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SUMMARY

Since the Department of Correctional Services has been transformed into an institution of rehabilitation and the promotion of corrections has become a societal responsibility, there is a new dimension to the classification system whereby offenders are separated according to their potential for treatment and training programmes.

Research into offender classification as a tool to rehabilitate offenders in corrections was necessitated by the way in which assessment was used for classification. Corrections uses offender files as the only determinant of classification assessment. Simply investigating offender files and observing classification hearings does not reveal the full aspects of the character of the offender as an individual. Corrections does not use qualitative research to gain an understanding of real issues faced by the offender. The problems with classification are also quantity assessments that are too narrow. Most correctional institutions believe that better data and statistical analysis will in one way or the other improve the situation for offenders and correctional officials. Staffs have limited skills and lack the appropriate training to support the rehabilitation of offenders. This remains an obstacle to the delivery and transformation of the department and implies that there is ineffective treatment of offenders. The increasing dissatisfaction with treatment and rehabilitation services available to offenders in South African prisons can result in an increase in recidivism. All of the above are reasons why this research became important.

The investigation contributes largely to scientific knowledge regarding the importance of classification for each individual within corrections. In this research the extent to which classification treatment rehabilitation arrangements are based on the concept of differential treatment is studied. This implies that offenders’ needs and problems must be specific and treated on an individualised basis. This study focuses on classifying offenders as a means to rehabilitate them effectively. Particular emphasis will be placed on philosophical approaches, theoretical frameworks and the effectiveness of offenders’ treatment through the utilisation of reliable assessment tools. This research was conducted through an extensive literature study by examining offender classification as a rehabilitation tool from a Penological perspective.
International and national approaches as well as standards for the treatment of offenders and a range of rehabilitation programmes were also studied.
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CHAPTER 1

THE RESEARCH

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The history of imprisonment has not always included a procedure for separating different types of offenders. At the time when reaction to crime was purely penalis- ing, there was no need for classifying offenders and all of them were grouped at the same confinement in one prison (Parenjape, 2005:369). One reason for the absence of separation was the failure to accept the idea that there are, in fact, different types of offenders (Reichel, 2001:358).

With the development of penal science during the late 18th and early 19th century, offenders were classified into different categories according to their sex, age and seriousness of the offence (Parenjape, 2005:369). During 1777 the House of Corrections was opened in England and Wales when John Howard, for the first time, called public attention to the classifying of offenders (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:97). By the late 1700s, in the United States of America (USA), the Walnut Street prison in Philadelphia launched a classification process to divide grave lawbreakers from others (Walsh, 2001:140). Johnson (1996:66) mentions that the Elmira Reformatory that was opened during 1876 used classification of offenders as a rehabilitation tool. Later, during 1904 in Europe, France began the separation of offenders for treatment purposes. This was when Benet and Simon were commissioned to develop an intelligence test (Fox, 1985:204). The origin of these types of separation was primarily humanitarian and moral in nature and their appropriateness seems self-evident today (Reichel, 2001:359).

The classification of offenders is one of the most important functions of any correctional agency. Actuarial tools have demonstrated superiority over clinical judgement in accomplishing the goal of classification. In general, they are more liberal and more accurate than clinical methods (Blanchette & Taylor, 2004: iii). The most important aim of offender classification is to give each offender an equal chance and opportunities to reform. The distinction can be made between offenders with the potential to reform and hardened criminals. Every offender, during
admission, undergoes careful screening and is evaluated for placement in treatment programmes and training best suited to their needs (Nxumalo, 1997:106). Classification begins by analysing the problems presented by the individual through the use of every available technique – through social investigations, medical, psychiatric, psychological examinations, vocational, religious and recreational studies. When the studies are completed, a staff conference is held to plan and outline a sound and realistic programme best suited to the offender’s needs, using whatever resources are available within the institution. The classification should therefore help ensure that offenders participate in appropriate, integrated programmes that assist them during their incarceration and subsequent release to the community (Nxumalo, 1997:106-107).

Offender classification was pushed as the necessary element for achieving the goal of rehabilitation, under the medical model that was popular during the rehabilitation era. Without a diagnosis or classification, officials would not know what to treat or how to treat it. To recognise the offender’s problems and to determine their need was a difficult task that required the services of specialists from the field of medicine, psychology, education, social work, religion and sociology. Shortly after the arrival of the offenders at the corrections facility, the representatives from the above areas would conduct interviews and prepare evaluations. Offenders’ reports were concentrated in a classification summary to be used by a classification assignment and treatment programme (Reichel, 2001:360).

Internationally, offender assessment is mainly utilised for classification (medium and/or maximum categories), intervention (to determine offenders’ needs), risk management (to determine the risk of escape and self-harm) and pre-parole (reoffending risk) purposes. The assessment of offenders is a reliable practice to challenge, address and correct offending behaviour in custodial settings. It effectively abates, reduces and addresses criminal and reoffending behaviour. It directs therapists and custodial officials to rehabilitate offenders adequately.

In South Africa, once an offender is incarcerated, the Department of Correctional Services begins with formulating the offender’s classification and correctional intervention plan. This is
when the offender will be assessed to determine his/her needs for rehabilitation (Hesselink-
Louw, 2004:16-17). The assessment of an offender is key to personal growth, development and
rehabilitation. Proper assessment involves knowledge of the criminal mind and crime motives,
causes, behavioural triggers, identification of risk factors, offender profiling and theoretical
explanation of offensive behaviour (South African Department of Correctional Services,
being with potential and behaviour which can be understood and possibly corrected.

“Whether the offenders use developmental models, problem-area models or other groupings of
models, to carry out classification for treatment, it is important to realise that the classification
process is still being used for rehabilitation purposes” (Reichel, 2001:362).

This study examines the concept of offender classification as a tool to rehabilitate offenders and
describes their impact on corrections. This was accomplished by researching relevant
regulations, such as Rules 67 and 68 of the United Nations, the European Prison Rules with
regard to the function of classification or reclassification of offenders and the South African
Correctional Services Act. The Department of Correctional Services has come to realise that it is
important to ensure that as soon as an offender is admitted to prison, he/she must be assessed and
matched with the appropriate level of programmes and services to fit his/her needs.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Corrections has shifted from punishing offenders to developing offenders by rehabilitating them
in order to be reintegrated into society as law-abiding citizens. According to Hesselink-Louw
(2004:4), there is a misconception regarding imprisonment and offender rehabilitation.
Correctional Services has been criticised for giving offenders more privileges than they are
supposed to have. Society believes that corrections has become a “five-star” holiday home and
even Sun City, and they believe that the rehabilitation of offenders is a misuse of the taxpayers’
money. The imprisonment and treatment of offenders contribute to the public’s lack of interest
since society believes that offenders who are reintegrated back into the community may reoffend (Hesselink-Louw, 2004:5).

According to Ross (2008:106), the problems of overcrowding in prisons causes correctional administrators to be more frustrated. Although, in principle, classification is a valuable tool, this can prevent offenders from entering appropriate educational counselling and vocation programmes and facilities that they would be best suited for. Muthaphuli (2008:3) also mentions that prison overcrowding rises at and that the annual offender expenditure is approximately R40 489,45 of the taxpayers’ money (Department of Correctional Services, undated). This has been confirmed by the Department of Correctional Services. Better classification procedures will minimise these problems with incarcerations. At the very least they may save the taxpayer the increased cost of housing offenders in more restrictive settings.

According to its annual report (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2007:41), the Department of Correctional Services has placed the rehabilitation of offenders at the centre of all its activities through its strategy of an offender rehabilitation plan known as the rehabilitation path. The offender’s rehabilitation path gives an overview of the offender’s admission until he/she is released to society.

Poor reception and evaluation assessment can cause serious problems to the entire classification process. Hesselink-Louw (2004:2) points out that currently the assessment of criminal behaviour mostly depends on the skills experience exposure of the individual practitioners (psychologists, social workers). No structural and/or scientific offender assessment practices exist within the South African Correctional Services. Furthermore, there is no extensive research on offender assessment (custody settings) in South African contexts (Hesselink-Louw, 2004:2).

Sechrest (1987:3) indicates that there is a lack of theoretical rationality for treatment classifications for offender rehabilitation in general. Most correctional authorities have a tendency to allocate individual offenders to explanatory classes that have power over little, or no
direct relation to treatment programmes. The achievement of rehabilitative goals can be damaged by disparity between the classification system and treatment programmes.

According to Hippchen (1975:28), most classification systems are limited either to the use for management and/or treatment purposes, or to interinstitutional use for institutional assignment of offenders. The classification processes are not often linked and are, as a result, regularly irrelevant to the rehabilitation process, as was clearly stated at a meeting of the American Correctional Association’s Committee on Classification and Treatment (Hippchen, 1975:29).

Hippchen (1975:29) also indicates the problems of reception and diagnostic centres, which have a tendency to be too large and are also isolated geographically from the regions from which they draw offenders, and too isolated from society at large. There is also the well-known internal orientation and overconcern with offender adjustment to the correctional system rather than concern with the issues of integration or reintegration into society (Hippchen, 1975:29). “It seems that the reception and diagnosis point is not too early to begin to develop programs specifically geared to overcome such deficiencies in order to speed up the reintegration process” (Hippchen, 1975:29).

According to Ross (2008:107), offender files should not be the only determinant of classification assessments. Simply investigating offender files and observing classification hearings do not reveal the full aspects of the character of the offender as an individual. Qualitative research, on the other hand, can be used to gain an understanding of real issues involved.

Many offenders in the USA argue that disciplinary committees rule against convicts without affording them due process rights. Disciplinary intelligence as the crucial measure for the reclassification of offenders may lead to the construction of more maximum security prisons. It costs more to house offenders in high security correctional facilities. Offenders who serve time in these institutions suffer psychological problems and are less prepared for release. Disciplinary matters have irregular effects on allocation and that can cause difficulty with classification (Ross, 2008:108).
Ross (2008:107) cautions that using offenders to take part in prison programmes as a measure of discipline is problematic. These programmes usually include activities such as work, vocational training, education including custodial responsibilities (washing dishes, mopping floors), etc. According to the Department of Correctional Services (2002:12), the limited skills and lack of appropriate training of staff to support the rehabilitation of offenders remains an obstacle to the delivery and transformation of the department. This implies that there is ineffective treatment of offenders. The increasing dissatisfaction with treatment and rehabilitation services available to offenders in South African prisons can result in an increase in recidivism. Desired participation in a unique and/or limited programme may:

- delay an offender’s transfer to a lower security level facility pending programme completion or
- require a facility placement not commensurate with the inmates’ placement due to programme participation outside of normal guidelines (Silverman, 2001:159).

The problems with classification are also quantity assessments that are too narrow. Most correctional institutions believe that better data and statistical analysis will in one way or another advance things for offenders and correctional officials.

The problem is that offenders and correctional staff have different constituencies with often competing interests:

- Correctional officials may want offenders to be detained in more provisional environments, e.g. maximum security, control units, segregation, where offenders are locked in and have little freedom of movement. This allows the correctional officials more control and takes away the potential for assault and injury.
- Offenders want less restrictive classification (minimum or medium security), in which they might have better living conditions, e.g. more time out of the cell, less restrictive family visits, better access to programmes and less violence (Ross, 2008:107).

The problems with classification in institutions is that job details take priority. It must be clear that sentenced offenders need more formal education that will help them to become law-abiding
citizen after their release. They also need relevant institution job opportunities that can provide them with relevant skills. For example, offenders will often be assigned to maintenance operations, such as food services or janitorial work, which is unlikely to conform to their own vocational ambitions. All of this may be true, but staff members are no less frustrated than the inmates when prescribed programmes are ignored (Ross, 2008:106-107). It is therefore clear what the institutional need is and the problem area is the daily treatment of offenders and this often hinders their proper classification.

1.3 AIM OF THE RESEARCH

The primary aim of the research was to determine the impact of offender classification as a rehabilitation tool in corrections. The secondary aims of the research were:

- to investigate, illustrate and explain the practice of assessment of sentenced and unsentenced offenders for classification for rehabilitation and for security;
- to describe the process of the offender’s rehabilitation in general;
- to identify the international standards with regard to classification for treatment and rehabilitation;
- to identify how offender classification can be effective for rehabilitation programmes in corrections;
- to address the various assessment tools that are necessary to conduct classification for rehabilitation and security (risk).

1.4 MOTIVATION FOR THE RESEARCH

1.4.1 Value for the administration of Correctional Services in South Africa

Since the aim of the correctional system is to rehabilitate offenders, it is important to understand the effective classification of offenders through the utilisation of reliable assessment preparation. This will improve effective performance within the Department of Correctional Services in such a manner that the personal needs and risk of offenders will be addressed and rehabilitation
programmes individualised in order to improve the development and management of offenders. Effective offender classification can lead to the prevention of wrong classifications, inappropriate allocation to treatment programmes, unsuitable work allocation and wrongful release of the offender in society.

The Department of Correctional Services can benefit from the research by relieving the overwhelming workload of correctional practitioners working with offenders, evaluating existing rehabilitation programmes and assisting parole boards in predicting reoffending through assessment.

1.4.2 Value to society

The research can assist society to understand its role in the integration of the offender into the community. Highlighting the importance of offender classification can serve as a tool to rehabilitate offenders in order to be released as law-abiding citizens. If everyone understands the functioning of Correctional Services, then people will understand that rehabilitation is not just a waste of time, since there are measures that are taken before offenders can be rehabilitated, such as assessment tools that are used during admission to prison.

1.4.3 Scientific value

This research will enable correctional assessment officials to have a thorough understanding of and be able to identify, analyse, compare, explain and predict anti-social and offensive behaviour. This study contributes to the knowledge and understanding of how offenders should be housed for proper classification into a relevant treatment programme. The study also enables correctional authorities to recognise the custodial therapists (social workers, psychologists and educators) as important engineers of the rehabilitation and also to rehabilitate offenders adequately.
1.5 KEY CONCEPTS

1.5.1 Sentence planning

Sentence planning is a system which consists of components or sub-systems that are independent but at the same time affect one another.

1.5.2 Rehabilitation

Any planned involvement that is aimed at decreasing additional criminal activity by an offender comprises rehabilitation. Rehabilitation brings about a challenge to decrease the offending behaviour.

1.5.3 Assessment process

This is a process of gathering, analysing and synthesising salient data into a formulation that includes offender problems and of identifying available resources that are needed to deal with these problems.

1.5.4 Needs assessment

Needs assessment refers the assessment system that recognises offenders according to important treatment needs.

1.5.5 Risk assessment

Risk assessment identifies offenders who should receive more intensive service through informed supervision and treatment.
1.5.6 Classification

Classification is a process of assigning an offender to a category specifying his/her needs for security, treatment, education, work assignment and readiness for release.

1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.6.1 Research design

“A research design is a strategic framework for action that serves as a bridge between research questions and the execution or implementation of the research. Research designs are plans that guide the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure” (Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutch & Cook, 1965:50). It is the designed and planned nature of observation that differentiates research from other varieties of observations. It is imperative for the researcher to think about the purpose of the research, the context or situation within which the research is carried out and the research techniques employed to collect and analyse data. This can be done when developing a research design (Durrheim, 2006:37). “Research design involves the creation and integration of many diverse elements” (Babbie, 2007:67). All these characteristics were considered in the process of conducting this research.

Sources such as official documents, books, newspaper articles, journals as well as both international and national standards with regard to classification and rehabilitation tools, such as international standards for classifying offenders in a humane manner based on treatment needs (e.g. Rules 67 and 68 of the United Nations, European Prison Rules with regard to the classification or reclassification of the offender, the Correctional Services Act, the White Paper on Corrections and the Constitution of South Africa), were used in this research in order to describe the impact of classification on the rehabilitation of offenders.
1.6.2 Methodological design

1.6.2.1 Qualitative research

According to Dantzker and Hunter (2000:75), qualitative research is the non-numerical examination and interpretation of observation with the aim of determining underlying meanings and patterns of relationships. Denscombe (1998:207) further describes qualitative research as an umbrella term, covering a wide variety of styles to conduct social research which originates from a wide variety of disciplines, such as sociology, social anthropology and social psychology. Qualitative methods allow the researchers to study selected issues in depth, openness and detail as they identify and attempt to understand the categories of information that emerge from the data (Durrheim, 2006:47). Qualitative researchers claim that they have entered and mapped territories such as inner experiences, languages, cultural meanings or forms of social integration. Their methods represent a general belief that they can provide a deeper understanding of social phenomena than could have been obtained purely by quantitative data (Silverman, 2001:89).

According to Payne and Payne (2004:175), almost all qualitative methods share certain features:

- The core concern is to seek out and interpret the meanings that people bring to their own actions, rather than describing any regulatory or statistical association between variables.
- They treat actions as part of a holistic social process and context rather than as something that can be extracted and studied in isolation.
- They utilise non-representative, small samples of people rather than working from large representative samples to identify the broad sweep of national patterns.
- They focus on the detail of human life rather than starting within a theoretical hypothesis and trying to test it. They explore the data they encounter and allow ideas to emerge from them, i.e. using inductive and not deductive logic.

This current research met the above requirements of qualitative research; therefore the qualitative method was followed as it provides a simple method of gathering information. Throughout the
research, the researcher focused on classification that has an impact on the rehabilitation of offenders rather than on broader offender classification for security. Offender rehabilitation forms an integral part of the correctional system, and therefore it is imperative to have a proper understanding of offender classification for treatment needs (rehabilitation) and the entire correctional system. This leads to a better understanding of how correctional assessment facilitates the rehabilitation of offenders. The information obtained through the literature survey leads to a better understanding and employment of offender classification as a rehabilitation tool within the correctional system, thereby resulting in new developments.

