INNOVATIONS IN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES AN EXCURSION THROUGH THE CHANGING PRISONS CULTURE OF VICTORIA

*John Brian Griffin**

ABSTRACT

Victorian prisons have witnessed significant changes over the past decade: from 1988 when there were a multitude of inquiries into prisoner incidents, deaths and corruption, through the turbulent beginnings of unit and individual prisoner management, to the creation of statewide Drug, Violence and Sex Offender Strategies and the contracting out of key services-culminating in the privitisation of 45% of the prisoner population and the closure of old prison stock.

For CORE- the Public Correctional Enterprise, Victoria's public corrections agency, the journey has been one of significant organisational and cultural change, and progression to a learning organisation. This is clearly reflected in the way we manage prisoners. "Just gaols" have at their foundation, professional staff-prisoner relationships and the empowerment of staff and prisoners. They welcome scrutiny and challenges to old practices.

Marked changes in culture and prisoner management mean that prisoners have a greater opportunity to return to the community with more skills. The challenge ahead however is to achieve the rhetoric of rehabilitation and demonstrate to the community that we have a system that 'works'.

* Chief Executive Officer, Core-the Public Correctional Enterprise, Department of Justice, Australia.

"Pain is an enduring feature of the correctional enterprise. We must accept this hard reality, and quite explicitly attempt to promote growth through adversity. This is a genuine correctional agenda. For men who cope maturely with prison, I will argue, are men who have grown as human beings and been rehabilitated in the process."

(Johnson, 1996, p.97)

I. INTRODUCTION

The tendency to use imprisonment as a punishment for crime has risen and fallen over the years, depending on the attitude of the courts, and the public's tolerance of crime. Despite the differing views and opinions people hold of imprisonment, it will remain an important feature of sentencing in the foreseeable future. Rightly or wrongly, in Australia, the community still sees imprisonment as the most effective way of protecting itself from fears. Nevertheless, to the community, imprisonment is a double edge sword: on the one side it offers protection, through deterrence and incapacitation; and on the other, it is expensive and damaging to the community, possibly causing an escalation in crime among many individuals who are eventually released.

Imprisonment emerged as a major form of punishment for crimes during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, coinciding with the period of "Enlightenment" in Europe and the

industrial revolution, replaced earlier forms of punishment that took their toll upon physical pain and social embarrassment.

The early aim of imprisonment was to achieve the "moral salvation" of the offender through the provision of harsh, deterrent and retributive justice. Prison programs, such as they were, facilitated this aim by providing hard labour and religious indoctrination.

By the mid 20th century, the aims of reformation and rehabilitation had come to be given equal status to those of deterrence and retribution. In the 1950s and 1960s the belief that the purpose of imprisonment included the "treatment and training" of prisoners had become fully established and accepted by the wider community.

Under this "treatment model", programs in the State of Victoria multiplied and there was a general feeling that prisons could succeed in rehabilitating offenders. Psychiatric services were introduced in the early 1950s. Parole was introduced in 1955 in order to allow "rehabilitated" prisoners the benefit of early (conditional) release. Training prisons were identified based on the theory that a strong work ethic in the prison system would produce rehabilitated offenders. The classification system was adopted by Victoria as a means of differentiating prisoners according to their different treatment needs.

In the mid 1970s the feeling of optimism began to change for two reasons. Firstly, the publication of a report by Lipton, Martinson and Wilkes (1975) which seriously questioned the efficacy of the treatment models. After examining the evaluation reports of 231 correctional programs in the US, dating from 1945 to 1967, the researchers concluded that "*with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have no appreciable effect on recidivism*".

Secondly, after a series of incidents and enquiries (such as the Jenkinson Inquiry in 1972) there was a general recognition that prisoners were citizens with legally enforceable rights. There was a time when a prison conviction often meant "civil death", a cruel form of punishment expressly acknowledging a prisoner's permanent removal from free society. It is now argued that prisoners should be entitled to the same rights as a free citizen, except where the nature of the confinement necessarily requires modification.

