are best used in different situations.

Many of the elements that would improve agencies' collective impact now exist:

- a There is greater understanding of the extent to which different agencies are spending most of their time and effort on the same set of clients.
- b There is also increasing interest in taking an investment approach aimed at focusing more attention on earlier intervention for the group of clients who are likely to impose the highest cost on the community over their lifetimes, in an attempt to help those people become more independent and productive.
- c More of the social sector and justice agencies are becoming more 'client-centric' and strengthening their investment in, and understanding of, the type of case management required to bring this to life.
- d These agencies are also looking to work more closely with a similar set of private sector partners who are themselves more willing to take the sort of outcome risk that aligns their incentives and encourages innovation and collaboration.
- e Agencies are more willing to share information at the same time as technology makes it far easier to turn that information into useful intelligence that helps identify the right intervention to be applied to the right client at the right time.

Harnessing these elements and reflecting them in improved agency operating models will help to make the effective collaborations we are seeing from some talented and committed individuals in some agencies and in some locations more common and enduring.

Holistic approach to intervention

A lot of progress has been made on end-to-end offender-centric case management. The integration service, especially Out of Gate, is operating holistically to address offender needs. But rehabilitation still has a strong programme emphasis.

From our backgrounds in customer service, we are familiar with the continuum from fully tailor made consulting services to pre-packaged off-the-shelf services. Corrections has been at the pre-packaged end but the more offender centric the philosophy, the more the need to shift towards tailor made. Few customer service providers can afford to operate at the tailor made consulting end, and even those that appear to, manage their offerings through configurable templates and modules and accessible domain knowledge. Out of Gate appears to be tailor made but for it to be economically delivered, we anticipate that providers will need to configure replicable modules for each of the pillars that can then be delivered in an offender-centric manner.

Further work could be undertaken to create modules for use within Rehabilitation to develop an integrated services suite that could then be configured to the needs of each offender when they need it. For example, NZTE has recently undertaken a work programme to reconfigure its service offerings from a list of programmes delivered to a suite of integrated services designed to meet customer needs based on an agreed pathway. An approach along these lines would put the needs of the offender before the needs of the programme. Duplication and overlap would be reduced or eliminated except to the extent that it has therapeutic value. Sequencing would be enhanced to create maximum value based on principles of service design. Value stream mapping may assist in eliminating wasted activity or processes. As well as efficiency gains this has the potential to enhance offender engagement, participation and success.

WHAT MIGHT THE NEXT PERFORMANCE CHALLENGE BE?

The PIF Follow-up Reviews have been asked to consider what New Zealand needs from the agency in future and, therefore, what its next Performance Challenge might be.

The enduring contribution that Corrections can make is to maintain the integrity and improve the performance of the justice sector. There will, therefore, always be a requirement to maintain a high level of sentence compliance, and to do that in a way that meets society's expectations for the treatment of victims and offenders, as well as consistent improvements in value for money.

While economic performance is expected to improve, it is difficult to see that translating into a significantly less constrained fiscal environment. Indeed, the most likely outcome is that a tightening labour market generates strong wage pressure that cannot be accommodated by increasing Crown funding. There will, therefore, be an increasing need to find significant savings to absorb that pressure and invest in reducing reoffending.

Once the current reoffending reduction target is delivered, further improvements in justice sector performance are likely to require more emphasis on reducing the harm that reoffending causes. An increased focus on 'harm' will require better targeting of effort on those who are most likely to be dissuaded from what would otherwise be a life of crime. It would also see more weight given to the most harmful type of offending and to reducing the seriousness of offending in those cases where reoffending did occur. This focus on reducing harm is already evident to some degree in the current Government's emphasis on reducing youth crime and violent crime.

All of these factors suggest that Corrections will need to be able to:

- a continue to innovate and to more quickly both evaluate what is likely to be most effective and then to scale quickly. That will, in turn, require an ability to anticipate and address early any factors that may constrain this effective scaling, eg, lack of appropriate housing is likely to constrain the effective scaling of the Out of Gate initiative in the current environment
- b a greater emphasis on reducing harm will require much better offender-level data and analytics that can predict likely outcomes for different offenders, rather than for different programmes, with even more effective partnerships with both public and private sector organisations. This is essential for those partnerships to be able to target and prioritise the offenders that are most likely to create the most harm over their remaining offending lifetimes
- c develop the use of new and emerging surveillance technologies, eg, GPS tracking and containment and geo spatial information to enable safer community-based sentences and efficient operation
- d become even more effective at converting reduced crime and reoffending rates into lower prison musters and substantial cost savings to meet future cost pressures and to invest in scaling its most effective interventions.

All of these attributes are present to some form, although not yet to the degree required to meet the next Performance Challenge.

CONCLUSION

This has been a rewarding PIF Follow-up Review to conduct because of the extent to which and enthusiasm with which changes have been implemented comprehensively across Corrections. It is one of the most rapid and effective organisation transformation projects that we have experienced. The most impressive aspect is the extent to which the 'reduce reoffending' objective has been embraced. This gives us considerable confidence that the target will be met.

We have made a series of recommendations for action to ensure that the sentence compliance, reduce reoffending and value-for-money aspects of the performance challenge are confidently achieved and to equip the organisation for progress towards the next challenge.

We advocate a continuing emphasis on further reduction in reoffending and factoring in the harm that offending causes for the next Performance Challenge.

Our sincere thanks go to the leadership team and the staff of Corrections for their help and assistance in the conduct of this review and for the constructive and enlightening conversations that we had in response to our enquiries.

Dr Mike Pratt
Lead Reviewer

Dr Murray Horn
Lead Reviewer