1.6.2.2 Exploratory research

Durrheim (2006:559) explains that exploratory studies are used to make preliminary investigations into relatively unknown areas of research. This type of research makes use of an open, flexible and inductive approach to research as it challenges researchers to look for new insight into phenomena. Exploratory research is generally classically done for three purposes:

- To satisfy the researcher’s curiosity and desire for better understanding;
- To test the feasibility of undertaking a more extensive study;
- To develop the methods to be employed in any subsequent study (Babbie, 2007:67).

Since exploratory research does not pursue official research protocols and procedures, it was conducted prior to the study to gain insight into and understanding of the phenomenon (Zikmund, 1997:127).

1.6.2.3 Data collection

Bless and Higson-Smith (1995:99) classify data by referring to the way in which it is collected. Data can be collected in two ways:

- Primary data: The researcher obtains the information himself/herself for the particular purpose of his/her research.
- Secondary data: This data is collected by other investigators and is data that is readily available and that builds upon previous research. Data is the essential material with which
researchers work. It can take the form of numbers (numeric or quantitative data) or language (qualitative data) and it can come from observation (Durrheim, 2006:51).

Since the researcher in this study used qualitative data, this data was drawn from departmental policies and also from informally interviewing the Head of the Prison and a senior correctional official. This data dealt largely with the justification of how Correctional Services conducts assessments of the offenders before they can be sent for classification. The types of questions posed to gather this data were: Why did the offender commit crime? What types of persons will the department deal with in order for the offender to be classified into appropriate treatment programmes that match their offence as well as appropriate levels of security?

According to De Vos, Strydom, Fouche and Delport (2007:287), interviewing is the leading mode of data or information collection in qualitative research. Qualitative interviews aim to understand the world from the participants’ point of view and to clarify the meaning of people’s experiences. Interviews made it possible to analyse, interpret, explain and understand the overall picture of offender classification and to determine the participants’ willingness to provide information concerning how they assess offenders for rehabilitation purposes. An informal interview was conducted during November 2010 at a prison in the Johannesburg management area in the admission and classification office and in the office of the Head of the Prison. Both offices were outside of the hearing distance of any offender or Correctional Services officials.

1.6.2.4 Data analysis

According to Taylor (1994:9), the process of analysing data begins after collecting the data and double checking it. Data analysis in a qualitative inquiry necessitates a twofold approach. The first aspect involves data analysis at the research site during data collection. The second aspect involves data analysis away from the site, following a period of data collection. The second aspect is conducted between site visits prior to as well as after completion of data collection. Qualitative data is analysed in two methods: social constructionist analysis, which involves the revealing of cultural material from which particular utterances, texts or events have been
constructed, and interpretative analysis which involves the description of the characteristics, processes, transactions and contexts that are related to the phenomena that are being studied (Taylor, 1994:9).

1.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

This study was analysed by means of interpretative analysis. This is done by listing all the findings of the research and describing how they are related to the phenomenon being studied. Since researchers use a variety of data collection instruments in their research process, to adopt a valid and reliable data gathering instrument is a significant element (Brown & Curtis, 1987:21). According to Babbie (2007:515), the quality of measurement methods suggests that the same data would have been collected each time in repeated observations of the same phenomenon (Babbie, 2007:518). The reliability of a measure is the extent to which the results are free from random error, whereas validity of a measure is the extent to which it measures what is required. For a measure to be valid it has to be reliable first and it must be able to present the expected results. Hence in this research reliable and valid sources are listed in the references where used.

1.8 DEMARCATION OF STUDY

Demarcation is the nominal reduction of the research group or phenomenon. In other words, the qualities of the group or phenomenon that is being researched are purified (Du Preez, 2003:5). The researcher is expected to summarise the universal approach to the research development in no uncertain terms. The limits of the study environment are made up of the demarcation of the universe, the demarcation of countries and time delimitation.
1.8.1 Demarcation of the universe

The total group that the research aims to explore is referred to as the demarcation of the universe. The universe for this study was the unit of imprisonment (Luyt, 1999:12). The study concentrates on offenders who are classified for treatment needs (rehabilitation) and security. Within the universe of incarceration the researcher focused on offender assessment, offender treatment programmes, admission of offenders to the correctional institution and orientation. The universe in this study included any person or group of individuals who were in custody for a considerable length of time.

1.8.2 Demarcation of countries

Sources were obtained for this study from Australia, Canada, the USA, Europe, England, Wales and South Africa concerning offender classification.

1.8.3 Time demarcation of study

The gathering of information for the study commenced during April 2009 and was completed during January 2012. Appropriate literature in relation to the phenomenon has been gathered and processed. The researcher visited Johannesburg management area in South Africa, Gauteng, where the phenomenon is prevalent, during November 2010.

1.9 PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED DURING THE STUDY

In conducting the current research, the researcher experienced problems. However, it was possible for the researcher to overcome these stumbling blocks and complete the study effectively.
The researcher found that there was a distinct lack of literature on this specific topic and study focus area in South Africa. However, a wider search for linking information to the various broad aspects of the study was undertaken. The South African Correctional Services has no documented policy on classification. The department uses templates as a guide for offender classification, e.g. the Department of Correctional Services Admission Security Risk Classification tool (5303(B)), the Department of Correctional Services Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment (5303 (A)) and Admission Risk and Needs Assessment. During the literature study, it became clear that very little research has been done on classification as a tool to rehabilitate offenders. In most of the literature that was available, the discussion was focused mostly on classification for security.

1.10 LAYOUT OF THE DISSERTATION

The study consists of seven chapters.

**Chapter 1**: This chapter sets out the basis of the study and the reason for conducting it. The methods used to undertake the study are also outlined in this chapter as well as the definition of concepts used in this research.

**Chapter 2**: The chapter begins with a discussion of the aim of punishment and prisons. This chapter uncovers the origin and development of prisons and the classification of offenders, and also deals with the periods of reformation as a movement that emphasised rehabilitation. Through this chapter the development of the offender classification administration is explained in three phases.

**Chapter 3**: This chapter covers the concept of rehabilitation and how it became the important part of corrections that it is today. The chapter also presents an overview of the process of rehabilitation from its significance to the programmes that are aimed at ensuring that it takes place. Rehabilitation can be aligned with classification since classification of offenders is a critical step in the process of devising effective rehabilitation programmes.
through the chapter, the reader will have an understanding of classification as a means to rehabilitate offenders and the role players in the rehabilitation process such as offender, official and community.

**Chapter 4:** This chapter deals with the process of classification within corrections in general. The classification of offenders serves many functions for the Department of Correctional Services and individual correctional institutions. In general, it determines which facility and security level the offender will be sent to, since this may protect the offender and correctional officials from being hurt by an offender and also facilitates offender rehabilitation. The admission of offenders, orientation, assessment and classification for rehabilitation and security are discussed.

**Chapter 5:** This chapter outlines the international concept of offender classification with regard to treatment programmes. Classification for treatment needs is compared in countries such as Canada, Australia, USA, England and Wales. Reference is made to the European Prison Rules with regard to the classification or reclassification of offenders and UN Rule 67 which has to do with the aim of offender classification to facilitate their treatment with a view to their social rehabilitation. Each country assesses the security of all sentenced offenders depending on the nature of their offence since all levels of security have different treatment programmes.

**Chapter 6:** This chapter covers issues of offender classification in South Africa. Aspects of offender assessment within the South African Correctional Services regarding needs and risk of offenders after admission are dealt with. The White Paper on Corrections (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005:21) mentions that the department must assess the offenders’ needs such as their physical and emotional well-being and education and training needs. Offender classification is explained at three basic levels, namely safe custody diagnosis, job allocation and special needs case offenders. South African corrections for treatment needs is utilised as part of an assessment process to ensure the allocation of offenders in the establishment where they may benefit from the treatment programme.
Chapter 7: This chapter consists of a summary of findings of the research as well as conclusions.

1.11 CONCLUSION

To ensure the effectiveness of the rehabilitation or treatment programme, every sentenced offender during admission must be screened carefully and be evaluated for placement in treatment programmes and training best suited to their needs. Therefore the classification system should ensure that the offenders take part in suitable, integrated programmes that will help them during their imprisonment and following their release into society. Classification means that an offender’s treatment programme is integrated with that of other offenders receiving the same treatment. According to Nxumalo (2002:52), it is important to determine the benefit that the offender would draw from classification; failure to conduct a proper assessment can lead to serious consequences. An offender could be placed within an inadequate security setting and subsequently escape. A parole board could mistakenly release an offender who was thought not to present a danger and a parole officer could fail to recognise a parolee’s deteriorating situation. These are but a few examples that illustrate the importance of offender assessment. Classification can also match offenders so that they do not receive the wrong treatment or training that does not fit their individual needs and results in the failure of offender rehabilitation.

This study focuses on classifying offenders as a means to rehabilitate them effectively. Particular emphasis will be placed on philosophical approaches, theoretical frameworks and the effectiveness of offenders’ treatment through the utilisation of reliable assessment tools. The aim is to enhance service delivery in the Department of Correctional Services so that the personal needs and risks of offenders will be addressed and individualised rehabilitation programmes can be improved to develop and manage offenders.
1.2 REFERENCES


CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PUNISHMENT AND IMPRISONMENT

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to uncover the origin and development of prisons and the classification of offenders. An understanding is necessary of how prisoners were confined before there was classification of offenders and how prisons were first used in contrast to their function today. There are a number of things that happened in the 17th and 18th century during the period known as the reformatory era. This was known to be the movement emphasising rehabilitation, for example education and training as the basis of correctional achievement, and offenders were advanced forward towards release. This chapter will also attempt to uncover the origins of punishment and related concepts.

The study analyses the development of offender classification administration in three stages: during the medieval period, from 1870 to 19th, 20th to 21st century. The period of 20th and 21st emphasises classification as a means of treatment. Confinement in both Europe and the USA followed the same patterns at the same time in the history of correctional practice. This section also reveals the two principles regarding classification that were approved by the National Congress and Reformatory Discipline held in Cincinnati in 1870. A new type of classification approach was initiated at the beginning of the 19th century.
2.2 PUNISHMENT

According to Palermo & White, (1998:177) The word ‘punishment’ comes from the Latin word meaning penitence; to repent, to search for Godly pardon, to be remorseful towards persons wronged, to be on your own to consider the sympathy of a person’s sins. This was the theory, if not the practice, of early penitentiary. The very same word may also have originated from an Indo-European root meaning to make one pay; legally documented authority to use punishment as a deliberate infliction upon one who has violated the law and who has been found accountable and imputable for their conduct. Punishment has to do with the legal justice system and a codified definition of offence (Palermo & White, 1998:177). According to Johnson and Toch (1982:15), punishment is an aim that requires that every offence experience embarrassment.

According to Clack, Du Preez and Jonker (2008:4), punishment is regarded as the consequence of an offence committed by an offender. Punishing a person is to cause injury infliction on the offender who committed the crime. This is done by the state, since offenders cannot legally punish themselves. Punishment is the infliction of a penalty, loss or suffering as defined in the (Oxford Dictionary, 1990:970). The development of punishment has been associated with that of religion and other forces (Carlson & Garrett, 1999:10). The church has regarded punishment as a means by which people could cleanse themselves of the sin or crime they had committed; this idea was prevalent during the mediaeval period (Cilliers, 2008:12).

2.2.1 The origin of punishment

During ancient times the punishment for a crime was very harsh; many prisoners were made blind by spear, e.g. Assyrian Persians inflicted this punishment. In addition, the king of the Assyrians held cords with his left hand with a hook attached at the opposite end and these were inserted into the lips of the prisoner. The person who had committed a crime was tied with his stomach or throat to the point of a stake so that their own weight thrust them downwards. This was the Assyrian form of the death penalty (Schmalleger, & Smykla, 2001:65).
One account of punishment written in the Bible in Daniel, chapter 3, verse 11, took place during the time of King Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon. Everyone who disobeyed the king’s order was cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. This clearly shows how Babylon used cruel punishment during ancient times.

In ancient Greece it was documented that many early crimes were punished by execution, banishment or exile. Victims were punished by throwing them off of high cliffs, stoning them to death on a stake bind (which was the same as crucifying them) and ritual cursing. Some of these criminals’ dead bodies were regarded as dishonoured and could not be buried, and so their bodies were thrown to the jungle to be eaten by animals, birds or snakes (Schmalleger, & Smykla, 2001:65).

The early Romans used to scourge a condemned criminal before putting the person to death. The scourge was also called a flagrum or flagellum. This was made up of two or three leather thongs or ropes connected to a handle (Bible History Online, [s.a.]). In ancient Rome criminals were punished by means of decapitation. Offenders who killed their close relative were punished by confining them in a sack with an ape, or dog, and serpent, and the sack was thrown into the sea. This was known as subject to the coleus. Vestal virgins who had violated their vows of chastity were buried alive. Some offenders preferred to be exiled, rather than executed (Schmalleger, & Smykla, 2001:65).

According to Johnson (1996:16), prison was regarded as a natural means of punishment during 50-60 BC. In the mediaeval period, places of confinement were arranged chaotically; pain was inflicted on the prisoner without reason or metered out for pain’s sake. Imprisonment was always used as a punishment in itself at Mamertine prison in Rome during 64 BC, which was built under the sewers of Rome. Prisoners were imprisoned in cages and the prison was in fact built with the aim of causing prisoners to suffer great discomfort while detained there. Clearly this shows that the method confinement to produce pain is not new. The rough and ready form in which imprisonment was originally practised, and the pain of prison are not subtle or hard to
understand. Prisoners were thrown into a cage and chained or tied to a wall for good measure, and they suffered deprivations to compensate for the harm they had caused to the victim. Banishment was also used as a method of punishment for the most important crimes, as well as whipping, hanging and the pillory rather than confinement, before 1770. Imprisonment was used by the local justices of the peace for summary offences (Ignatieff, 1978:24).

In early Greece and Rome, harsh physical punishment was commonly imposed only on the slaves for their transgressions. The most common state-governed punishment was banishment or exile. Crimes such as attacks that resulted in death and interpersonal violence were considered as private matters. Economic punishments, such as fines, were typically used for crimes such as assault on slaves, arson, or housebreaking. Penal practices were brought by the development of common law in the 11th century when the criminal poor were controlled through capital and corporal punishment (Senna & Siegel, 1998:336). According to Allen and Simonsen (1986:6), the Greeks were the first society to allow any citizen to prosecute the offender in the name of the injured party.

In the 19th century community use of the whipping post was the moral condemnation of criminal punishment (Duffee, 1989:7). According to Silverman and Vega (1996:49), the methods of punishment that were used were corporal punishment, capital punishment, less often public ridicule and magical spells. Some offenders were placed in public pillories. Judges were expected to be harsh towards a person who committed a crime; during that time it was believed that crime was due to sin and that suffering was the problem. Capital punishment, torture and painful physical penalties served this view of criminal behaviour (Schmalleger, 2003:390). Hawkins and Alpert (1989:5) add that other methods of punishment would include flagging and maiming, such as cutting off ears or slitting the nostrils, confiscation of property, incarceration to await trial, incarceration after sentence, transportation, being sold into slavery, forced labour and torture.
2.2.2 Justification for punishment

Cilliers (2008:16) mentions that punishment is both formal and informal, i.e. formal as it is obvious in the judicial system courts and informal as it is imposed by the church, the school and the family. Cilliers also says that punishment has five elements in common:

- It is horrible for the one who is experiencing it.
- It is a burden for an offence.
- It must be forced on the responsible offender.
- It must be the action of an agency vested with the necessary authority.
- It is enforced by the special power decided by the organisation against whose laws or regulations the offence has been committed and implemented with a specific purpose.

Ball (1955:349) believes that the effectiveness of punishment as a deterrent depends on the following factors:

- Societal constitution and values in society;
- The population group of a particular society;
- Ethical support of the law on which punishment is based;
- The nature and cruelty of punishment;
- The assurance of arrest and punishment; and
- The individual knowledge of and attitude to legal prescription and existence of punishment.

Duffee (1989:8-9) identifies four elements of criminal punishment that are important. These elements are as follows:

- The person who is involved in the crime must be responsible for his/her conduct before he/she can be punished. Punishment cannot be applied to a person who is mentally incompetent or one who is undeveloped and too young to understand that what they are doing may be controlled by other formal social controls.
- In some sense the punishment is projected to be painful.
- The offender or criminal being punished is unambiguously blamed for his/her conduct because the pain inflicted is headed by a judgement of conviction. People who have the legal
power to issue instructions must make decisions to impose punishment over the convicted person and for the implementation of the law or standard in question. This means that criminal punishment cannot be imposed unofficially, even by persons who feel directly injured. Only the person who holds formal office and is charged with determining guilt and imposing punishment can impose criminal punishment.

- The behaviour has to be punished, therefore the punishment that attaches to that behaviour must be specific.

Anderson and Newman (1998:289) mention that punishment is related to what went before the crime was committed and is imposed to express condemnation of that behaviour. According to Schmalleger (2003:390), two things are necessary to make punishment effective and efficient. There must be the state of being certain and there must never be the state of two things not being at an equally high or low level.

2.3 THEORIES OF PUNISHMENT

Different authors come up with their own explanation of philosophy and goals. According to Schmalleger (2003:391), each goal represents a quasi-independent sentencing philosophy, since each holds implications for sentencing practice. “These justifications of punishment belong to one of two groups, namely absolute theory or relative theory. The distinction between the two theories is that, unlike in the absolute theories where the justification of punishment is found in the past, the justification in the relative theories is found in the future. In the absolute theory punishment is an end itself, while in the relative theories punishment is only a means to a purpose.” There is only one absolute theory, which is retribution, whereas there are three relative theories, which are deterrence (prevention), incapacitation and rehabilitation (Muthaphuli, 2008:47).

Regardless of the crime offender involved, punishment must be imposed. However, the punishment concept has been justified in a range of social contexts. Punishment can be justified
on one or more subsequent grounds, namely for retribution, deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation (Muthaphuli, 2008:47). Anderson and Newman (1998:288-289) state that these four major goals are designed to achieve sentencing in criminal justice. They also state that incapacitation, deterrence and rehabilitation are designed to prevent additional crime by an offender or other; however, these three justifications for punishment are known to be the future orientation. These philosophies of punishment or goals are also similar within Islamic law. The multiple purposes of Islamic criminal law are reflected in the nature and magnitude of different types of punishment for offences and prohibited behaviour (Miethe & Lu, 2005:165). The justifications for punishment are briefly discussed below.