These two developments led to the "justice model" of punishment and to the notion of the purpose of imprisonment as being "humane containment". This view has been sustained since the 1980s and is still current today. There was during this "justice model" era an increasing emphasis on physical security and a growing concentration on prisoners' rights, rather than their needs. The rhetoric of treatment and training had had its day. Programs were provided for prisoners to access only if they wished. Correctional agencies did not perceive that they had any responsibility for encouraging prisoners to undertake programs. The belief was that only properly motivated prisoners would benefit from participation in prion programs.

It is clear that prison programs in an historical sense through the "justice model" have focused on the "rehabilitation" of the offender; ensuring the prisoner does not reoffend after release. Even during the humane containment era, prison programs were conceived of as being related to the prisoner's capacity to cease reoffending. They were viewed cynically by the majority

of correctional practitioners for this very reason. The evidence suggested that programs could not succeed in rehabilitating offenders. Prison programs were offered only if prisoners sought them out and expressed a desire to participate. The rhetoric of the time identified it as the prisoner's responsibility to rehabilitate themselves.

Another purpose of prison programs is only just now emerging. Rather than focussing solely on the goal of rehabilitation and therefore "outwards" and into the future, prison programs are increasingly focussing "inwards" and upon the present and upon the goal of providing positive and effective custodial management. This is what is termed as "positive custody".

Building upon the humane containment era, the "positive custody" model recognises that imprisonment can be "criminogenic" or can increase the likelihood of future crime and can promote immature coping behaviours by prisoners. Prison programs as part of the "positive custody" can enhance the safe and secure management of prisons and promote the development of mature coping skills which are equally relevant within and on release from prison.

Achieving Positive Custody-Prison systems can intensify the social conditions that lead to offending behaviour. For instance prisons have the potential to:
- *Alienate* prisoners by failing to give them any say in the management of their lives and by removing them from their normal environment;
- *disempower* prisoners by failing to provide adequate and accessible information about the system and the way that it works;
- *bore prisoners* by failing to provide activities that effectively occupy their time;
- provide *opportunities* for crime by failing to provide adequate supervision or the means for prisoners to be safe or to protect their personal belongings;
- promote *sub-cultural norms* by failing to provide adequate supervision or the means for prisoners to be safe or to protect their personal belongings;
- promote continued *poverty* by failing to provide prosocial leadership and by allowing gangs to be maintained in prisons;
- reinforce *patriarchal social norms* by having a majority of male staff and prisoners with no active consideration of the needs of female staff or prisoners; and
- promote undesirable outcomes of *deinstitutionalisation* by failing to involve relevant agencies in the supervision of the psychiatrically ill or intellectually disabled.

In order to achieve positive custody, prisons should emulate within their walls the society that is not "criminogenic". To do so, prisons must adopt community standards as a base but at the same time be less alienating, more empowering, more constructive and more egalitarian.

Managing people within prisons is a complex affair. Complex, because invariably it involves the need to balance a number of conflicting needs and aims. Stakeholder analysis has shown my organisation, CORE-the Public Correctional Enterprise, that these needs and aims are described as:

> "custody, safety, crime prevention, deterrence, reform, containment, control, incapacitation, punishment, retribution, restraint, rehabilitation, constructive activity, justness, therapy and training".

Johnson (1996) argues strongly that a traditional hierarchal system of prison

management "conditions" those associated with it, that includes both staff and prisoners, to cope "immaturely". He goes on to say that modern prison systems should be re-structured in such a way as to encourage what he calls "mature coping".

Certainly to become more effective, imprisonment must continue to offer the protection of incapacitation and deterrence but at the same time it must lessen the harmful effects of the experience. Biles (1992) argues that the totality of the experience of the prisoner must be considered when developing a regime to manage the offender whilst challenging (and changing) antisocial or criminal behaviour. I strongly believe that good management and leadership can only achieve this.

In terms of management, this means that prison staff must provide prisoners with the opportunity to develop or maintain skills that will enhance their chances of leading a law-abiding lifestyle after their release. Skills that lead the individual to accept greater responsibility, self reliance and self discipline. In terms of leadership it means that prison staff- all prison staff - must serve as strong examples of honesty, fairness, tolerance, patience and understanding. In essence, good management and leadership are the essential features of prison work and are our prime collective responsibility. To fail that responsibility is to fail ourselves and to fail to provide the community with protection beyond the prisoner's term of imprisonment and prisons remain "just gaols".

