

**Submission  
No 19**

## **INQUIRY INTO PARKLEA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE AND OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES**

**Name:** Mr Alex Ing

**Date received:** 14 February 2018

---

To the Parliamentary enquiry into Parklea Correctional Centre and other operational issues,

I am an employee of Corrective Services NSW. I am a Public Servant, a role I do not take lightly. It is intrinsic to my title that I provide a professional and cost effective service to the people of NSW.

In my opinion Dr Robert C Camp, President of the Global Benchmarking Network and the father of benchmarking as we know it would be outraged to see the abysmal staffing model rolled out under the guise of "Benchmarking" by CSNSW. This is not benchmarking this is job cuts by stealth.

Upon its inception the process of "Benchmarking" was originally termed "competitive benchmarking", do CSNSW intend to utilise this approach to manage its correctional centre's? To pit them against one another in an attempt to warehouse inmate's for the lowest cost? This is against the principles outlined in the "standard guidelines for corrections in Australia" specifically "Guidelines for the management of prisoners" please see page 15 of the attached document.

In Dr Camp's 1989 novel (Benchmarking: The search for the industry best practices that lead to superior performance) he refers to an example of "Benchmarking" whereby GM utilised a press that required 24hrs to change the die, Toyota had a press which only consumed two hours of labour to change dies, thus Toyota became the benchmark for this process. I am unaware of any two correctional centres operated by CSNSW where you could apply any "best practice" as the parameters cannot be narrowed to suit. The differences in infrastructure, classification of inmate and correctional complex requirements, for example taking the benchmark from Brewarrina CC and applying that best process to the MRRC. Brewarrina CC moves a small quantity of inmates per week with the polar opposite, the Metropolitan Reception and Remand centre that facilitate hundreds of inmate movements per week. Brewarrina CC is a remote facility which accommodates only sentenced minimum security inmates whom are no longer required for court proceedings and are not currently prescribed Methadone or Buprenorphine. The MRRC houses volatile un-sentenced maximum security inmates, many of whom have been received as fresh custody's directly from the Police still in the grip of drug addiction and mental health issues. Using just this one example I believe we are not comparing apples with apples.

The desktop benchmark submitted to the committee by CSNSW was obviously flawed from its inception. The P28 (departmental document listing staffing by post subject to rostering 195 formula) for Cessnock minimum security was set out as an 8-4 operation. CSNSW's own KPI's for hours out of cell could never be realised under this model. This poses the question did the desktop model include the staffing required for a D watch (the afternoon shift required to afford inmates time out of cell). How do we as an industrial body question the validity of a model generated from a report (MAXIM) that has been deemed commercial in confidence? It would seem as though the lack of information shared by CSNSW has been intentional so as to rush these reforms through without any meaningful consultation with the industrial bodies.

It is commonly accepted that the majority of inmates come from poor socio-economic backgrounds. Poor literacy, numeracy and life skills are endemic to individuals whom are raised in this environment. It is a reasonable assumption that the incarceration of these individuals is, at least in part, a result of this upbringing and the failings associated with it. We as Correctional Officers endeavour to impart the skills required to function in society without reoffending. We do so in an attempt to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

The department's current credo is "A respected leader in breaking the cycle of re-offending and enhancing community safety. The "Benchmark" generated from the desktop of a faceless manager does not seem conducive to achieving the KPI's set out by the department. We need only look to Europe and specifically the UK to see the complete failure that the benchmarking process was when applied to a correctional environment. The dollar should never be the overriding factor. The author could only estimate the dollar figure associated with the damage to the community an offender whom is released onto the public without the skills and assistance currently offered by CSNSW would cause. The CSNSW education staff have already had their numbers slashed to near extinction with RTO's identified to pick up the slack, yet again another private enterprise driven by profits.

I would ask the inquiry to keep in mind the fact that benchmarking was created by Xerox to claw back market control from its competitor's during the 1970's. Are we running a professional corrections organization with principles aligned with reducing recidivism through education and a meaningful day or are we running a private enterprise only interested in financial outcomes?

I would ask that the inquiry recommends the cessation of the "Better prisons" project and current benchmarking process until the findings and recommendations of the inquiry are gazetted.

Respectfully,

Senior Overseer Alex Ing.