2.3.1 Retribution

Retribution is known as one of the oldest justifications of punishment. In single terms retribution is the belief that punishment must avenge or retaliate for a harm or wrong done to another individual. It can be traced back to both the code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, and the biblical books of Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy in the Old Testament (Mays & Winfree, 2005:3). During the 18th century the code of Hammurabi stated: “If a man destroys the eye of another man, they shall destroy his eyes. If he breaks a man’s house, they shall break his bone. If a man knocks out a tooth of a man of his own ranks, they shall knock out his tooth.” This was also the same with the law of Moses: “Thou shall give life for life, eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe” Exodus 21:23-25 (Mays & Winfree, 2005:5). According to Bartollas (2002:71), for centuries retribution was the more important motive of punishing criminals. Schmalleger, Smykla (2001:37) refers to retribution as a process whereby an offender gets what he/she deserves. According to Schmalleger and Smykla (2001:486), retribution is a philosophy of punishment that has to do with vengeance against one who has committed a crime. Matshaba (2006:21) explains that the justification for retribution was usually based on the following three basic principles:

- Punishment should be imposed on the person who has committed an offence.
- The extreme form of punishment should match the state of the offence.
• The degree of punishment specified is independent of the actual or predicted consequences of the punitive measure.

2.3.2 Deterrence

In the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries Beccaria and Bentham defined the concept of deterrence as a way of controlling crime (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:20). Beccaria mentioned that punishment should be done quickly and immediately because the greatest deterrence was offered by swift punishment. He advocated a balance between deterrence and prevention (Snarr, 1996:57). Matshaba (2006:19) states that deterrence means that punishing an offender can prevent future criminal behaviour and the effects of punishment will serve as a deterrent to other criminals. Deterrence is a crime control strategy that uses punishment to prevent others from committing similar crimes (Bartollas, 2002:492). Rabie, Strauss and Mare (1994:11) point out that deterrence also makes potential criminals aware of the consequences of crime and is not only aimed at preventing the person who has been punished from further criminal behaviour. According to Schmalleger and Smykla (2001:37), even today in most countries that follow the Islamic law, specific deterrence through corporal punishment is used, such as cutting off the hands of habitual thieves.

There are two type of deterrence: specific deterrence and general deterrence.

• Specific deterrence applies to the individual who is being punished; the aim is to prevent that person from committing additional crime in a sense that the punishment will prevent that offender from being involved in any criminal activities because of bad experiences with previous offences (Muthaphuli, 2008:48).

• General deterrence discourages other offenders from committing the crime; the punishment imposed on an offender shows others what will happen to them if they engage in doing the same crime (Silverman & Vega, 1996:566).

There are two ways in which general deterrence functions:

• The threat of punishment may prevent society in general from becoming involved in criminal activities.
• The continuation of punishment may have an educational and formative influence on the moral conditioning of society in general (Cilliers, 2008:45).

Ultimately, deterrence is scrutinised based on its effect on those who are punished (Silverman & Vega, 1996:21).

2.3.3 Incapacitation

Incapacitation is the means of detaining a person who has committed a crime and thus preventing him/her from committing additional crime. This punishment serves as a strategy to separate offenders from society and is also referred to as the “lock them up approach” (Schmalleger, 1995:368). Incapacitation refers to a way of keeping criminals off the streets in order to reduce crime (Livingston, 1996:476).

Muthaphuli (2008:49) identifies three types of incapacitation, i.e. collective incapacitation, selective incapacitation and criminal career incapacitation:

• Collective incapacitation means that offenders who have been convicted for the same offence should be given the same sentence.

• Selective incapacitation means that sentences are based on forecasts of crimes that convicted offenders will be responsible for committing (Silverman & Vega, 1996:22).

• Criminal career incapacitation means selecting those criminals who have a high rate of crime.

Bartollas (2002:75) maintains that the advantage of selective incapacitation is that the rate of crime will be reduced by aiming at offenders who are regarded as high risk.

2.3.4 Rehabilitation

In the USA rehabilitation was the most well-known correctional philosophy for many years (Mays & Winfree, 2005:6). The use of rehabilitation has always been promoted as a key correctional goal in every correctional institution. The term ‘rehabilitation’ can be described as the process of changing the current criminal behaviour of an offender through some form of
vocational, educational or therapeutic treatment (Clear & Cole, 2000:77). Offenders are expected to learn sound work skills and go through educational programmes that will ensure their effective reintegration into community (Balfour, 2003:46). Rehabilitation is also known as treatment-based penalty and has to do with improving the offender’s condition in order not to resort to crime again. The Department of Correctional Services plays a most prominent role in this goal as punishment is designed to fit the need of the individual applying correctional resources (Schwartz & Travis, 1997:11). The goal of this punishment is to change the offender’s attitude about what they have done, and reform them so that they do not commit crime again (Wikipedia, [s.a.]).

Boyes-Watson (2003:244) assert that the criminal justice of our time accepts an idea all of these goals, to a certain extent, yet these goals also compete with one another, and the justice system has generally only embraced one or two of these goals throughout history.

2.4 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRISONS

Various authors over the years have issued different opinions regarding the history and development of prisons. Therefore, it is very difficult to trace the origin of prisons. According to Snarr (1996:80), the word ‘jail’ originates from the Old French word ‘jaole’. It is obvious that the place of confinement has existed for centuries, no matter the linguistic origins or spelling. Muthaphuli (2008:50) traces the place of confinement to the ancient Greeks, in 1399 BC when Socrates was authorised to put forward his sentence. This is in line with Snarr’s statement (1996:80) that during ancient times, countries such as Rome, Greece and Egypt all had selected confinement.

2.4.1 The origins of prison from the biblical perspective

The history of prisons has been traced back to 2 000 years before the birth of Christ. The book of Genesis contains an account of Joseph’s imprisonment in Egypt. Howard (1777: 3) writes: “Plato announced that ‘Let there be prisons in the city, one for the safe-keeping of the person awaiting trial and sentence, another for the amendment of disorderly persons and vagrants, those
guilty of misdemeanors ..., a third to be situated away from the habitation of man and to be used for the punishment of the felon’. An example of arrest is found in Genesis, chapter 39, verses 20-22: “Joseph’s master took him, and put him in prison, a place where the king’s prisoners were confined: and he was there in the prison. But the lord was with Joseph, showed him mercy, and gave him favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison. The keeper of the prison was committed to Joseph and all the prisoners that were in the prison, and what they did, he was the doer of it”. Du Preez (2003:28) also finds that a number of other well-known characters in the Old Testament were confined for different reasons. The book of Leviticus, chapter 24, verses 10-12 also serves as an example of people who were arrested. Arrests can also be traced to the New Testament after the death of Christ Jesus. The account of where Peter was apprehended and imprisoned can be found in Acts, chapter 12, verses 4 and 5: “and after arresting him, he put him in prison and delivered him to four quaternions of the soldiers to keep him … Peter therefore was kept in the prison”. Other religious books also refer to confinement in rooms and facilities such as old cellars and dens for animals which were not originally constructed for punishment (Muthaphuli, 2008:50).

During biblical times, one of the features of imprisonment was the manner in which the prisoner was incarcerated. Prisoners were housed together in one big space and there were no single cells. Prisoners had limited freedom of movement and they were also responsible for their own maintenance inside the prison (Du Preez, 2003:28).

2.4.2 The origins and development of prisons in the mediaeval era

According to Neser (1993:13-14), in the early mediaeval period, places of confinement served as accommodation for prisoners who were awaiting trial. The prisons housed debtors punished by religious courts and were also used for the confinement of political prisoners. Howard (1777:3) explains that in Roman law by Justinian in 5 BC, prisons were used not as a means of punishment, but as a way of ensuring safe custody.
Allen and Simonsen (1986:10) state that in the early mediaeval era most places of detention were basically cages. The Mamertine prison was known as the only early Roman place of imprisonment. In 64 BC Roman prisons such as Mamertine were built and constructed in a simple and old dark underground building under the main sewer system. Both Snarr (1996:80) and Reid (1981:130) also state that early places of detention were characterised by unscalable pits, dungeons, suspended cages and sturdy trees to which prisoners were chained pending trial. The Mamertine prison, which still exists in Rome near the Capitoline hill, was an underground cellar to which entrance was gained from a small grating covering the top. The prison consists of an upper rectangular room lit by a hole in the roof, with a dome-shaped cell below. Prisoners not sentenced to death were confined to the upper room and thrown into the lower dungeon where they had nothing to eat, were strangled or waited for an even more painful and lingering death. The use of long-term confinement of offenders was first used by the Roman Catholic Church; this was done by locking offenders into the gate house of the abbey throughout the Middle Ages as a humane intention to replace execution (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:90).

During that period offenders were not separated according to classification. There were very inhumane physical conditions, unhealthy food and no treatment or rehabilitation programmes took place.

The earliest prison construction was authorised by Assize of Clarendon in 1166. This also outlined the jury system and court procedure but these were not the same as we have in the 21st century (Kerle, 1998:2). Muthaphuli (2008:50) describes how King Henry II ordered that the jail be built. Criminals were confined in the baulk house in Winchester High Street; therefore, this is claimed as the first true prison (Pugh, 1968:59). According to Snarr (1996:80), King Henry II required each sheriff to establish a place to secure the offender until the next king court emergency in the district. Pugh (1968:4-5) explains: “The somewhat sporadic arrangement was made systematic by instruction issued in 1166. This instruction, which has hitherto been accepted as part of Assize of Clarendon, enjoined all sheriffs to ensure that in counties where no gaols (prisons) existed gaols should be built. In this building there should be those presumptive evil-doers who had been arrested by those officers who were accustomed to make arrest or by the
sheriff’s own servants. From this time forth the detention of untried suspects in gaols is a common occurrence. Such detention lasted until the prisoner was bailed or judgment was passed on him by a court. Even if bailed he was naturally no quit of the menace of confinement until his trial had ended.” In England, during 1160, all services of confinement were operated by municipal and city governments as well as the religious order. The English jails were responsible for local units of government and were administered by law enforcement personnel. These two descriptions of early English prisons remain common elements of the current US facilities (Snarr, 1996:80).

During 1569 in Rome, Pope Pius V erected the prison of inquisition. The prison was located next to the great church of St. Peters. The prison’s windows were built in wooden blinds, with high walls (Chaneles, 1985:11). In Italy there were three well-known prisons: Venice, Florence and Bologna. Venice was probably the first prison to formalise the use of a punitive imprisonment system and has been well known since the 13th and 14th centuries. The prison was designed with official holding rooms. Beneath the roof of the palace’s eastern wing, several cells were constructed simultaneously, including the ward for female miscreants, whom until then were imprisoned in close proximity monasteries (Geltner, 2008:11-12). Bartollas (2002:32) indicates that prisons were used more extensively throughout the mediaeval era by Romans as well as within and outside Rome. There was also a prison situated on the southern slopes of the Capitoline hill in Rome called Latumiae Quarry Prison. Florence was known as an original, purpose-built prison. Bologna was a more modest and less eccentric city state, and its prisons’ history is only known only in its general contours.

According to Snarr (1996:80), the places of confinement from the 16th to the 18th centuries were mostly places of disease and faith. There was no policy regarding imprisonment or function in the early prison (Du Preez, 2003:27).
2.5 THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF PRISONS BEFORE 1870 IN THE USA

“Early prisons in the United States of America were modelled on the British system. Both were based on the idea of expiation and required that inmates be as socially isolated from each other as possible” (Quinn, 2003:35).

2.5.1 The Walnut Street Jail

There was a radical proposal by Philadelphian society for the alleviation of the misery of public prisons after they observed the many emerging problems at the birth places of the US prisons. Stinchcomb and Fox (1999:100) explain that in 1790 the community of the city of Philadelphia recognised the first penitentiary at the Walnut Street Jail. Sentenced offenders were detained in Walnut Street Jail for correction. This jail was influenced by and used the concept of John Howard, who believed that offenders should be classified with regard to the seriousness of their offence and that alcohol should not be allowed in the prison. It therefore had a crude classification system (Hippchen, 1975:4) and was known for its humanitarian approach. In the Walnut Street Jail, offenders performed their work activities as inflexible labour in their cells under strict rules of silence, during the day. Each cell was attached to a small exercise yard for offenders. The jail was designed in such a way that offenders to be in solitary confinement; this was done to decrease moral suppression from other offenders. The notion was that a humane prison was created by hard work, Bible reading, religious instruction and solitary confinement. The aim of the penitentiary during this period was to ensure that the offenders were given the opportunity to feel repentance for their unlawful act that they had committed for some extended period of time (Carlson & Garrett, 1999:9). Throughout the first decade of operation the Walnut Street Jail had a successful programme. During that time society outside the street and at home was free of crime. The same also applied to businesses. Because crime dropped to the point that society felt free, the jail initiated the programmes that formed the basis for the development of early prisons of the USA (Silverman & Vega, 1996:75).
From 1790 the Walnut Street Jail construction and programmes were used throughout Europe because of its reputation of being a model prison. Due to the fact that the Walnut Street Jail was the only prison with the best treatment programmes, this led to an increase in the number of offenders as a result of the growing state population (Silverman & Vega, 1996:75). Because of the overcrowding in the prison, no labour could be found for prisoners in single cells. Its programmes started failing from 1800 because it was not able to manage the number of offenders who were admitted to the prison. It was also impracticable for prison personnel to provide the personal attention that was the main factor of the prison administration (Silverman & Vega, 1996:75). By 1820 the situation had collapsed.

In 1818 and 1821 an Act was authorised by the Pennsylvania legislator to construct two more penitentiaries, the Western Penitentiary at Pittsburgh and the Eastern Penitentiary at Cherry Hill. Identifying that reform was impossible under overcrowding conditions in the Walnut Street Jail, these two prisons were to operate under the principle of solitary confinement (Silverman & Vega, 1996:75). Due to the failure of Walnut Street Jail, some alternatives were considered and large prisons were built with separate cells for the incarcerated offenders who were serving their extended sentences. In the 1820s the Pennsylvania and Auburn systems came to the forefront in the USA as model prisons. According to Cilliers, Luyt, Du Preez & Jonker (2008:4), both prisons were similar with regard to absolute silence between offenders.

2.5.2 The Auburn system

The Auburn system was implemented in 1816. This system was known for its harsh programmes where offenders were locked in solitary confinement at night but during the day they worked as a team. The prison was also known as the congregate or silent system (Carlson & Garrett, 1999:9) where the prisoner was securely entombed within the penitentiary walls; once again the outside world was left at bay (Johnson, 1996:38). The prison rule was that offenders were not allowed to talk or even to have a quick look at each other (Du Preez, 2003:31). Prisoners ate together, worked together and moved together through the prison, and so it was a challenge to maintain isolation of prisoners because at all times prisoners were forced to be silent. They marched in
lockstep from the cell block to the mess hall and to the factory (Bartollas, 2002:51). During the day inmates maintained silence when performing their work; the silence was only broken by the sound of tools and machines. Self-punishment and purity were sought in the form of solitary penance by night (Johnson, 1996:39). The Auburn prison became the model for prisoners through the USA. The system was built on the idea that corruption among inmates could be prevented by making sure that inmates were silent and that this could also prevent riots and inmates plotting to escape and ensure that they really worked hard (Silverman & Vega, 1996:79). It was believed that the Auburn system provided an economical system of management and stringent discipline to meet imprisonment objectives and allowed the safe and efficient effective functioning of the prison. Muthaphuli (2008:54) states that in the Auburn system income was generated by the offenders who worked in groups and this reduced the burden of the prison of expenses such as food and housing. By producing food, prisoners could maintain themselves.

2.5.3 The Pennsylvania system

2.5.3.1 Western Penitentiary

The Pennsylvania system was established in Pittsburgh in 1826. The penal system advocated total separate confinement and silence of each offender. Offenders were confined separately to their cell during the night (Carson & Garrett, 1999:10). This system was the first system of prison discipline developed at the Walnut Street Jail. Offenders behind each individual cell were offered only an hour to relax during the day in a walled area.

2.5.3.2 Eastern Penitentiary

By 1829 the Eastern State Penitentiary was opened at Cherry Hill as the first facility to be put into effect and became a model for prisons in several European countries (Silverman & Vega, 1996:75). Clear and Cole (1997: 54) point out that “Eastern State Penitentiary resides outside of Philadelphia and was recognized as the model for the Pennsylvanian system of separate confinement. The building was designed to ensure that each offender was separated from all human contact so that he could reflect upon his unlawful conduct”. It was designed with seven
wings radiating from a central hub; each wing consisted of 76 cells, where control personnel were allocated (Bartollas, 2002:48). The thick cell walls were built or designed to effectively prevent prisoners from communicating with one another (Bartollas, 2002:48). The prison was designed in such a way that offenders would not have to be removed from their cells (Silverman & Vega, 1996:75). Allen and Simonsen (1986:30) explain that Eastern Penitentiary was designed to some extent like a square wheel with the cell blocks arranged like spokes around the hub, or central rotunda. Offenders were allowed to exercise in a separate exercise enclosure and were given an opportunity to go to the open area for an hour in a day (Bartollas, 2002:48). Prisoners on the second floor were allowed an extra cell for exercise purposes, whereas first floor cells had individual walled exercise yards which prisoners were allowed to use for an hour per day (Silverman & Vega, 1996:76).