How does CORE- the Public Correctional Enterprise respond to this challenge? The greatest single endeavour of public corrections in Victoria over the past decade has been to change the culture of our prisons and CORE as a whole. I would like to take you on a brief journey through the significant events in Victorian prisons over the past 10 years that have shaped the management of prisons to go beyond "just gaols". I believe we now have to talk about the challenges ahead and deliver on rehabilitation and harm minimisation strategies.

Probably the blackest day in Victoria's prison history was the death of five prisoners in October 1987 in a fire at Jika Jika, a high security, management unit in Pentridge Prison. On the heels of this tragedy were numerous internal and external inquiries into incidents, deaths, drugs, accountability, corruption and mal-administration within the then Office of Corrections. It was a demanding time for me to take on the responsibilities as the then Director of Prisons, because it was at this time that changes to the way we manage prisoners in Victoria really began in earnest. We are entering the era of humane containment going beyond the concept of "just gaols". In the early 1990s CORE (the then Office of Corrections) developed a framework to encompass all aspects of the prison environment, including regimes, programs and prison "culture" and worked to establish, develop and exploit the synergistic links between each in order to maximise the potential for successful rehabilitation of Victorian prisoners.

What is "rehabilitation"? Complete loss of freedom is the maximum punishment our law permits. The length of time that freedom is lost depends on many factors; the crime, the circumstances, the intention of the offender, prior history, displays of remorse and the plea. The court will also weigh the need for: retribution; specific deterrence; general deterrence; rehabilitation and parsimony. In balancing these considerations, no two cases are exactly the same.

Whilst rehabilitation often implies the restoration of a previous level of functioning, for example learning to walk again after a physical injury, this is not a useful definition when talking about the "rehabilitation" of offenders. Their level of functioning before entering the prison system may not have been conducive to the ultimate goal of prosocial and lawful behaviour. For example, a prisoner may have had poor living and vocational skills prior to incarceration. Thus rehabilitation in the first instance must refer to equipping prisoners for making a living or integrating into the community in a prosocial and lawful manner, and will in many instances involve a gradual process of acquiring new skills and challenging offence related behaviours.

Successful rehabilitation is generally taken to mean that a prisoner will not re-offend after release. This may not always be a realistic goal given that most offenders will need to make substantial attitudinal personality and behavioural changes and develop educational, vocational, social and living skills in order to increase the likelihood that they can successfully maintain themselves in the community. It may therefore be more useful to measure the effectiveness of rehabilitation in terms of altered offending patterns, such as reduced seriousness of offending, or increased time periods of re-offending.

A. The Purpose of Prison Programs

A rehabilitative environment encompasses all aspects of the prison environment, including regimes, programs and prison "culture", and synergistic links between these different facets must be established and exploited in order to maximise the potential for successful rehabilitation. Thus, while programs can make a strong contribution to the achievement of a rehabilitative environment, a broader strategy including: promoting humane and effective management strategies; the successful adoption of unit management, and promoting the input of the programs team into management approaches is crucial to achieving the goal of "positive custody".

The potential contribution of prison programs to achieving these objectives can be summarised under the following headings:

(i) programs which create an environment conductive to rehabilitation:
  • programs which provide basic standards of care;
  • programs which seek to create a rehabilitative environment;
(ii) programs which prepare prisoners to re-enter society:
  • programs which provide prisoners with integration skills;
  • programs which seek to reduce offending behaviour.

Programs which provide basic standards of care and which seek to create a rehabilitative environment should receive the highest priority. Both contribute to the goal of developing a prosocial prison environment, which is conductive to change and to the development of mature coping skills. Programs which prepare prisoners to re-enter society, including those directed towards reducing specific offending behaviour, tend to be more successful within a rehabilitative environment.

These program categories apply equally to male and female prisoners, as well as to special groups within the prison population (such as Aboriginal prisoners and young adults). The different needs of groups of prisoners will be relevant to the design of programs rather than modifying their overall purpose.