According to Keve (1981:73-74), the Eastern State Penitentiary had the appearance of sombre power, of order and of control. This was done through the designing of the facade of the building with its flanking walls and mediaeval castle. The cells of Eastern State Penitentiary implemented the philosophy and function of the prison. The prison had central heating with steam pipes running to each cell, as well as sewer lines and running water pipe systems, permitting toilets in cells. Such advanced equipment was not available even in many prisons built half a century or more later. Overcrowding became a problem in this prison and inmates had to double up in each cell, the prison was expensive to function and it was no longer possible for inmates to be in solitary confinement (Bartollas, 2002:48).

The Eastern Penitentiary’s programmes focused on a separate system, work and penitence, and this was justified based on the view that:

- “Communication in any (form) contributed to the contamination of the less hardened by the vicious....”
- The only thing that could stop such contamination was by applying solitary confinement so that offenders did not have an opportunity to communicate with each other.
- Working in their cells relieved the dreadful boredom of solitary confinement.
- Locking up prisoners in prison in silence day and night would inevitable make them reflect upon their unlawful deeds (Silverman & Vega, 1996:76).
The Pennsylvania system was based on principles that were highlighted by Robert Vaux, who was known as one of the original prison reformers. Clear and Cole (1997:54-55) state that the principles that were described by Vaux are as follow:

- Prisoners should be treated in a manner that can lead them to change their lives and not be abused.
- Solitary confinement can be a solution to prevent the offenders from being a corrupting influence.
- By confining offenders in a solitary cell the offender has to think about their unlawful conduct.
- Solitary confinement is a punishment.

According to Quinn (2003:34), offenders in the Pennsylvania system were not in contact with each other. This was done because it was believed that solitary confinement would reduce violence. The Pennsylvania system extended the concept of the Walnut Street Jail. In the Pennsylvanian prison only clergy and a small number of general public were permitted to see offenders. The system was not profitable because offenders working by themselves were not very productive. The segregation system was eventually abandoned. There were also unresolved financial support problems in the prison system. Owing to the economic crisis and overcrowding, Pennsylvania ultimately adopted the congregate system that had been developed in Auburn, New York.

2.6 THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRISONS IN THE LATE 19TH CENTURY

"However by the 1860s, overcrowding became the rule of the day, partly because of the long sentences given for violent crimes, despite increasing severity inside the prison and often cruel methods of gagging and restraining prisoners. An increasing proportion of prisoners were new immigrants. As a result of a tour of prisons in 18 states, Enoch Wine and produced a monumental report describing the flaws in the existing system and proposing remedies. Their critical finding was that not one of the state prisons in the United States was seeking the
reformation of its inmates as a primary goal. They set out an agenda for reform which was endorsed by a National Congress in Cincinnati in 1870. These ideas were put into practice in the Elmira Reformatory in New York in 1876 run by Zebulon Brockway. At the core of the design was an educational program which included general subjects and vocational training for the less capable. Instead of fixed sentences, prisoners who did well could be released early” (Morries & Rothman, 1995: 175).

2.6.1 National Prison Association (Cincinnati)

Stinchcomb and Fox (1999:105) point out that finally in 1870 the sad plight of American prisons recaptured public notice, with attention no longer diverted by wars. In the very same year there was an assembly in Cincinnati, which was to form the National Prison Association. The meeting was held by reform-minded prison administrators, members of Congress and provincial citizens. This assembly was later known as the American Correctional Association. In these meetings new and progressive ideas were presented by the speakers from the USA and abroad, such as providing prisoners with educational opportunities and religious instruction. Clear and Cole (1997:59) state that among these public figures were Gaylord Hubbell, a warden who in 1863 had observed the Irish system in operation; Enoch C. Wines, the New York Prison Association Secretary; Franklin Sanborn, Charities Massachusetts State Board Secretary; and Zebulon Brockway, head of Detroit’s Michigan House of Correction.

These penologists understood how prisons operated and they were also motivated by humanitarian concerns. The Association advocated a new design for penology in its famous declaration of principles: that prisons should be operated on a philosophy of inmate change (Clear & Cole, 1997:59). Issues such as corporal punishment, overcrowding and the physical condition of prisons were some of the important concerns that were dealt with by this association (Carlson & Garrett, 1999:11). Silverman and Vega (1996:87) comment that it is truly outstanding that these principles were adopted by the conference in view of the inhumane prison conditions during this period, even though the humane and progressive methods advocated at the Cincinnati conference were only employed on young, first offenders in so-called reformatories.
Stinchcomb and Fox (1999:105) indicate that the principles of the 1870 National Prison Association were as followed:

- Prisons should not use cruel methods of suffering; the purpose should be penal treatment and thus reformation.
- There should be classification of offenders on the basis of a marks system patterned after the Irish system.
- Prisoners should be provided rewards for good conduct.
- The prison authority should make prisoners aware that their futures rest in their own hands.
- Indefinite sentences should be substituted for permanent sentences, and differences in sentences removed.
- Prisons should have education and religion as the most important agencies of reformation in order for the prison to gain the prisoners’ cooperation and maintain their self-respect.
- The prison authority should administer discipline.
- The prison goal should be to make industrious free citizens, not orderly and respectful prisoners.
- The prison authority should fully provide industrial training.
- Prisons should be small; separate institutions should be provided for different types of offenders.
- The rules of silence should be brought to an end and the aim should be the facilitation of prisoners’ social training.
- It is the responsibility of society at large to realise the conditions that raised crime.

2.6.2 Elmira

Clear and Cole (1997:60) state that in 1876 at Elmira Reformatory in New York a new approach was implemented when Zebulon Brockway was appointed as superintendent. Brockway, as a leader of the new form of penology, believed that the identification and treatment of offenders were the keys to reforming and rehabilitating them. Brockway established a school programme which enabled offenders to progress from learning basic arithmetic, reading and writing skills to
classes in psychology, ethics, etc. (Silverman & Vega, 1996:88). Offenders were classified according to principles of treatment; treatment, in turn, was personalised (Johnson, 1996:66). The release date could be determined by the administrators once the courts had committed an offending lawbreaker to Elmira. The time served could not exceed the maximum prescribed by law for the particular offence (Clear & Cole, 1997:60).

Johnson (1996:66) describes Elmira Reformatory as “the original model from which progressive penology evolved”. It was the first correctional institution to pay wages to offenders. The wages also served to pay for board, lodging and clothing. The finances of the system were orderly so that when offenders were released from the prison there would be some money to their credit. By the turn of the 20th century the Elmira programme was being copied in 12 other states and in 11 more by 1933 despite growing doubts about the success of the system (Bartollas, 2002:53). Even though Elmira was originally built for adult offenders, it was later utilised for youth from 16 to 30 years of age who were serving in prison for the first time and who were identified as capable of being reformed (Allen & Simonsen, 1986:43). Personalised indeterminate sentences were offered to these offenders under which they were imprisoned either until they had served their maximum term or were reformed (Silverman & Vega, 1996:88).

Brockway initiated the process of classification at Elmira Reformatory to ensure that prisoners could be grouped according to custody requirements and programme needs (Clear & Cole, 1997:360). According to Silverman and Vega (1996:88), Elmira was the first to introduce the parole system in the US. Brockway was credited with developing the first parole system which decided on a prisoner’s appropriateness for release after seeking advice from the superintendent. The offenders had to have a job they could start when released. In order to qualify for their freedom from prison and transfer by their employers, parolees had to submit monthly reports stating that they were sustaining good work behaviour. This took place while offenders were under supervision during the six-month parole period. The superintendent had to rely on volunteers to supervise parolees, due to the problem that the parole officers were not paid. Offenders who were not acting in accordance with the circumstances of their parole were returned to Elmira and placed in the second or third grade. Those offenders were offered a second chance to be reformed at Brockway’s discretion (Silverman & Vega, 1996:88).
According to Hippchen (1975:5), Elmira Reformatory was the beginning of the significant movement toward educational, vocational and individual rehabilitation programmes in correctional institutions. Johnson (1996:68) adds that in both Brockway’s time and for some time thereafter, Elmira was known for its obvious discipline and order. The orderly behaviour of the offenders was observed by visitors and attributed to the effectiveness of the Elmira system. However, this was based on patterns of abuse brought to light during and after Brockway’s term.

2.7 ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION

Before 1870 in mediaeval prisons offenders were not classified. Women and children both healthy and sick were detained in the same cell. Sanitation did not exist; the strong preyed on the weak amongst offenders and there were poor environmental and unhygienic conditions as well as other inhumane conditions. Furthermore, officials viewed their jobs as a business opportunity by selling food and accommodation to offenders (Clear & Cole, 1997:34).

2.7.1 Offender classification in the mediaeval period

According to a number of authors such as Carlson and Garrett (1999:261), Clear and Cole (1997:34), Pugh (1968:363), Fox (1985:204) and Silverman and Vega (1996:359), during the mediaeval period, England was identified as the country in Europe that initiated the classification of offenders, even though there were no treatment programmes that were considered in prisons. According to Pugh (1968:363), in 1293 the Chancellor of Oxford University requested the Borough prison to separate serious offenders from those guilty of petty offences in order to provide separate accommodation for clerks.

In 1344 at Warwick a special room was constructed for trespassers. In 1368 at Newgate prison there were separate rooms for housing the felons and offenders who had committed crimes that were not considered to be very serious (misdemeanours). The original prison at Newgate was built in 1188 but was rebuilt in 1770. The accommodation of Newgate prison after it was rebuilt was divided into three classes:
• The first class was for honourable persons who were known as the best free men of the city and honest.
• The second class was for strangers and people of lower ranks.
• The third class was for felons and other persons suspected of a major offence. They were detained in basement cells and strongholds (Pugh, 1968:353).

This above indicates that England by then separated offenders according to the nature of their crime.

Sorting out offenders into groups based on certain general descriptions dates back to the 1500s, where small numbers of offenders were sorted out from dangerous ones. In the early stages of correction, placing men and women offenders in different parts of some facility was common, but authorities realised that more distinctive separation was necessary (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:142).

According to Hippchen (1975:4), Spain first separated women from men in their prisons and other institutions in 1518. Stinchcomb and Fox (1999:309) also support this statement by mentioning that in 1519 classification was a method which was used by the Spanish prisons. Separated men and women were probably the earlier examples of classification. “The histories of classification date back to the mid-1500s when the house correction was first opened in England and Europe. Initial forms of classification resulted from demands of reformers who were trying to eliminate prisoners’ vices and reduce the mistreatment and corruption of younger and weaker offenders” (Silverman & Vega, 1996:359). During the mediaeval period in Rome, several cells in Venice Prison were simultaneously constructed beneath the roof of the palace’s eastern wings, including wards for females and wrongdoers, until then incarcerated in nearby monasteries. Several decades later the Venice council of ten commissioned more cells on the palace’s top floor to serve as holding rooms for men under investigation. Theoretically this act created a separation between the detainees of the upper prison and the debtors and convicts of the lower ward.
Howard (1777:3) claims that Plato announced: “Let there be prisons in the city, one for the safe keeping of persons awaiting trial and sentence, another for the amendments of disorderly persons and vagrants, those guilty of misdemeanours ..., a third to be situated away from the habitations of man and to be used for the punishment of the felon.” Hippchen (1975:4) agrees that Plato contributed to the structure of mediaeval society. Plato clearly believed in offender classification and it is also evident that classification was not something used frequently at that time.

Superintendent Jean Jacques Phillips, Vilain of the Maison de Force in Flondes, implemented the segregation of misdemeanants and vagrants, as well as women and children, i.e. a simple classification of prisoners. This indicates that classification as a process is not a new idea (Hippchen, 1975:4). The society of St. Vincent de Paul in Europe established the first house of refuge for stray children (Hippchen, 1975:4).

### 2.7.2 Offender classification in the late 1700s

“In 1773, the Maison de force at Ghent reserved each of its housing units for a particular type of offender. In eight self-contained, trapezoid-shaped components, which together formed a giant octagon, offenders were first separated by gender. With each gender, offenders were separated by age, degree of criminality, and length of sentence” (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:142).

In 1777 Howard for the first time called public attention to improvements in English and Welsh prisons such as separation of offenders by sex, age and severity of their offence (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:97). In 1790 in the USA at the Walnut Street Jail, the Quakers separated offenders by sex (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:309). Muthaphuli (2008:52) states that on the basis of gender, age, debtors and the mentally ill, offenders were separated from the criminal population in the Walnut Street Jail. Later the Walnut Street Jail launched a classification process to divide grave lawbreakers from others (Walsh, 2001:140). According to Lewis (1967:17), those classified as serious offenders were placed in isolation and were not allowed to work or interact with other prisoners. Classification was not a main issue during the development of prisons in the US. However, in 1804, the Charleston prison in Massachusetts established a tri-level system of
classification based on offenders with prior convictions. Each of the three groups was identified by a distinctive uniform and groups were segregated according to prison work and differential access to various amenities. First-time offenders were allowed only two meals per day and performed the less desirable work. Third time, or habitual reoffenders did the most menial tasks and received the worst food (Lewis, 1967:17).

According to Muthaphuli (2008:50), at Auburn prison, offenders were confined according to the nature of their crime. However, classification at that prison was not recognised much more because offenders were detained equally, worked at productive labour, and harsh discipline was used as a way of maintaining order (Silverman & Vega, 1996:359). Walsh (2001:141) supports this statement by mentioning that the Auburn prison system provided the model for most prison construction which invariably entailed maximum security with harsh conditions of confinement.

2.7.3 Offender classification from 1800s to the 20th century

According to Carlson and Garrett (1999:260), prisons were arranged in a way that law violators were made to read the Bible. In the early 1800s prisoners were to think about whether they should do misdeeds and become patient: Classification served only a separation function due to the fact that every prisoner was treated in the same manner. Prisoners were detained separately in different cells. In the late 1800s some prison reformers recognised the need to classify offenders by the seriousness of their offences and to separate children from adults and women from men (Reid, 1997:545). Beccaria of Italy and Howard in England suggested that prisoners be separated by gender and by severity of the offence; they felt that sane and insane prisoners should not be confined in the same cell and that juvenile offenders should also be confined separately.

In the early part of the 19th century adult offenders and juveniles began to be segregated within the New York establishment of private houses of refuge. By 1847 in Massachusetts public juvenile training schools were established and they were followed by educational programmes for juveniles at the Elmira Reformatory in 1876 (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:309). At the Elmira Reformatory the offenders were classified according to principles of treatment; treatment, in
turn, was personalised (Johnson, 1996:66). By mid-19th century, separation of juvenile and elder offenders was well launched globally (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:142). Between 1840 and 1844 Alexander Maconochie, who served as the warden of New Folk Island penal colony near Australia, came up with the idea that offenders had to earn their board and lodging by working in small groups. This system was known as a terminate sentence, where offenders could benefit from early release from prison custody by doing hard work and displaying good behaviour. Sir Walter Crofton of Ireland adapted the Maconochie idea. His system was based on a series of stages through which offenders go to earn their own freedom (Silverman, 2001: 94) & (Quinn, 2003:36-37). Offenders were given a certain number of marks during admission, depending upon the seriousness of the offence (Hippchen, 1975:5).

Boon and Moerings (2007:20) report that by 1840 in France parliament showed strong feelings of excitement and interest in discussing and expressing different opinions regarding the classification of offenders. The majority of parliamentarians expressed their support for solitary confinement of unlimited maximum duration. The revolution of 1845 destroyed the enthusiasm for prison reform.

According to Johnson (1996:66), in Elmira Reformatory, classification of offenders was seen as a rehabilitation tool, and the treatment was individualised. Clear and Cole (1997:60) explain the so-called three grade system of classification at Elmira. Each offender entered the prison in Grade 2. If an offender earned nine marks a month for six months by hard labour, completing school assignments and causing no problems, then the offender was transferred up to Grade 1. If the offender was unsuccessful in cooperating and violated rules governing proper conduct, then the offender could be downgraded to Grade 3.

The first public notice of the birth of a new organisation was found in the proceedings of the Annual Congress of the National Prison Association, held in Nashville Tennessee (Community Resources for Justice, [s.a.]). In 1889 the Prison Association from the Nashville meeting provided the classification status and administration processes for prisons.
2.7.4 Offender classification in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century

Separation for treatment purposes began to appear in France when Benet and Simon were commissioned in 1904 to develop an intelligence test to determine which troubled children could be sent to school and which might as well be sent to work. In 1908, the test was improved, translated into English in 1911 and brought to the Vineland training school in New Jersey (Fox, 1985:204). Stinchcomb and Fox (1999:309) mention that the period in which classification was used for diagnosis and planning was stimulated by these developments that provided more focus on institutional security.

Hippchen (1975:8) reports that based on results from a study by the prison inquiry commission, a classified system was established in 1917 and clinical experts were introduced into penal institutions. The original classification in New Jersey was as follows:

- A complicated class of prisoners who were aggressive to the public and needed close custody. These included prisoners that were serving long-term sentences with reasonably good prognosis and needed secure supervision.
- The basically unintelligent prisoners whose conditions were not complicated by psychotic behaviours.
- The faulty criminal class whose feeble minds were combined with high emotional unsteadiness and who could need a period of long custody and training under an indefinite prison term.
- A class of offenders who suffered from epileptic and psychotic disorders who had to be transferred to the hospital for psychological or mental examination.
- The offences who were behaving in a confused and harmless way.

According to Hippchen (1975:9), by 1920 different types of classification had been identified and recommended as follows: transfer, social services, medical, treatment and training programmes, including employment, education, religion and recreation. During the 1920s, classification was analysed as a critical aspect of functioning in a penal system. It was used both
when offenders entered the system and as a tool instrument to determine the likelihood of parole in the community (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:142).

Carlson and Garrett (1999:261) point out that in the late 1920s better classification of inmate and progressive treatment to reshape offenders was urged by the Wickersham Commission on developing individualised treatment programmes based on clinical data. Each inmate’s social and criminal history became the point of focus. In 1929 a classification system was developed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons under Sanford Bates, which provided the congressional action of 1930. The programme for classification was the same as that in New Jersey. In Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Massachusetts and other states, classification was spreading and popular. In the North and South the segregation of black and white prisoners was made during that era.

According to Carlson and Garrett (1999:261), a congressional Act, approved on 27 May 1930, mandated the classification of federal prisoners as follows:

“It is hereby declared to the policy of the congress that the said institutions be so planned and limited in the size as to facilitate the development of an integrated federal penal and correctional system which will assure the proper classification and segregation of federal prisoners according to their character, the nature of the crime they have committed, their mental condition, and such other factors as should be taken in to consideration in providing an individualizing system of discipline, care and treatment of the persons committed to such institution”.

Stinchcomb and Fox (1999:309) explain that in the 1930s, the concept of classification was adopted by most state correctional systems in the USA. Before the classification was adopted, judges sentenced persons to any correctional institution within the state, therefore classification was done by the courts. During the 1930s the Federal Bureau of Prisons was organised and the programmes of individual treatment using classification were introduced (Fox, 1985:204). According to Carlson and Garrett (1999:261), during 1930 not every correctional official believed in classification. Since the congressional Act required radical changes and challenges in
their daily work activities, they felt threatened or insecure, because transformation often results in so many insecurities.

In 1931 a research division was created and was known as a classification committee. The classification committee method produced part of the programme of a general session of the American Prison Association in 1936. The Assistant Director of the US Bureau of Prisons specified that the Bureau was not the only agency undertaking classification, but that it was straight from the New Jersey plan (Hippchen, 1975:9). Hippchen (1975:9) states that in 1935 Minnesota established a state board of classification. In December 1936 the state of Indiana commenced with classification, and Michigan followed in 1937. According to Allen and Simonsen (1986:167), a great amount of debate about correctional treatment accompanied the movement towards increased use of classification. The American Correctional Association outlined some of the more positive aspects of this strategy.

In 1938 the first handbook on classification procedure was developed by an institutional classification committee appointed by the American Correctional Association (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:309). According to Fox (1985:206), the handbook was published in 1947 and has improved prisons over the years in the USA.

Fox (1985:206) reports that when classification in prisons began, the committee was large. The practice was generally to meet twice a week for an afternoon to classify the offenders who had arrived approximately 30 days before and whose information was available. The committee, made up of 10 to 12 people, frequently included the Director of Education, Chief Steward, Director of Classification, the chaplain, the laundry superintendent and previous staff members. Hippchen (1975:20) explains that the main aim of the committee was to analyse the problems of the offenders in the institution and to plan and administer an individualised treatment plan that met offenders’ requirements. Each member of the classification committee took an offender’s files and gave a brief history and recommendation of an offender, and then the offender would meet the committee. The committee member would then announce to the offender what the committee had decided. This type of classification was called the pre-professional type (Fox,
1985:206). Most correctional institutions commenced operating on the basis of the institutional classification committee after the Second World War in the US (Hippchen, 1975:21). “Many states, particularly Southern states, have had statutes establishing classification on the basis of whether a man could do a good day’s work, generally on the roads. For example, Florida law until July 1, 1957 indicated that class 1 prisoners were those who could do a good day’s work on the roads and class 2 prisoners were women and those men who could not do a good day’s work on roads. Custom developed a class 3 prisoner who were infirm and had to be hospitalized or otherwise treated with care” (Hippchen, 1975:9).

Butler (1960:38) describes how in England and Wales during early 1950s the Prison Act of 1952 was promulgated. The Act empowered the state secretary to make rules providing for special treatment of certain classes of prisoners. The category of classes included the following:

- **Untried offenders**: offenders who had not been admitted to prison on remand or awaiting trial. This offender had not been sentenced for any crime but there were one or two other classes of offenders who were treated as untried.
- **Appellants**: these were the offenders sentenced by the superior court and offenders who had been sentenced or who appealed against their convictions and had not been released on bail while waiting for the hearing of their appeal.
- **Offenders awaiting sentencing**: offenders who had been sentenced by the magistrate court and committed to custody by a higher court, or who had been allowed to make enquiries in order to determine the most appropriate particular way of dealing with them, and offenders who were committed to prison by the court of assize or quarter session.
- **Civil prisoners**: offenders who did not pay their debts and had been committed to prison. This included prisoners committed by the magistrate court who had failed to pay civil debts, rates and taxes. This also included contempt of court cases.
- **Sedition prisoners**: offenders who took the place of the former first division. This class had been sentenced for sedition, seditious conspiracy or seditious libel.
- **Other special classes**: offenders who were under the death sentence were confined in a special room. These classes included offenders suffering from mental disorders.
Carlson and Garrett (1999:261) state that by 1960s, a number of treatment practices had been developed in prisons, more predominantly young offenders’ treatment services such as vocational training, group and individual psychotherapy, and education up to a high school equivalency diploma, to meet the needs of the large numbers of prisoners. Classification became the main tool for the evaluation of a prisoner’s rights. In 1967 US President Johnson’s task force on correction stressed the point that management and treatment classification had to be based on procedures that could be implemented voluntarily within the correctional environment (Allen & Simonsen, 1986:168). According to Duffee (1989:333), in the period from 1930 to 1960 personality as a fundamental concern for correctional classification created a positive approach. During that period, the attention on individuality characteristics become connected with medical models of correction.

The first classification system in South African prisons employed from 1910 to 1957 concentrated on disciplinary measures. On 1 January 1958 the horizontal classification system was implemented. This classification system was very much associated with the consensus model, while in practice it rested on purely subjective principles. At the start of 1971 the South African correctional institution adopted a powerful classification system with the intention to launch individualised treatment of offenders in South African prisons (Neser, 1993:259).

The legitimacy of classification for management purposes was recognised by the National Advisory Commission on criminal justice standards and goals in 1973 (Duffee, 1989:334). Bartollas (2002:307) emphasises that offenders could make choices among the opportunities that were available in the reintegration model that was incorporated into the classification process during the 1970s. The reintegration model was widely used in America prisons during the 1970s. This model was also concerned with the overall needs of the offenders, such as vocational, medical, educational and religious needs, but since that period it has lost much of its recognition. Neser (1993:259) reports that in 1984 South African correctional services came to the conclusion that safe custody circumstances should be separated from offender concession. It was agreed that it should be possible for offenders in maximum security to enjoy maximum privilege, depending on the facilities available in the particular prison if offenders showed some kind of good
behaviour and cooperation. This was different from the provisions of the horizontal classification system.

2.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter provided an overview of the concept of punishment and its theories. Punishment has advanced through many phases since its inception and differs from one generation to the next. The origin of prisons was also outlined in this chapter. Europe shaped the American experience with regard to corrections. In the USA all the states were required to establish their own prisons at public expense. All prison structures became more popular. It is very clear that the classification that we experience in our modern times can be dated back to the mediaeval era up to the 18th century. The good example followed was that of the Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia which instituted a classification process to separate serious offenders from others. This separation was also done in the Pennsylvania penitentiary, which operated under the principle of solitary confinement. This clearly shows that there has always been some sort of classification in US prisons. Classification by institution began early in the development of prisons and correctional institutions. Classification as means of treatment is a mid-20th century developme
2.9 References


Pugh, R.B. 1968 *Imprisonment in Medieval England* University of London: Cambridge at the University press


CHAPTER 3

THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF REHABILITATION THAT ARE RELATED TO CLASSIFICATION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this research was to determine the impact of offender classification as a rehabilitation tool. This chapter will introduce how the rehabilitation concept caused significant friction in various correctional programmes within the correctional system. The model that has influenced correctional programmes within the system will also be discussed, in order to understand the functions of corrections.

Until recently, prisons focused on the punishment of offenders. However, a new school of thought regarding correctional institutions is that prisons should concentrate on the rehabilitation of sentenced offenders. An attempt is made in this chapter to uncover the establishment of new generation prisons based on principles of rehabilitation as a point of departure and other rehabilitation programmes that have implications for classification including education, recreation, counselling and case management. Offenders are classified and reclassified for any or all of these purposes throughout their imprisonment. In addition, the concept of professionalism that it is expected from correctional staff in order for the rehabilitation process to be successful will be discussed in this chapter and will also cover the various role players in the rehabilitation process which involve staff, offenders and external organisations (the community). The community as a role player cannot be taken too lightly since the offenders come from society. Therefore, the programmes that the community are involved in the prisons give offenders a greater sense of self-worth and membership in the outside world. The community must remain the centre of the rehabilitation process because for the offender it is both the place of origin and the place of return.
3.2 THE PHILOSOPHY OF REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation has been the dominant ideology of prisons since 1870 at the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline (Silverman, 2001:126). During the 1950s, the rehabilitation philosophy conquered correctional institutions, at least in the sense that penologists regarded it as acceptance of the aim towards which corrections should work (Silverman, 2001:126). Even in the 21st century prisons are known as correctional facilities that provide a diversity of rehabilitation programmes (Livingstone, 1996:475). Since the early days rehabilitation has assumed a variety of forms. Prison reformers believed in the idea that places of confinement could rehabilitate offenders; this idea was initiated in the 9th century. Through rehabilitation, correctional services should offer decent living conditions and effective programmes (Livingstone, 1996:496).

The Pennsylvania Quakers were one of the first to make serious efforts to reform adult offenders. This led to the late 18th century penitentiaries (Schmalleger, 2003:407). Classification was always a part of the system, since offenders were classified by the seriousness of their offences and children were separated from adults and women from men.

Rehabilitation allows offenders to be successfully reintegrated into the community as potential law-abiding citizens. It visualises the reorientation, re-education or reform of offenders with a view to their self-improvement, self-upliftment, greater self-control, greater acceptance of responsibility towards themselves, improvement etc. No one can force an offender to be rehabilitated. A realistic view of rehabilitation is based on the idea that there are degrees of rehabilitation and that not every offender is equally able to be rehabilitated (Cilliers, 2008:65). According to Bruyns et al. (1997:15), the key objective of the Department of Correctional Services is to rehabilitate offenders up until their release and to help them successfully reintegrate into the community as potential law-abiding citizens.

The rehabilitation of offenders within correctional institutions will assist offenders to be equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge in order to avoid reoffending. This can help
offenders gain insight into their criminal behaviour and realise that crime has brought injury to society.

The Department of Correctional Services offers skills training, education, sport recreation, culture opportunities, health care and psychological treatment, maintenance of family and community links, a safe and healthy detention environment, in order to prepare offenders to return to society with life as productive and law-abiding citizens (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2007:10).

According to Du Preez and Luyt (2004:154), the Department of Correctional Services has placed the rehabilitation of offenders at the centre of all its activities as one of its instruments to prevent crime and to control its potential to eliminate recidivism. It has formulated a strategy on offender rehabilitation plans called the “Offender Rehabilitation Path”, and it puts the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa into perspective. The offender rehabilitation path gives an overview of how offenders enter the correctional system (admission) until they are released to society as law-abiding citizens (Department of Correctional Services, 2007:8).

Therefore, every correctional official should be seen as a rehabilitator. The Department of Correctional Services needs more professional correctional officials to fulfil the abovementioned strategy.

3.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IMPRISONMENT AND REHABILITATION

It is not that difficult to reconcile the custody function with the treatment function of a correctional institution, since one of the functions clearly contains components that complement the other. Coetzee and Gericke (1997:43) assert that the safest prison is the one in which offenders are locked up in their cells all day long. However, the fact that a prisoner must return to society at some stage should not be ignored. Therefore, attention should be given to offender attitudes towards crime and the improvement of their quality of life. According to Muthaphuli (2008:60), every offender must participate in rehabilitation programmes that are accessible
within the correctional institution. Since the rehabilitation process forms a significant element of humane correctional treatment, functions of correctional systems must be aimed at the offenders’ rehabilitation and every correctional official must demonstrate the custodial function, the restorative function, the controlling function and the maintenance function (Faugeron, 1996:126).

3.3.1 The custodian function

The work of correctional services is to ensure that it carries out sentencing orders of the courts and monitors offender safety, ensuring that it prevents escapes by all means possible. Correctional officials are responsible for protecting the public by detaining persons in safe custody away from the public to limit offenders’ freedom (Seiter, 2002:375). While offenders are serving time in a correctional facility, society can be free from criminals knowing that the offenders cannot continue to victimise them (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:260).

In terms of the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998, the Department of Correctional Services must take the necessary steps to ensure the safe custody of every offender, and to maintain security and good order in every prison. Safe custody does not only mean that escape must be prevented, but also that prisoners must be held in safe conditions. Section 4 of the Act provides that custody must satisfy two requirements:

- It must be commensurate with the purpose for which it is applied.
- It must be applied in such a manner that the prisoners are not affected to a greater degree or for a longer period than is necessary (Jonker, 1997:81).

Correctional officials must ensure that rehabilitation is a point of departure during the custodial function (Coetze & Gericke, 1997:43).

3.3.2 The restorative function

The effective treatment or rehabilitation of offenders is made possible by the effectiveness of the correctional system in the way it achieves its objectives. It is also achieved through the restorative function because offenders comprise individuals with low education and a variety of
social, economic and personal problems such as addiction. Rehabilitation programmes must be designed to tackle these problems because the main aim of imprisoning offenders is to rehabilitate them in order to prepare them for their eventual return to society as law-abiding citizens (Faugeron, 1996:126).

3.3.3 The controlling function

There must be a regulatory relationship between the offender and correctional official, even though this is not easy. A good relationship between officials and prisoners is important as they strive for the same objective, which is to rehabilitate offenders (Muthaphuli, 2008:62).

3.3.4 The maintenance function

Offenders have to be provided with an extensive variety of services including housing, foodstuff, washing and laundry facilities and other resources. This is essential during their imprisonment in order to handle the offender population and to maintain control within the correctional institution. The Department of Correctional Services also has to provide services such as welfare services and leisure activities (Muthaphuli, 2008:62).

Coetzee and Gericke (1997:45) mention that the Department of Correctional Services also has a treatment function and this is a function that every correctional official must perform. The treatment function aims to train offenders in the practices of industry and labour and to rehabilitate them. The treatment programmes only focus on sentenced offenders, not at all offenders. For treatment programmes to be successful, a number of services must be available to offenders, since these programmes are at equipping them with those skills which can lead to dignified integration into society after their release. We can therefore conclude that the custodial and treatment functions are so interrelated that they can never be separated.
3.4 MODELS INFLUENCING THE HANDLING OF OFFENDERS IN THE CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM

A brief discussion follows regarding the contributions of six models which have influenced the modern philosophy of rehabilitation. These models are the medical model, adjustment model, reintegration model or community model, justice model, neo-utilitarian punishment model and confinement model.

3.4.1 Medical model

Plato, as the philosopher of the idea of reform or rehabilitation through punishment, emphasised that offenders were morally sick people and needed to be treated as sick people, and therefore the punisher (correctional system) acted as the soul’s doctor. Punishment is an instrument which the authorities can use to induce the offender to hate injustice, whose result is crime and to learn to love justice (Moberley, 1968:121). Schwartz and Travis (1997:205) explain that the term ‘medical model’ can be associated criminally with mental illness. “The medical model had several consequences for conventional treatment. The consequence of the medical model was that the focus of correctional intervention became the individual offender. The idea was that treatment programs should be designed to deal with those shortcomings in personality that caused the offender to commit a criminal act. The strategy central to that kind of treatment almost always included a variant of counselling.” Bartollas (2002:54) supports this statement by saying that with the concept of personal responsibility for culpability of offenders, the medical model proponents are concerned with finding cures rather than placing blame. It is believed that the model could treat the disease of criminality by implementing the ideal treatment plan and by recommending the proper kind of treatment. The medical model treats offenders according to their individual needs. Professions such as psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers play an important role in helping the offender throughout the process of recovery (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:30).
The medical model of individualised treatment of offenders was anticipated by a group of reformers during the so-called progressive era (1890-1920). The aim was to treat offenders as though they were sick and to analyse and treat criminal behaviour (Bartollas, 2002:52). Therefore emphasis is placed on the treatment function, which depends on the aim and philosophy of the correctional system. Correctional institutions offer various and specific treatment programmes. Classification will be then utilised as part of an assessment process to ensure the assignment of offenders to institutions where they may benefit from the treatment programmes available. According to Duffee (1989:333), a number of the medical model classifications used in corrections dishonoured the standards of good classification systems.

Since the medical model analyses the criminal act as a “cry for help”, punctual and effective therapeutic intervention is outlined in the treatment plan during classification. Whether or not the offender considers the necessary treatment is not the point. The offender’s own motivation to ask for assistance or not is largely ignored. Relatively, the treatment plan is based on the classification committee’s examination of offender needs (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:329). Offenders are released from confinement through parole, when they are rehabilitated (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:33).

3.4.2 Adjustment model

Muthaphuli (2008:55) states that the adjustment model was founded on the following views:

- As long as offenders do not blame their past problems as a reason for what caused them to be involved in crime, they can become law-abiding citizens by accepting that they are responsible for their problems.
- Offenders must gain insight into their offending behaviour and understand that their crime has caused injury to others. They need to try to adjust in order to improve their chances of leading a crime-free life.
- Offenders can be taught alternative law-abiding behaviour.
- In order to understand the criminal behaviour of the offender, offender relationship and interaction with the rest of society should be taken into consideration.
The adjustment model forms part of the classification for treatment needs since the offender is assigned to a correctional institution most suited to their individual needs; the goal of the classification process is to rehabilitate offenders (Cilliers, Luyt, Du Preez & Jonker, 2008:113). According to Du Preez (2003:38), there must be an acknowledgement of the offenders’ responsibility for their dilemma. It is believed that offenders are different from law-abiding citizens.

### 3.4.3 Community model

The community model is also sometimes called the reintegration model. It is a relatively new concept based on the correctional goal of offender reintegration into the community. This model stresses change in offenders. The main strong point of the community model is that offenders are able to re-establish associations with their families and they have the opportunity to work at jobs for which a portion of their salary can be used for victim restoration, payment of fines and defraying of programme maintenance costs. Furthermore, offenders may participate in psychological therapy or education and vocational programmes designed to improve their work and social skills. Bartollas (2002:307) shows that the reintegration model is incorporated into the classification process since it is also concerned about the total needs of the offender, such as medical, vocational, educational and religious needs.