II. PROGRAMS WHICH CREATE AN ENVIRONMENT CONDUCTIVE TO REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation and education of offenders is a priority. However, programs targeted towards reducing offending behaviour are best provided in an environment that actively encourages prisoners to use their time constructively, and provides basic standards of care.

A. Programs Which Provide Basic Standards of Care

The first and most important duty of prison administrators must be to provide basic standards of care for prisoners, and such programs must receive the highest priority.

Programs, which fit into this category, include:

- Primary medical and psychiatric care (addressing the physical and mental problems of prisoners).
- Crisis intervention (addressing the immediate needs of distressed or suicidal prisoners).
- Classification programs (achieving safety and security for all prisoners by differentiating between groups of prisoners based on their risk and needs).
- Legal aid (providing prisoners with adequate access to legal representation).

B. Programs Which Seek to Create a Rehabilitative Environment

Creating a positive, rehabilitative environment within the prison system is essential if prisons are to cease being criminogenic in nature, and if the prison conditions are to be conducive to rehabilitation. Prisons should not intensify the social conditions that have lead to criminal behaviour in the first place, but must provide a pro-social environment which:

- is conducive to change;
- challenges rather than supports or accepts offending behaviour;
- provides pro-social modelling;
- minimises harm;
- promotes self-esteem;
- maximises prisoners' self-control and sense of control over their environment and their future;
- encourages prisoners to take responsibility for their actions;
- promotes mature coping skills.

Programs which seek to contribute to a rehabilitative environment can reduce the opportunity for crime to occur within a prison, and can provide a forum in which staff can provide pro-social leadership. Such programs seek to occupy the time of prisoners and so reduce the boredom that may lead to management problems within the prison. These programs may also provide the potential for the acquisition of basic skills and interests that may assist prisoners to undertake more constructive activities and leisure pursuits on their release from prison.

Programs which assist to create a rehabilitative environment include:

- Reception and orientation programs- reception into custody (providing prisoners with information about the prison system and allowing them to learn how to deal positively with the here and now of their imprisonment).
- Reception and orientation programs- transfer between prisons (providing prisoners with information about the prison system, and options for program participation).
- Drug and infectious disease education programs (providing prisoners with information about

drug and alcohol use and infectious diseases).

- Recreation (reducing boredom and promoting productive use of leisure time by providing interesting and pleasurable sporting and hobby activities).
- Contact visits (promoting the maintenance of essential links with family and friends).
- Spirituality (allowing prisoners to receive the support of their faith).
- General welfare and counselling (addressing the welfare needs and problems of prisoners).

III. PROGRAMS WHICH PREPARE PRISONERS TO RE-ENTER SOCIETY

Rehabilitation, education and reform are an integral part of the prison system, and preparing prisoners for constructive and non-violent participation in community life upon their release must be a priority. The prison system must provide opportunities for prisoners to participate in programs, which reduce offending behaviours and encourage citizenship, and must actively support and encourage such participation. Programs which prepare prisoners to re-enter society include programs which provide prisoners with basic skills to facilitate integration, and programs targeted at offending behaviour.

A. Programs Which Provide Prisoners with Integration Skills

Programs targeted at assisting prisoners' reintegration into the community provide the potential for the acquisition of skills that may assist prisoners to pursue education, find employment or use their time in a more constructive manner on their release from prison. Such programs may include;

- Prison industries (promoting work skills and habits through the

provision of rewarding and useful work).
- Education and Training (promoting skills acquisition relevant to the labour market by providing accredited training and basic education for prisoners).
- Release preparation (providing a range of life skills programs that assist the prisoner's return to the community).
- Custodial Community Permit Program (allowing long-term prisoners the opportunity to gradually re-establish family ties and readjust to life in the community prior to their release).
- Community Integration Program (providing prisoners due for release with practical and essential information to assist their reintegration into the community).
- Integration Programs (increasing prisoners' practical living skills necessary to re-enter the community).
- Personal development programs (increasing prisoners' personal and social skills through programs including adventure-based challenge programs, communication skills, social skills, etc).