According to Siegel (2005:46), proper administration and control of released offenders will assist in preventing relapse into crime. Therefore the successful reintegration of released offenders into society is strongly dependent on the degree of special supervision of the released offender. Since offenders come from the community, the Department of Correctional Services should make sure that after their release, the offenders are once again reintegrated into the community as potential law-abiding citizens and should offer critical involvement to prevent a reversion to criminal behaviour of each offender (Coetzee et al., 1995:117). Seiter (2002:160) indicates that in the reintegration model, offenders are classified in the community to identify their risk and
appropriate supervision is matched in order to maximise the distribution of resources and to focus on public safety, since public safety is part of the main classification goal for correctional administrators (Kane, 1993:125).

In Texas in the USA there is the so-called Project Reintegration of Offenders scheme. The scheme operates mainly through the school operating within the prisons, namely the Windham School District. The school offers offenders services such as assessment and testing, documentation, job readiness training, employability and life skills projects and changes programmes (Schmalleger & Smykla, 2001:363):

- **Assessment and testing:** Each participant’s skills and offender employment record are considered by an assessment specialist to formulate an employability development plan that reveals available jobs and occupational demands in the community where the offender will be released. Therefore offenders will be classified into groups for a variety of intentions and considerations which include assessing the offender for placement in the community change programmes and for special needs (Cilliers et al., 2008:104).

- **Documentation:** Documents such as social security cards, birth certificates, diplomas and school records are collected by assessment specialists so that these records are available for employment requests.

- **Job readiness training:** To improve the offender’s job interview skills a specialist regularly meets with every offender.

- **Employability and life skills projects:** Under a specialist, offenders work to complete skill-building projects at their own pace (Schmalleger & Smykla, 2001:363).

- **Changes programme:** Offenders who are within 6 months of release go on a life skills programme by Windham District School which includes courses on family relationships, self-concept, civic and legal responsibilities, personal health and hygiene, victim awareness and job preparation (Schmalleger & Smykla, 2001:364). This programme is done during the
pre-release classification that usually prepares the offenders for transition to society. During this programme the correctional institution concludes whether the offender is in need of a housing transfer from the prison to the community (Seiter, 2002:163).

3.4.4 Justice model

According to Bartollas (2002:76), the justice model of corrections was recognised in the early 1970s by David Fogel and other penologists as a retributions arrangement. In this model, everyone has the right to make his or her own decisions and has a free will. Therefore, if that person makes a decision to violate the law, that individual warrants discipline. The offender’s punishment should match the injury done to society and should not be based on their needs. The goal is to offer offenders their just deserts (Schmalleger, 2003:500). This model views custody as a fully deserved and proper consequence of criminal and irresponsible conduct. Stinchcomb and Fox (1999:33) indicate that in the justice model the sentence is intended to punish the offender, protect society and hold criminals accountable for their behaviour through imprisonment. Therefore objective classification has a role to play in addressing concerns of the general public. Concerns for safety have increased in line with systems to protect society by preventing escape. The justice model is a combination of free thinking on crime and criminals and traditional philosophy.

3.4.5 Neo-utilitarian punishment model

Prison reformers such as Beccaria and Bentham during the 18th century developed the neo-utilitarian punishment model that was copied from the classical school of criminology (Du Preez, 2003:40). Muthaphuli (2008:57) shows that the neo-utilitarian model grants social benefits to the community because this philosophy justifies punishment. Since people fear models aiming at behaviour change and self-improvement, the neo-utilitarian punishment model aims at deterrence as grounds of social benefits. The main strategy for this model to control crime is to act unsympathetically towards the person who has committed a crime against society and there is
less concern about the treatment of the offender. Offenders who are regarded as dangerous will, for instance, be classified in maximum security institutions. Offenders of this class have limited access to programmes within the unit.

According to Muthaphuli (2008:57), the philosophy of the neo-utilitarian model is based on the following hypothesis:

- It is the responsibility of the state to ensure that its citizens delight in life by means of maintaining and developing laws.
- Order should be maintained through punishment.
- Criminal behaviour will be prevented by obeying the laws.
- Offenders are legally responsible for their own unlawful conduct, therefore everyone in society is free.
- Serious crimes such as white collar crimes are taken more seriously than the misdemeanour offences.

Hawkins and Alpert (1989:87) are of the opinion that incarceration for a certain period will deter offenders from resorting to crime again. Offenders are only deterred from criminal behaviour when they know that these actions can lead to imprisonment away from society. The following are two stipulations for this model:

- Circumstances in prison should be as intolerable as possible, to ensure that offenders do not resort to crime once more.
- Offenders who regularly commit crime should be detained for a long term even after their sentences have expired.

“The main utilitarian principle is that society is rightly ordered if its major institutions are arranged to the maximum aggregate satisfaction and minimum aggregate suffering; that suffering of a few persons is made by the benefits accruing to the many” (Hawkins & Alpert, 1989:87).
3.4.6 Confinement model

This model is similar to the justice model. The aim of incarceration is to punish offenders honestly and reasonably through an imprisonment term matching the seriousness of their offence. Even though incarceration may serve other purposes in addition to justice and punishment, the very act of sending offenders to prison is the punishment in this model. Confinement in this model must meet constitutional standards of fairness and due process. The confinement model has programmatic activities under rehabilitation which are seen as part of the surroundings of confinement (Schwarz & Travis, 1997:233-234).

3.5 PROGRAMMES AIMED AT THE REHABILITATION OF OFFENDERS

According to Deputy Minister of Correctional Services of South Africa, Ms Hlengiwe Buhle in a speech to the 2009 National Assembly (Mkhize, 2009), the classification of offenders, on admission, is a critical step in the process of devising effective rehabilitation programmes. Classification categories are an objective instrument through which to measure correctional and development of offenders. Rehabilitation-oriented facilities develop elaborate classification systems catering for the placement of offenders into the treatment programme (Silverman, 2001:147).

Offenders can be assigned to different programmes with the aim of offering the best available programme to satisfy offenders’ needs through classification (Kratcoski, 2004:207). It is not clear whether the rehabilitation programmes that take place within the Department of Correctional Services can really change offender behaviour, but it was discovered that offenders who are rehabilitated do not commit new offences after release and do not return to prison again. Therefore, classification is the way forward to match offenders who are willing to be reformed with appropriate programmes (Pollock, 1997:94). Offenders, on the basis of their need, attitude, motivation and attributes, are then offered the treatment necessary to bring about the desired changes in values, attitudes and skills that will prevent the offender from reoffending and returning to prison. The classification treatment rehabilitation arrangements are founded on the
concept of differential treatment, which implies that the offender’s needs and problems and those of probations must be definite and treated on an individualised basis. The offenders are linked with the special treatment programme that addresses their particular problems and needs (Kratcoski, 2004:213). Therefore there is a need for corrections and classification to do a better job of identifying offenders who can best benefit from treatment programmes and intentions and drug abuse programmes, education vocational training, counselling and specialised housing during the offender’s imprisonment (Austin, 1993:21). Some treatment options based on characteristics of known groups of offenders, including their responsiveness to treatment and their particular criminogenic needs, are presented by the omnibus model of classification, and must be addressed in correctional institutions (Enos & Southern, 1996:103).

According to Faugeron (1996:126), effective classification takes into account offender needs so that the rehabilitation programmes can be implemented successfully. If offenders are classified according to their needs, they will be able to access programmes that are necessary for their rehabilitation. The treatment concept has been extended to include community-oriented professionals and community volunteers who have begun to give offenders the support and guidance necessary for reintegration (Allen & Simonsen, 1986:387).

Pollock (1997:167) emphasises that rehabilitation focuses on the eradication of offender criminal behaviour. It is a programmed effort to change offenders’ conduct and thoughts. Another definition of rehabilitation programmes includes the following elements:

1) They have specific goals.
2) They are based on clear concepts of theory.
3) They have specific structure and methods.
4) They are intense and require time.
5) They have a history of success.
6) They are run by trained counsellors and are composed of professionals such as psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and educationists; this group is known as a classification committee (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:142).
7) They are offered to inmates who can benefit from the programmes (Pollock, 1997:167).
Silverman (2001:128) points out that the Manual of Correctional Standards of the American Correctional Association analysed rehabilitation as the basic aim of correctional institutions. The offenders were to be classified to receive suitable institutional programming and treatment. Preferably, classification in correctional institutions was to be comparable to the process physicians use to diagnose and treat physical illness. A team of correctional professionals was designated to discover the nature of offender criminality and to prescribe a programme to cure these insufficiencies. Classification was analysed as a dynamic process to be modified continually according to the offender’s changing needs. Unfortunately, classification did not take place as anticipated since social scientists were unable to develop applicable diagnostic instruments and programmes that cured criminality (Silverman, 2001:129).

The correctional environment is considered as a type of sick bay where offenders can be treated for the disease of their criminal behaviour and overcome whatever their character is lacking (Duffee, 1989:119).

Offenders should be classified by different programmes which will suit different behaviour characteristics of the offenders. Correctional treatment programmes must meet the following goals of a complete programme as designed by Casella (Kratcoski, 2004:201):

- A complete, individualised review and treatment plan should be included in the programme.

- The offender must accept responsibility for his/her unlawful conduct and appreciate and be alert regarding his/her model of crime.

- The treatment programme should support the offender.

- The treatment should support the offender in gaining knowledge to mediate in or break his/her offence pattern and should call upon tools, methods and procedures to suppress, control, manage, or stop the behaviour.
• Re-education and resocialisation should be offered by the treatment, in order to replace anti-social thoughts and behaviour with pro-social ones, acquire a positive self-concept and a new attitude and expectations of themselves and to gain knowledge of new social and sexual skills to assist in developing healthy relationships.

• Offenders need a long period to safely test their newly obtained control mechanisms in the community within residential treatment.

• Each offender needs a post-treatment support group and continued post-release access to therapeutic treatment.

The independent panel of international academics and expects in the criminal justice system of England and Wales is also known as the correctional services accreditation panel (Sheehan, McIvor & Trotter, 2007:111, 112). Its function is to assess the quality of programmes submitted to it by prisons and community supervision services against published criteria of what is most problematic in accomplishing successful re-education in reoffending. The criteria are the following:

• A clear model of change: an open model of explanation on how the programme is willing to come up with relevant change in the offenders group (the theoretical basis of the programme).

• A clear model explaining how offenders will be appropriate for this particular programme and the characteristics of those not suitable and how these would be identified.

• Aiming services of active risk factors: how those have been identified as likely to affect offending for a particular group of offenders.

• The skills orientation programmes to be used effectively.
How the programme will be linked with other activities and how long the programme takes to complete (Sheehan et al., 2007:111, 112).

The Department of Correctional Services ensures that offenders are rehabilitated through work activity; therefore they can learn job skills or work habits that can allow them to make a living after they are integrated in society. The rehabilitation programmes that are used for classification include education, mental health treatment, medical treatment recreation, and preparation for release. This means that throughout the custody process offenders are classified and reclassified for any or all of these reasons (Pollock, 1997:94). Clear and Cole (2000:223) also include programmes such as counselling, case work and psychological programmes, as well as behaviour, social and vocational programmes.

3.5.1 Educational programmes

Section 29 of the Constitution of South Africa provides that the aim of education and training in prisons is to develop and enhance the educational level and improve an offender’s skills to enable them to be reintegrated into the community once they are freed from prison (Republic of South Africa, 1996). Each and every person, including offenders who are sentenced, are also allowed access to basic education.

According to Coetzee and Gericke (1997:96), every sentenced offender who is not educated and who wishes to advance themselves academically and technically are offered a chance to advance or enhance their level of education, more especially illiterate offenders. Silverman (2001:213) emphasises that it is very important for offenders to know how to read and write because these skills are essential for the offenders to be employed after release and for them to lead a positive life both within and outside the correctional environment.

The following standards have been developed by the United Nations Economic and Social Council. All correctional educational programmes must meet these standards to ensure that every offender can reach their full potential (Muthaphuli, 2008:64).
• Every offender must be able to access library programmes, basic education, cultural activities, social education, vocational training, religious and cultural activities, creative programmes, higher education and library facilities.
• All parties responsible for the operation of the correctional centre must offer support for educational programmes.
• At all costs, lack of encouragement to offenders who take part in approved formal education programmes should be avoided.
• Not only should offenders be allowed to participate in education inside the correctional institution, but education outside the correctional institution should also be encouraged.
• The involvement of society in educational programmes that take place within the correctional centre is also encouraged.
• Vocational training must be aimed at offenders who cannot read and write so that they can live and become accustomed to the conditions of the labour force.
• Educational programmes should consider the offender’s social, economic and cultural background.
• Culture activities play a most important part in allowing offenders to develop and express themselves; therefore these should also be encouraged.

Correctional institutions must ensure that offenders are classified into different programmes according to their different behaviour characteristics, e.g. educational programmes should consist of heavy, moderate and light structures. Heavy structure education differs considerably from moderate and light structures.

3.5.2 Recreational programmes

Recreational programmes are important to keep offenders busy, relieve tension and promote teamwork (Seiter, 2002:130). They promote the physical health of the offender, because a healthy body usually signifies a healthy mind and the ability to adapt to the realities of the correctional centre. These programmes also provide a release for excess energy and work boredom. The programmes include participating and training in a range of sports such as soccer.
and volleyball. A wide range of opportunities are offered, such as drama groups, traditional
dancing, choirs and music. In most prisons central broadcasts and television programmes are also
accessible (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:97).

Group recreation can be an important part of the socialisation process by teaching decision
making, teamwork and empathy while encouraging positive relationships. Even though
recreational programmes help offenders to develop mental health and prevent idleness, they do
not equip offenders with the interpersonal skills that prisoners require. However, they do have
positive impacts on prison life (Quinn, 2003:253). In order for recreational programmes to be
successful, correctional centres need enough finance for equipment, supplies and well-trained
professional correctional personnel and as well as facilities for a year-round programme of
diversified outdoor and indoor activities (Silverman, 2001:407).

3.5.3 Vocational programmes

These are offered to offenders so that they can be successful outside the correctional institution.
Vocational programmes must provide offenders with marketable skills by training them specific
job skills. Prison discipline problems can also be reduced by these programmes, and recidivism
can be reduced. Correctional centres must provide skills such as electronics or car repairs
(Quinn, 2003:251). It has been found that fewer offenders who take part in vocational training
programmes resort to crime again (Seiter, 2002:113).

Correctional institutions provide vocational training so that offenders can obtain a diploma or
qualification from the Department of Labour or a national training council as soon as they have
completed their training (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:98).

According to Silverman (2001:13), vocational programmes for women must be categorised into
the following five types:
1) Institutional: maintains clerical work, food services for the institution, and general cleaning
   and maintenance of the grounds;
2) Education (mostly remedial);
3) Vocational training (primarily traditional cosmetology, sewing, food services and clerical skills);
4) Treatment (Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous); and
5) Medical care.

Therefore women should be classified into special treatment groups and provided with religious instruction, work education and preparation for employment after release.

### 3.5.4 Psychological programmes

These programmes are established to concentrate on developing offender intellectual capacity. Correctional psychologists ensure that they evaluate offenders’ ability to cope and change in the outside world (Allen & Simonsen, 1986:386). Programmes with the aim of improving offender mental health concentrate on the following categories of offenders:

- Offenders who are identified as suicidal;
- Offenders who are referred by the court for treatment;
- Psychiatrists and district surgeons may also refer offenders to psychologists;
- Offenders who have specified that they would like to see a psychologist, by means of the complaints and request procedure or in any other way;
- Offenders who display aggressive tendencies or sexual delinquency and drug abuse; and
- The institution committee or other functionary may also refer offenders for psychological treatment (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:99).

Clear and Cole (2000:323) mention that psychological programmes can be implemented in two ways, i.e. psychotherapeutic approach and group treatment. Psychotherapeutic approaches entail every type of programme that is designed with treatment in mind within the correctional centre. In this approach the need for goals of the treatment process is verified by the therapists even if the client does not have the same opinion. Mutual problems are discussed in group treatment by
offenders who come together. Group approaches include reality therapy, confrontation therapy, transactional analysis and cognitive skill building.

3.5.5 Counselling and case management

There are two approaches to implementing counselling, i.e. individual counselling and group counselling (Snarr, 1996:175).

- Individual counselling usually includes any range of counselling such as rational emotive therapy. This session is a part of a larger treatment programme. This counselling is usually available to a restricted number of offenders, mainly because they need numerous visits. In most correctional centres a large number of offenders for personal counselling make it difficult to conduct an extensive individual counselling programme.

- Group counselling sessions are aimed at solving social and personal problems and it involves three or more people. In correctional centres five to ten offenders are confronted by one or two counsellors. It is a practical approach because of its availability to clients with the same problems that lend themselves to a group approach. Problems such as drug abuse, sexual offending and suicide prevention are tackled (Snarr, 1996:175).

Counselling is a part of a treatment team. This is an improvement over the classification committee which generally has a correctional official. Counselling is the form of classification that is currently functioning in prisons (Hippchen, 1975:11).

In terms of section 42 of the Correctional Services Act (Republic of South Africa, 1998), the primary responsibility of the case management committee is to decide upon the safety classification of offenders, their integration into individual and group programmes, rewarding good conduct of offenders and punishing bad behaviour. The committee also deals with work classification, conditional work classification and reclassification of offenders.
3.5.6 Social services

Social therapy under correctional institutions is available to all offenders who are sentenced as well as those who are on probation. It plays a most important part in terms of the treatment and rehabilitation programme within the Department of Correctional Services. The following are problems areas that the social workers need to focus on (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:104):

- Maintaining and strengthening family relations;
- Drug addiction problems;
- HIV/AIDS; and
- Preparation for release and aftercare service (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:104).

3.5.7 Behaviour therapy

According to Muthaphuli (2008:66), behaviour therapy involves treatment that encourages new conduct through strengthening, role modelling and previous dynamics in a structure of education. The main aim of the behaviour therapy counsellors within the Department of Correctional Services is to help offenders understand and recognise values that are at odds with common sense by correcting them. Offenders’ problem behaviours come from defective thinking and irrational values. This counselling is highly directive, didactic, challenging and usually aggressive and painful for the offender. The behavioural therapy counsellor believes that offenders in most cases are unable to make the important link between isolated origins and current behavioural problems. Therefore they function from the point that offenders need to come to understand their unpleasant conduct (Walsh, 2001:209).

In order to encourage desirable behaviour, behavioural therapy uses positive and negative reinforcement and at the same time suppresses unwanted behaviour (Bartollas, 2002:313). The mission of the behavioural therapy counsellor is to reindoctrinate offenders about themselves and
thoughts that are real. This may comprise the deflation of an overly inflated image based on their anti-social behaviour, through the medium of reality-based logical thinking (Walsh, 2001:210).

3.5.8 Religious care

Religious programmes have always been significant to the administration of prisons as well as the offenders. In the early years prisons were formed as places for religious improvement. Offenders are given the opportunity to worship in whatsoever approach is a valid tenet of their religious belief. They have the right to attend religious services of their own choice as long as it does not affect security in the correctional centre. Religions such as Muslim, Jewish, Protestant or Catholic are catered for (Seiter, 2002:128).

There are two main characteristics that religious care consists of: it is a basic right to which all prisoners are allowed access, and it is a significant requirement for the successful reintegration of offenders into society. Religion can also form a vital safeguard against crime in society. Religious programmes are a basic and critical part of every prison. Chaplains are responsible for the religious care of offenders (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:101). Religion has always played a key role in corrections.

3.6 ROLE PLAYERS IN THE REHABILITATION PROCESS

The rehabilitative objective of the correctional institution can only be accomplished in a proper enabling environment for both offender and correctional personnel where rehabilitation is expected and maintained. In the correctional institution the correctional official must therefore develop a professional character, based on knowledge, skills and attitude (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:154-155). In order for the offender to be a better person, he/she must be ready to change his/her attitude. This will give rise to an effective rehabilitation process.

There are various role players involved in the process of rehabilitation, in order for correctional institutions to be able to productively embark on the process. Du Preez and Luyt (2004:156)
highlight the importance of external role players in the rehabilitation process: “A common understanding, and a common commitment to rehabilitation by all the partners within the justice, crime prevention and security, as well as the social clusters, is indispensable to the fulfilment of the rehabilitation of offenders. Reinforcing experiences and coherence of the message to offenders throughout the criminal justice system and within communities can only assist the objective or rehabilitations then, as well as censuring crime force living.”

3.6.1 Offenders

With regard to the rehabilitation of offenders through treatment, the question needs to be asked what role individual offenders play in their own rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is only possible if offenders themselves first accept their own disposition, attitude and behaviour (Cilliers, 2008:68). This simply means that voluntary participation is required from offenders. This is mainly because rehabilitation is intended to redress the specific history of the offender and as a result requires full commitment (Muthaphuli, 2008:68).

Since offenders’ physical freedom has been taken away from them, offenders must realise that they can take full advantage of all the privileges that they have while they are incarcerated by equipping themselves through participating in programmes that will empower them. As soon as offenders understand that they must reject and do something about their unpleasant situation, this will automatically build positive experiences. Offenders will start using time instead of doing time by following a relevant study course and participating in training programmes which will better equip them to adapt to society after their release and help them lead an honourable life. Offenders who have realised that they have to accept challenges will find it easier to adapt to the routine and discipline of a prison and will work better. Offenders need to be kept busy with meaningful activities in order to avoid adopting negative behaviour such as sexual deviances, gang activities, escapes and even unrest and protests in prisons (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:84-89). After release, offenders must ensure that they do not find themselves on the wrong side of the law. There are three keys to change that can also help to change offenders, as identified by Muthaphuli (2008:19). These are relate, repeat and refrain.
3.6.1.1 Relate

Offenders can shape a new, emotional relationship with a person or a society that encourages and maintains expectations during the process of rehabilitation. Offenders need the influence of seemingly unreasonable people to restore their hope and make them believe that they can change and expect that they will change if they come face to face with a situation that a sensible person would regard as impossible (Muthaphuli, 2008:69).

3.6.1.2 Repeat

The new relationship within the prison environment will help the offender to look at the world in a way that would have been so foreign before they changed. Offenders will find out new ways of thinking about their circumstances (Muthaphuli, 2008:70).

Coetzee and Gericke (1997:86) further emphasise that there are four realities that contribute largely to the fact that offenders suffer anxiety and that make it difficult for them to make sense of life: shock of admission, loss of external communication, loss of stability and loss of normal human activities. All these realities can lead to negative behaviour by offenders and can cause the offender not to be rehabilitated successfully.

- Shock of admission: As people who have been isolated from society, most offenders are aware of their social rejection, and experience feelings of helplessness, frustration and loss of hope (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:369). Most offenders experience feelings of fear, frustration and uncertainty on the day of admission to prison. This could lead to the development of illness due to the fact that the offender is stressed, depressed and feels useless and pointless. It is important for correctional staff to refer offenders to a psychologist, social worker or medical practitioner as soon as possible. During this period offenders believe that there is no future for them (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:87).

- Loss of external communication can also cause offenders to become lonely because they are no longer in touch with the outside world. These offenders may attempt to escape from
custody to be in touch with the outside world, e.g. family and friends. Offenders may sometimes join gangs within prison in an effort to do away with loneliness. This type of offender conduct cannot be changed and social workers should encourage offenders to have contact with their family and to communicate with them on a regular basis (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:88). Being locked away from one’s family and friends, being totally out of control of one’s life, is a deprivation that dwarfs the significance of televisions, stereos and designer jeans (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:369). During the initial step in classifying offenders, the reception and intake team of psychologists, medical personnel and social services must interview the offender with regard to problems, family welfare or personal matters. The offender’s adjustment to the correctional institution should be discussed with the social worker assigned to the offender (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:310).

- Loss of stability: The prison environment is a place where the offender’s life is largely transformed into uncertainty. Correctional centres cannot replace the offender’s consistency. Therefore, correctional officials can succeed in relieving the need for stability by encouraging offenders to participate in meaningful activities such as study, training, constructive reading material and hobbies (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:88).

- Loss of normal human activities: Normal human activities are restricted in prison; therefore the meaningfulness of the prisoner’s life is threatened since there are not enough activities available in the prison to keep them busy. A lack of important use of time frequently leads to negative behaviour such as gang activities, sexual deviances, escapes, unrest and protests (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:89).

These realities can contribute to negative conduct and offender attitude, and a disposition not to change. For correctional services to successfully rehabilitate offenders, they need to consider these realities, otherwise rehabilitation cannot be effective.
3.6.1.3 Reframe

Offenders need to have new relationships in order to gain knowledge of the latest habits of thinking about their situation and their lives in general (Deutschman, 2007:15). Bartollas (2002:256) identifies three main groups of ex-offenders, i.e. Those who will ultimately fail, those who will make a marginal adjustment to society and those who will be successful. He further gives reasons why offenders who want to succeed fail in the end: failure of will, lack of satisfaction with the straight life and the inability to make it in the outside world.

● Failure of will

If offenders do not want to change in a manner that could overcome the everyday anxiety they face, eventually they have a tendency to be unsuccessful. Offenders leave the correctional institution with opportunities, but they discover that it is not easy to change in a world that has been progressing without them. There are real problems that offenders are confronted with, such as finding jobs and societal interaction. In facing all these challenges offenders tend to reoffend as a result of frustrations and disappointments. Within the rehabilitation perspective, offenders themselves must be willing to change from their unlawful conduct to lead an ordinary life as law-abiding citizens, and for them to lead a normal life they have to conquer all their problems. If this fails, the rehabilitation programmes will be unsuccessful (Bartollas, 1985:261).

● Lack of satisfaction with the straight life

If offenders do not accept the straight life, which is crime free, this may cause them to leave the ordinary life or to commit robberies as a way to survive. Others commit fraud because it is difficult for them to work in a company where they are paid once a month. First offenders must recognise that committing unlawful conduct by robberies is not the way to go, if rehabilitation is going to work (Bartollas, 1985:261).
• The inability to make it in the outside world

Some offenders tend to commit crime because they are not successful within society. Offenders are not capable of getting jobs in order to survive, as most companies do not prefer to hire ex-offenders. As a result offenders commit offences again as a means to survive. In addition, habitual conduct leads to offenders failing in the outside world (Muthaphuli, 2008:71).

3.6.2 The correctional staff

The correctional official as an operational worker also functions as a manager (Bruyns et al., 1997:15). The role of the correctional official is greatly challenging and broad. They are involved in security, guiding, mentoring, facilitating, developing and inspecting offenders. They help when offenders need assistance with jobs, or to get along with other offenders, to enter programmes, to interact with staff, or to obtain privileges (Hemmens & Stohr, 2000:327). In cases where offenders are feeling worthless and meaningless, it is the duty of correctional staff to make an important contribution to encouraging offenders to admit to the challenges that they are facing within the prison as a result of their incarceration, and to keep offenders busy with meaningful activities such as study, training, construction, reading and hobbies (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:97).

Even though correctional staff are not counsellors, they must frequently communicate with offenders and carefully listen to their worries and problems. This will help offenders relieve stress and tension and will shape the line between custody and treatment personnel. Most offenders’ problems are solved by discussing issues with them (Seiter, 2002:382).

The White Paper on Corrections (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b) stated that the services rendered by the Department “are personnel intensive”, and “[s]ound personnel practices are, therefore, promoted as a prerequisite to the rendering of professional services”.
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According to Coetzee and Gericke (1997:63), the department believes that to accomplish policy, in terms of the White Paper (Republic of South Africa, 1994:19), the following principles must be adhered to:

- Correctional officials should always be non-partisan and perform professionally.
- Correctional officials must contribute to employee initiate, creativity and reliance.
- The Department of Correctional Services should provide enough information, training and supervision required by the correctional officials to do their jobs in the most effective way.
- There must be a good relationship between correctional staff and labour organisations established through successful communication and mutual respect.
- All professional correctional staff should actively achieve goals and implement policies, plans and priorities of the department.

According to Seiter (2002:34), the correctional officials’ duties are no longer what they were in the past. They have gone far beyond merely guarding offenders; their duties now require knowledge, training, good interpersonal communications and sound decision making.

Coetzee and Gericke (1997:63) are of the opinion that in order for the Department of Correctional Services to be effective in the rehabilitation of the offender, it must value the professional character of its staff, such as knowledge, skills and attitude. Correctional officials will then be professional and deal with offender rehabilitation effectively as an internal role player.

3.6.2.1 Knowledge

Professional correctional officials need knowledge in the following areas for the rehabilitation process to be successful (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:63):

- **Knowledge of the Department of Correctional Services** in order for correctional staff to know the latest developments in the departmental vision and mission. This will enable staff to function effectively and professionally.
Knowledge of departmental policy and prescriptions as set out in the Correctional Services Act. This includes corporate, functional, operational and legislative policies.

Knowledge of job content

Academic knowledge

Officials must be knowledgeable about offenders and see them as people and special beings. This can help the offenders to change their attitude and conduct since officials value them as unique and special beings.

3.6.2.2 Skills

Professional correctional personnel need to be equipped with all the necessary skills in order to be able to perform better and in a more professional manner, thereby making an important contribution to effectively rehabilitate offenders. It is very important for correctional personnel to have self-knowledge and communication skills, and to promote teamwork and dealing with conflict, etc., since they interact with people every day (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:68).

- Self-knowledge: The truth is that most correctional officials must know themselves, e.g. accept themselves, have a direct relationship between themselves and their self-concept and be able to be with other people. Offenders will then follow their example and improve their own self-image.

- Communication: This needs to take place with colleagues, seniors, subordinates and the public, as well as offenders (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:68). When correctional officials communicate with offenders in a polite and respectful manner, this can have a positive impact on the offenders’ anxiety and encourages discussion about offender apprehension or grievances, thus contributing to an effective rehabilitation process (Seiter, 2002:228).

- Promoting teamwork: The team approach is very important in terms of problem solving. One of the advantages of teamwork is that complex tasks that are too much for one correctional official to deal with are more controllable in teams.

- Dealing with conflict: One of the unavoidable aspects of the correctional environment or personal relationship is dealing with conflict in situations where offenders continually try to
make false statements about each other, tell lies and smuggle dagga. Correctional staff must try to deal with this conflict.

- Problem solving and decision making: A correctional official’s ability to make decisions and solve problems is a significant life skill, and is almost certainly one of the most important professional skills that correctional officials must consider for them to participate in offender rehabilitation (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:70). Decisions which are made at operational level are usually regarded as more important than decisions which are made at top management level in the Department of Correctional Services. It is the responsibility of correctional staff to ensure that decisions, however minor, are carefully and impartially taken (Bruyns et al., 1997:182).

- Coping with stress: It is important for correctional officials to handle stress effectively. Correctional centres are high stress environments due to the nature of the work situation.

- Educators: Correctional officials must act as educators; this does not mean, though, that correctional officials have to be formal educators. They can mainly be involved in the presentation of informal education. The role of a correctional official is just the same as that of an advisor or counsellor who presents knowledge, skills and abilities to colleagues and offenders.

3.6.2.3 Attitude

Coetzee and Gericke (1997:70) point out that the attitude of the professional person distinguishes them from others. Attitude and behaviour relate to an ethical basis. Since different officials have different ethical standards, it is difficult to set clear guidelines for ethical correctional official behaviour. In order for the correctional official to be regarded as a professional, there are values and norms that they must pursue. These norms and values are also derived from what is regarded as correct, adequate and humane, and are reflected their attitude to work, which is also known as work ethic. According to Bruyn et al. (1997:46), the foundation of all management ethics is: treat others the way you would like them to treat you. This means that officials must treat offenders fairly.
A correctional official’s work attitude is based on the following values in terms of the rehabilitation of the offender: humanity, respect for human potential, relationships, partnerships and accountability. These values are based on the manner in which the officials conduct themselves (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:71):

- **Humanity**: Correctional officials must at all times respect offenders as people and recognise the human dignity of all offenders under all circumstances. They must try to be sensitive to offenders’ needs and feelings, respect their point of view and must promote offenders’ well-being, without undermining the most important function of safety and security.

- **Respect for human potential**: In order to make an important contribution to the rehabilitation process of the offender, officials must at all times respect the human potential of offenders through their words and actions every day within the work environment. Officials must recognise that the offenders have the potential to become law-abiding citizens.

- **Relationship**: “The professional correctional official believes that sound human relations between staff form the basis to achieve departmental objectives. The decision of the correctional services can be attained through a work force that is committed to their profession and maintains meaningful and transparent relationships with their colleagues, the public and the offender case in their care” (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:71).

- **Partnerships**: For the department to achieve its mission and values, it is necessary for professional correctional officials to accept that the exchange of ideas, knowledge and experience is important both nationally and internationally. Correctional services can survive through social, political and economic partnerships at local, provincial, national and international level. Therefore it is important for the department to have strong partnerships with other sectors in the rehabilitation of offenders.

- **Accountability**: Professional correctional officials must be answerable for their actions. They must perform their duties in a transparent manner and they are authorised and responsible to perform tasks as stipulated by the Minister of Correctional Services and therefore they can be made to answer for the consequences of their actions. Wrongful action can thus result in an official and the department being held responsible for the unlawful act of the offenders (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:71).
For the correctional institution to be able to function effectively and therefore be able to successfully undertake the process of rehabilitation, professional behaviour is a prerequisite. The manner in which correctional officials conduct themselves contributes to the rehabilitative aspect. They perform this task not by trying to make friends with offenders or advising them about personal problems (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:71).

The roles that officials perform with regard to the offender rehabilitation process, irrespective of whether they are counsellors or treatment specialists, are as follows (Seiter, 2002:383):

- Contributing to surroundings of control without threats and tension: A pleasant personality, a fair and important upholding of prison roles, respect for individual dignity, and an understanding of correctional officials’ role in the rehabilitation of an offender contribute to a relaxed environment with positive interaction between staff and offender.

- Communicating with inmates on a professional basis: Communication with offenders has a major impact on the whole prison environment. The manner in which officials communicate with offenders can also contribute towards offender rehabilitation, as it sets the tone in the environment. Attitudes can create hostility, poor or good communication between staff and offenders.

- Focusing on providing human services: There must be an overall environment of respect for offenders as individuals for a prison to maintain order and control, as well as to have effective rehabilitation programmes. As part of humane treatment, officials must at all times meet offenders’ needs. By providing the necessary services to the offenders, offenders will focus more on their rehabilitation programmes (Seiter, 2002:383).

### 3.6.3 The community

According to Muthaphuli (2008:73), the involvement of community members in correctional issues is made possible by the Sub-directorate of Community Involvement. The aim of the sub-directorate is to ensure that it shares responsibility for offender rehabilitation, encourages co-responsibility for offender management and crime prevention, reintegrates offenders into the community as well as maximises the use of public and private forums.
The Department of Correctional Services on its own cannot be effective if it is solely responsible for rehabilitation. It must therefore recognise the significant involvement that the community can make. For rehabilitation to be effective, the community must be at the centre of the rehabilitation process because it is both the place of origin and return for the prisoner. The causes that contribute to criminal behaviour also support both the victim and offender. The principle of restorative justice should be initiated by the community (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:156).

According to Bailey and Ekiyor (2006:27), the Department of Correctional Services supports community participation in correctional matters through the following means:

- The department drafted a community participation policy that outlines the guidelines for community involvement, which are in line with the departmental rehabilitation strategy.
- The department encourages greater community participation as a means of reducing crime, thereby promoting good relationships amongst community members.
- It offers support to both offender and the victim.
- In all activities it aims at integrating offenders into the community.
- The department ensures active involvement in the definition of offender obligations.
- It offers offenders opportunity for remorse, forgiveness, reconciliation and for offenders to make amends.
- The department aims to ensure that relations are restored for successful reintegration of offenders.