B. Programs Which Seek to Reduce Offending Behaviour

Programs which seek to reduce offending behaviour will either be related directly to offence types or to underlying problems within the individual that have caused the offending behaviour. Treatment programs and programs targeted at offence-related behaviour include;

- Drug and alcohol treatment programs.
- Sex offender treatment or management programs.
- Violent offender Treatment

Programs.
• Drink-drive programs.

In 1988 F Division, previously a prisoner accommodation unit at Pentridge prison in Melbourne, was developed into a state-wide reception and assessment program centre for all newly received male prisoners entering the Victorian prison system. For the first time, remandees and sentenced prisoners were given a comprehensive induction into the prison system that included medical assessments, screening for risk and providing information about the prison system and options for program participation. In the five years prior to the creation of the reception and assessment program, there had been twenty-six suicides in Victorian prisons. In the five years following the introduction of this program, six prisoners committed suicide.

In 1989 and 1990 three new 250 bed prisons were commissioned in Victoria to replace old facilities. They were the Melbourne Remand Centre, Barwon and Loddon, each with single self-contained cell accommodation. CORE, the Public Correctional Enterprise, manages each of these prisons. Moves to change the infrastructure of our other facilities also began and our large, old divisions where we previously 'warehoused' prisoners were re-furbished into smaller, more manageable and livable units. Sanitation was provided to all prisons, cells re-furbished and large dormitories were replaced by smaller rooms with a maximum of four prisoners.

This was also the time that unit management was borne in Victoria, wherein prisoners were managed in smaller groups, with high levels of interaction between staff and prisoners and the requirement for prisoners to take greater accountability for their lives in prison (Griffin, 1995).

Unit management provided the framework for achieving a positive custodial environment. In a unit managed prison, prisoners have the opportunity to have a say in the management and organisation of their lives through the development of individual management plans in tandem with their supervising prison officer and through unit meetings. They are therefore potentially less alienated by the justice system.

The opportunity to have input into the development of individual management plans and the capacity for prisoners to get to know their supervising prison officers also provides a means for prisoners to have access to information about the way a prison system works.

Under unit management, prisoners are managed in small groups by staff who know them. They receive closer scrutiny and surveillance which leads to increased security, feelings of safety, less opportunity for crime and lessened potential for gang formation and maintenance. Barriers between staff and prisoners are broken down in unit managed prisons so that staff have the capacity to provide prosocial leadership to prisoners.

The Individual Management Plan (IMP) was also created as part of Unit Management. This is a file in which all information pertaining to the prisoner's sentence, management and participation in industry, education and programs was detailed. Prison officers are trained to broaden their traditional roles to include prisoner assessment and orientation, individual management planning, general welfare and counseling, and recreational planning.

All of these initiatives helped tremendously in our endeavour to work

towards a safe, secure, humane and just environment for both prisoners and staff. Prisoners began to feel more empowered. They could make decisions affecting their own lives. They could choose when to shower, they had a greater choice of canteen items, in many locations they could cook their own meals, they could apply for positions in industry, they were educated through the external educational TAFE campuses at each location, rather than by primary school teachers, they could commence and complete programs regardless of which prison they were housed in, and they had a choice of a range of programs and activities directed at integration and rehabilitation. They began to talk to officers about what they wanted and expected from the prison system to ensure that the Individual Management Plan recorded their working toward their release.

The use of Individual Management Plans (IMPS) meant prisoners were required to be more accountable for their actions and were required to take greater personal responsibility than they had under previous regimes.

In the mid 1990s, CORE developed Strategies relating to Drugs, Violence and Sex Offenders, which provided clear direction for the management of such offenders within the prison and methods of addressing their offending behaviour. For example, in regard to drugs, from the outset the results of the Drug Strategy were promising. Results indicated decreased drug use and a reduction in the number of violent incidents and standovers. However one of the unfortunate paradoxes of this detection, deterrence and treatment paradigm is that those who elect to continue to use drugs in prison tend to do so now more unsafely because our ability to find injecting equipment and associated paraphernalia is much improved and they resort to unsafe injecting practices.

The way CORE has re-developed Bendigo prison in country Victoria is exemplary as far as progressive prisoner management is concerned. Bendigo prison accommodates up to 80 medium security male prisoners for whom drugs and related harmful behaviours have contributed to their incarceration. The prison offers a range of treatment options to substance abusers within a "community prison" environment. CORE has contracted with a provider of specialist offender psychological services and a well-respected community drug and alcohol agency. Prisoners are assessed and matched to programs of varying intensity and duration. An essential element of the success of the program is the positive environment; created by prisoners and prison and treatment staff that reinforces personal accountability, mutual respect and a commitment to model community values.

However these approaches only went part way to dealing with the problem. Breaking open the 'closed rank mentality' and challenging the way prison officers related to prisoners brought about the real difference to prisoner management in Victoria. In the words of Vivien Stern:

> *"The prison officer is at the centre of the system. And the prison officer's job is crucial to a humane and civilised system. This is where reform has to start"*
> (Stern, 1975, p.94)

In 1991, in a move unprecedented in Victorian prison history, six officers were charged with assault for the violence that was perpetrated on a prisoner who was being transferred between divisions. To be brutalised by the relationships one has in

prison is a most damaging experience for persons whose histories are typically marked by pain and abuse, for whom this pain and abuse is a factor in their offending behaviour and who will one day be released from prison into the community.

In 1996, CORE implemented one of the most important elements of its *Strategy for Violence Prevention*, namely conflict resolution training of all prison staff. This training, rolled out by trained prison officers, further empowered staff by offering them skills to manage themselves and their relationships with prisoners. An interesting outcome of the training was that staff feedback also told us that the training impacted on their home lives in a positive way.

Lateral entry across all levels in Corrections and new paradigms of correctional management challenged the decade-old mentality that the only way one could be appointed as a prison governor was by coming up through the ranks. We now recognise that to manage a prison, one needs to be a good general manager, a leader and an enabler, not necessarily a good custodian. CORE has invested a great deal of resources in ensuring our senior managers receive diverse leadership and management training. We have also invested heavily in succession planning.

One example of CORE's commitment to staff training is its strong support and leadership role in developing National Competency Standards for all Officers working in Corrections. Under unit management the base grade officer has been empowered to make decisions in a significant number of areas; a marked departure from the traditional hierarchical structure where even the most mundane of decisions required the manager's action. (Griffin, 1995). To enable these changes to occur, we attempted to work differently, less

antagonistically with the unions and have been successful in pushing through many changes as a result.

In a move that in hindsight advanced the public corrections reform agenda by creating a sense of urgency, the Victorian Government called for expressions of interest from the private sector to build, own and operate two X 600 bed facilities for males and one X 125 bed female facility. These prisons were to replace existing public sector prisons and lead to the decommissioning of five old Victorian era public prisons and the retrenchment of just over 600 staff. CORE then had the opportunity to assist staff moves who either did not have the skill mix or the wish to enter into a new era in corrections.

Through these changes CORE-the Public Correctional Enterprise has accepted the challenge of a competitive business environment and is developing into a learning organisation. We have adopted the Business Excellence framework of the Australian Quality Council; we're surveying offenders, prisoners, staff, and other stakeholders on their expectations of our performance. We have developed our own identity and clearly articulated our mission, vision, values and behaviours to our staff.

We are moving from being "just gaols" in the sense of "simply" or "only" prisons, to "just gaols" or "fair" prisons and beyond that of a correctional organisation that strives to offer a range of products (placement options, services and programs for prisoners) in a competitive environment in an attempt to match the individual needs of the prisoner.

I believe we have come a long way, and from structured feedback mechanisms know that the majority of prisoners perceive the prison system as fair and

generally safe. It no longer offers the excesses it did previously. In the event of disciplinary action and sanctions being necessary, they are anticipated and do not constitute a flagrant abuse of power and position. In a system that is fair and without excesses, and where prisoners can question why things are done a certain way - where there is fundamentally a sense of justice, then prisoners are less damaged by their experience and more easy to manage.

But the bar needs to be set even higher. All prisons have the capacity to challenge the immature and destructive ways prisoners deal with their imprisonment experience and the other elements of their lives. Robert Johnson's concept of "mature coping" has application here. It means:

- dealing with life's problems like a responsive and responsible human being;
- seeking autonomy without violating the rights of others (the premise here being that prisoners with a sense of control over their lives adjust better to prison and to life on the outside);
- security without resort to deception or violence and relatedness to others as the fullest expression of human identity (wherein trust replaces power as a mode of problem solving).

Mature problem solving builds self-esteem, which in turn produces confidence and resilience in the individual and often makes failure manageable. Our challenge as providers of correctional services is to offer prisoners an environment in which this growth can occur, wherein mature coping is modelled by our staff.

We must continue to offer high quality programs to assist prisoners' maturation and skill development, but also start asking the hard questions about "what works" and being prepared to have our program

development influenced by the outcomes of controlled evaluation studies. We must continue to promote professional staff-prisoner interactions - wherein prison staff serve as strong examples of honesty, fairness, tolerance, patience and understanding (Griffin, 1995). From this will develop a prison experience that is empowering for both prisoners and prison staff, rather than defeating.

Programs in the late 1990's are integral to the purposes of imprisonment. Where once the purpose of imprisonment was nothing more than humane containment (and the priority task related to security and custody), the purpose of imprisonment now includes a requirement that there be active attempts to rehabilitate prisoners, and it is acknowledged that this can only occur within an environment that is conducive to such rehabilitation. This must be achieved through a combining of unit management and effective prison programs and prison security. In the past, prison security has been used as an excuse for not providing effective prison programs. Prison security will be maintained in such a system through closer surveillance, staff personal knowledge of prisoners and through effective occupation of prisoners' time. Security is part of the process of creating a rehabilitative environment, not excluded from it. This new humane containment model, will be achieved through a combining of the many facets of the prison system such as programs, management approach and security in order to achieve a meaningful environment for prisoners which promotes pro-social behaviour and prepares prisoners to effectively reintegrate into society.

And, remembering the words of Johnson that I started with, that pain is the harsh reality of imprisonment, we must make concerted efforts to establish a greater range of diversion programs that offer

reparative value to the community whilst allowing the offender to maintain family and social supports and access to community treatment resources.

> *The notion that staff and inmates can share a constructive agenda- that they might work together in service of a prison community that promotes mature coping and responsible citizenship- looms as a distinct possibility for perhaps the first time in prison history*

> Johnson, 1996, p.89

> *Prisoners must cope maturely with the demands of prison life; if they do not, the prison experience will simply add to their catalogue of failure and defeat. Mature coping, in fact, does more than prevent one's prison life from becoming yet another series of personal setbacks. It is at the core of what we mean by correction or rehabilitation, and thus creates the possibility of a more constructive life after release from prison*

> Johnson, 1996, p.98

REFERENCES

Biles D., *Offenders and their Treatment: An Australian Perspective*, 3rd Conference of Commonwealth Correctional Administrators, Harare 9-15 May, 1992. Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

CORE (Correctional Services Division), Department of Justice, Victoria, Australia, *Prison Programs-Achieving Positive Custody*, Policy Document 1992.

Griffin J. (1995), *Modern Prison Management*. In Ellem, B.(Ed.), Beyond Catching and Keeping, p.117-129, Centre for Police and Justice Studies, Monash University.

King D., Goss E., Haas I. (1993), *The Purpose of Programs in Prisons: Working Towards Rehabilitation*, Correctional Services Division, Department of Justice, Victoria, Australia.

Johnson R. (1996), Hard time: understanding and reforming the prison, Wadsworth, USA, second edition.

Latessa, Edward & Allen, Harry (1997), Corrections in the Community, Cincinnati, USA.

Lipton D., Martinson R., and Wilks (1975), *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment*, New York, NY Praeger, USA.

Report of the Board of Inquiry into Allegations of Brutality and Ill-Treatment of Prisoners at HM Prison Pentridge (The Jenkinson Inquiry), Parliamentary Papers (Vic.), Australia.

Stern V. (1987), Bricks of Shame: Britain's Prisons, Penguin, England.