There are some community organisations that assist in offender rehabilitation, such as Promised Land, Nigro, Alpha, Khulisa and some external religious programmes.

3.6.3.1 Promised Land

This organisation was established in 2004 by the executive director and founder Lynn Smit. The mission statement of Promised Land is to focus on the correction of offensive behaviour, promotion of social responsibility and development of persons under correction and to create a structured environment and facility that will promote security, rehabilitation, holistic care and
development of each individual. The aims and objectives of Promised Land are as follows (Promised Land, 2004):

Aims of the organisation

- To upgrade the impressive social reintegration of offenders back to the community.
- During the offender reintegration process, to provide organisational support and assist offenders within their community.
- To support and assist in life skills and skill development of the offenders.
- To look after programmes that are designed for the offender rehabilitation process and to inspire offenders to develop further.
- To promote the participation of role players to give hope to further rehabilitation, employment opportunities, support services and prevention of recidivism.
- To improve healthy family relations.
- To integrate support systems.

Organisational objectives

- Change and transformation is possible to every individual.
- Fighting back against crime.
- Changing offender criminal behaviour in a safe, secure and humane environment.
- Producing a background for a multifaceted rehabilitation intervention.
- Contributing leadership support to offenders within their society.
- Establishment of instruments to deal with gangsterism, including spiritual care, life skills and other programmes.
- Encouraging healthy relationships between offenders, the community and society.
- Declaration of discipline.
- Improvement of the productive capacity of offenders through skills development.
• With the aim of restoring relationships with society, holding the offenders directly answerable to society (promoting the effective social reintegration of offenders back into society).

3.6.3.2 Residential community centres

Seiter (2002:389) explains that community residential centres are also important for most offenders in the community, who need more than standard probation to keep away from committing more offences and to become productive citizens. Halfway House is one of these community residential centres in the USA which serves an important function. Offenders who are on parole, probation and work release are offered a place to stay from a few days to several months. They are given the necessary food, shelter, supervision and treatment services. The following are the goals of community residential centres as identified by McCathy (in Seiter, 2002:390): To assist in the offenders’ reintegration as law-abiding citizens, to offer a suitable location for the treatment of substance abuse problems by employing counselling and treatment staff that deal with both the practical problems of community living and the more complex offender treatment needs, such as family counselling, job searches, transportation, and liaison with other social service agencies to reduce overcrowding in prisons, and to provide a cost-effective intermediate sanction in order to reduce correctional costs.

3.6.3.3 Khulisa

Khulisa was established in 1997 in South Africa as a non-profit organisation and the organisation functions countrywide. It has forged partnerships with local and international bodies, as well as government and departments such as Correctional Services, Education, Foreign Affairs, Health, Justice, Social Development, Community Safety, Housing and Labour. Khulisa offers the following programmes to offenders in their role in the rehabilitation process (Muthaphuli, 2008:174):
• Discovery, My path: This programme is designed to ensure that offenders understand the condition in which they found themselves and that they discover themselves. This programme is known as a self-help programme because offenders are then capable of understanding their emotions, and social, physical and psychological being through this programme.

• Silence the Violence: Within this programme, the violent conduct of an offender is challenged within 12 days. The offenders come to understand the nature and penalty of their violent behaviour and acknowledge their offence and in that way they will choose a life which is violence free.

• Restorative Justice: This aimed at ensuring that offenders are accountable for their offence and are capable of coming face to face with their victims and their families in order to work out their issues and get on with their lives.

Khulisa’s vision is: “Developing individuals, restoring relationships, revitalising communities.”

Its mission is: “Our enthusiastic professional team delivers cutting edge intervention which creates opportunities for safer self sustainable communities” (Khulisa Services, [s.a.]).

3.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter has reflected a broader perspective of the programmes and services provided within correctional facilities that promote socialisation among the offenders themselves. Rehabilitation of offenders is a central theme in correctional services and it can be handled through proper classification. Therefore, classification of offenders during admission is a critical step in the process of devising effective rehabilitation programmes. The classification treatment-rehabilitation arrangement is founded on the concept of deferential treatment, which implies that the offenders should be linked with the special treatment programmes that address their problems and needs. The main rehabilitation programmes which have been introduced into correctional institutions are education, vocational training and treatment programmes such as health care and psychological programmes. This chapter also outlined the concept of professionalism amongst correctional staff, and highlighted that every correctional official plays an important role in developing a professional character, based on knowledge, skills and attitude
for them to rehabilitate offenders successfully. The role of the offender, correctional staff and the community was also summarised in this chapter.
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CHAPTER 4

OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The correctional institution is responsible for the care of the convicted offender, and those who are responsible for their care have come to realise that if society is to be served well, it is the offender, not the offence, which must offer the primary consideration, since the courts are charged with the disposition of the convicted offender. This has led to the development of a new method in the field of penology known as classification, a process that matches offenders with appropriate levels of supervision, security, programmes and services to fit offenders’ needs, attitudes, motivation and attributes to bring about the desired changes in values, attitude and skills.

When offenders enter or are admitted to the correctional institution, there are well-organised reception processes where an assessment is conducted. An in-depth interview will be conducted with the offender during this stage, as well as an extensive series of psychological evaluation, intelligent tests, medical examination, aptitude tests and vocational interest measures. On the basis of the intake process, information concerning the offender is recorded in a permanent file. All the information that was gathered during reception and in the diagnosis centres is then sent to the classification centre, which will make a determination with regard to custody classification, housing assignment and what type of education, treatment, or work programmes the offender will be offered. Through this process efforts are made to predict both treatment potential and security risk.

This chapter focuses on the classification for special needs cases. Subjective and objective systems of classification as well as the criteria for an objective classification system are discussed. Offender classification for treatment needs will be the main focus of this chapter, since it is concerned with the total needs of the offender, such as medical, vocational, education
and religious needs. The reclassification of offenders for treatment needs and for security, classification for security purposes and pre-release offender classification will also be examined.

4.2 OFFENDER ADMISSION

The reception quarantine is part of social services, which is responsible for planning and coordinating the treatment services within correctional institutions (Hippchen, 1975:152). Reception in most state prison reception centres is an academy by itself. Classification decisions are generally made at a central reception centre when newly sentenced offenders enter into the correctional system (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:78). When offenders arrive at prison for the first time, they undergo a series of extremely upsetting experiences. They start to experience the shock of admission. This can be described as the most intense feelings of fear, frustration and uncertainty of their lives. Bales (1997:111) says that a well-organised reception and orientation programme lessens the offenders’ shock during admission and speeds up adjustment to the institution.

Before entering the correctional institution, all offenders are considered close custody offenders until the initial classification. The function of security at this point is to implant the reality of prison in the newly committed offender. Armed guards are present, orders are given and immediate compliance is demanded (Walsh, 2001:144). Within the security area of the institution all offenders and their accompanying personal property are properly searched before they enter the institution and offenders are pat searched with handheld metal detectors (Henderson, Rauch & Phillips, 1997:109).

Henderson et al. (1997:110) explain that newly admitted offenders are provided with a copy of the institutional rules and regulations and sign a receipt signifying that they received this information. The form must also be signed by the official who has observed the offender completing the form. The official also indicates in the space provided if the offender refuses to sign the admission folder. This folder consists of fingerprint cards, social and medical intake
screening form, offender commissary account card, admission and orientation handbook materials, and should be organised by the correctional official responsible for admission.

Offenders are housed at the reception and diagnostic unit for two to three weeks so that they can be closely observed by the security and programming staff. For them to be included in the offenders’ assessment and evaluation, the classification committee should be forwarded with observations of the offenders’ adjustment and behaviour (Walsh, 2001:144). The institution committee will serve as the offender’s connection to the classification committee for any changes in their programme that are desired and may also offer counselling support and approve and supervise outside visitors (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:75).

The team of psychologists, medical personnel and other professionals will thoroughly interview, test, examine and evaluate newly admitted offenders at diagnostic centres. During this period the incoming offender is interviewed by social services, and problems of health, family welfare or personal matters and offender adjustment to the institution may be discussed with the social worker assigned to them (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:310).

The detailed contents of pre-sentence investigation reports will also be needed, such as family member contact details, offender’s previous employment, whether the offender attended school and other social services agencies with which the offender had previous contact (Hippchen, 1975:153).

Finally, an uncertain programme of work, school, recreation, training and other long-range planning is drawn up and a working fact sheet is made out to be provided to the classification committee. The representatives from the education department, recreation staff, industries, custodial staff and chaplain will examine the offender and be tested by the psychologist and may be seen by the psychiatrist (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:310).
According to Bales (1997:113), some offenders require exceptional treatment instantly upon arrival in the institution. While procedures for those cases will differ, it is essential to refer to the most usual types such as:

- **Suicide risks:** Newly admitted offenders might experience the feeling of fear and tension, some might have pressure from other offenders, and these feelings can be overwhelming. For some, the humiliation of incarceration is almost unbearable. Correctional officials in receiving areas and during orientation must recognise the signs of depression or pre-suicidal behaviour.

- **Protective custody cases:** These are offenders who believe that they need protective custody because they may be in danger. The intake or admission and orientation staff should be prepared to take specific supervision or when reliable information is available, newly admitted offenders may be under security precautions until the degree of risk is evaluated and the offender is removed, if necessary, to a safe, secure section.

- **Medical isolation cases:** Correctional staff who deal with the intake of offenders must notify the medical practitioner as soon as possible if a newly admitted offender shows or reports any key change in their physical condition or unusual medical history. There must be a medical standard for screening and isolating entering cases. When the offender is transferred to the institutional hospital, they must be placed in a different orientation unit in the correctional environment than the unit in which AIDS offenders are confined.

- **Special management of high security cases:** Newly admitted offenders who are regarded to be a high risk escape or violent offenders are recognised as ultra high security cases. For this type of offender, a number of people must be involved: extra correctional staff, perhaps the use of restraints, and in most cases, a modified orientation programme for them while they are in a locked unit.
Parole violators: The brief orientation programme must often be used for the offenders who may have returned to the institution for a violation hearing or be in the institution following such hearing (Bales, 1997:113).

The admission summary consists of factual information such as (Hippchen, 1975:153):

- identifying material and court data;
- earlier criminal record and special information concerning the offence;
- the social history taken by the admission officer;
- an analysis of educational and vocational background and potential for more training;
- the results of medical and psychological testing;
- a psychiatric appraisal;
- special reports or observations from representatives of different departments of the institution who have been in contact with the inmate during the admission or orientation period; and
- information bearing on the degree of security required.

Bales (1997:111) also summarises the activities that correctional personnel perform during admission of new offenders:

- Each new inmate’s admission warrant is checked by officers assigned to the admission section.
- A register number is given to the inmate.
- Each offender and his/her belongings are searched completely, paying attention to all clothing such as cuffs on trouser legs, waistbands, zips, small (watch) pockets, and all other pockets.
- Goods that are illegally taken into the institution must be processed according to departmental policy.
- All medications the offender arrives with must be disposed of.
- Correct proof of payment is issued for any funds in the offender’s belongings, and the money is correctly stored in a secure place.
• All possessions must be properly searched and all forbidden personal property is kept or distributed to someone in the community. Any damaged property is recorded on an inventory form.
• Newly arrived offenders are issued with prison clothes.
• They are given shower and hair care products.
• The offender is photographed and fingerprinted, and any marks or other unusual physical characteristics are noted on a form.
• The offender is screened for medical, mental and dental health.
• The offender is immediately allocated to an accommodation region.
• Mail and visiting processes are explained and personal data and information about the offender is recorded, to be used for mail and visiting lists.
• Offenders are assisted to notify next of kin and families of their arrival and the institution address.
• New offenders are provided with written orientation.
• Officials decide on whether the offender is a person from whom he/she should be disconnected in the department, and take the necessary measures to look after the offender, if needed.

4.3 ORIENTATION

Before offenders can be sent for classification, they have to be orientated and may also be taken on a guided tour of the correctional organisation. The representatives from the custodial, industrial, education and recreational programmes and religious department will interview the newly admitted offender and case workers are engaged in orientating the individual to the programme (Bales, 1997:112).

The case management system is introduced at the orientation of new offenders as in the particular setting new offenders need to be informed about their rights and responsibilities. In actual fact new offenders need to know how to make and change appointments, prepare forms and reports, make requests and ask questions and complete follow-up requirements and recommendations. It is better for new offenders to be well informed so that they are best
prepared to comply with correctional procedures. Problems with the orientation process and communication can contribute to missed opportunities, failure to report, lack of follow up and other unnecessary complications, which contribute to case managers’ frustration and can even affect probation/parole recommendation in community correction (Enos & Southern, 1996:5).

“The orientation function in the case management process can take many forms; frequently, agencies provide brochures or information on sheets; however, some offenders and their families may have difficulty reading or remembering important details. Face to face orientation sessions are frequently ideal, but they consume scarce staff time. Videotaped programs and computer assisted instruction represent innovations that blend interpersonal and informational components of orientation” (Enos & Southern, 1996:5).

Bales (1997:112) indicates that orientation consists of three goals:

- To ensure that offenders are familiar with the correctional institution’s expectations;
- To provide correctional officials with a chance to gain knowledge about the offender for classification purposes; and
- To help offenders understand that the institution is interested in helping them change.

Hippchen (1975:140) states that in correctional surroundings an orientation programme consists of the following major characteristics:

- Orientation with administration to ground offenders or to provide vocational choices;
- Orientation with regard to the immediate problems of life in a correctional institution; and
- Orientation with administration for post-institution life.

Hippchen (1975:141) also summarises the objectives of a working orientation programme in a typical correctional institution as follows:

- To inform the offenders of methods, institution and regulations;
- To provide information about inmate conduct and responsibility;
- To make available information concerning offender activities and institutions;
- To offer information on the subject of training (vocational, academic, special, etc.) in the correctional programme;
To give information and recommendations to family members and next of kin about life and problems in the correctional institution in general;

To assist the offenders to begin the development of personal correction and to explore their unique problems;

To set up a foundation for contact with the offender upon which treatment and guidance procedures may be built;

To begin to organise the offenders for their personal readjustment after release in the community; and

To discover the world of work upon the inmate’s release from the institution.

There are certain activities that correctional officials who are dealing with the admission and orientation process must consider (Bales, 1997:112):

- Give a clear description of the correctional institution’s rules and regulations, issue out a written copy of these (translated into the offender’s language if necessary), provide the offender with an offender handbook and ensure that he/she signs a receipt form.

- Explain the programmes, their goals and how offenders are acknowledged in them.

- Run tests that recognise offenders’ talents, special interests or their problems.

- Document that the offender has completed all phases of the orientation programme.

4.4 TESTS

In the admission and diagnostic centre there are ranges of tests such as intelligence tests, IQ tests, reading comprehension tests, a complete medical exam, an interview with a psychologist and an interview with a classification officer in the United States of America. Medical officers will deal with examining newly admitted offenders by examining their health and determining communicable illness, e.g. tuberculosis, and checking to determine general physical health. A psychological examination tests an offender’s complete history of medication and any cover up of previous suicide attempts, hospitalisation and traumas experienced from physical or sexual abuse (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:145-146).
These tests are carried out in accordance with the policies of the institution. They may include the Nelson reading skills test, general aptitude test battery, the Wechsler adult intelligence scale, the Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory (MMPI), the human synergistic lifestyle inventory and the Myers-Briggs type indicator (MBTI) (Walsh, 2001:144).

- **Nelson reading skills test:** This test assesses the offender’s reading and vocabulary grade level and determines whether the offender qualifies for participation in subsequent testing. The results of subsequent testing will be unacceptable if the offender cannot read and understand written communications at least at the sixth to eighth grade level.

- **General aptitude test battery:** This type of test is often administered by governmental employment services and is designed to measure aptitudes that have been found to be significant in many occupations. The general aptitude test was established in 1947 to test adults and high school seniors. Conversion tables have been devised for converting scores obtained by those reading at less than. Scores are obtained for general learning ability to understand instructions and the capability to reason and make decisions; verbal aptitude, which is the ability to use the meaning of words effectively and understand the information associated with them; numerical ability to carry out calculation functioning quickly and perfectly; and spatial ability, which is the aptitude to figure out forms in space. The tests bear a superficial resemblance to abstract reasoning tests, as both types of questions contain a series of pictorial figures rather than words or numbers. However, partial ability does not involve analysing and reasoning. Form perception is the ability to perceive pertinent details in objects or in pictorial or graphic material. Clerical perception is the ability to observe relevant information in verbal or tabular material. Finger dexterity is the ability to move the fingers and manipulate small objects rapidly and accurately and manual dexterity is the skill to move the hands easily and skilfully. In most cases offenders usually score extensively higher on the functional areas than on the cognitive section of the general aptitude test battery.
- **Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory**: This test was established in the 1930s in correctional institutions. The testee responds with “true or false”. The Minnesota inventory-based typology of criminal offenders is one of five psychological classifications systems used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. A classification system for youthful and adult offenders was constructed by Edward Margagee in 1979.

- **Human synergistic lifestyle inventory**: This is used extensively and has been carefully studied. Most of the scales on the instrument were constructed by comparing the differences between samples of patients with exacting psychiatric diagnoses and normals (Lester, Braswell & Voorhis, 1992:71). This test is also known as a self-report test and is designed to generate a character report. It is valuable for recognising oppositional characteristics or respondents’ personalities.

- **Myers-Briggs type indicator**: This test was based on psychoanalyst Carl Jung’s theories of judgement and perception. Jungian assumption progresses from the principle that, from an early age, people are influenced to react to the world in different ways. They make use of judgement and perception which are directed by these preferences of interaction and will influence both what people direct their concentration to and the conclusion they draw from their interpretations. MBTI consists of four separate preference types that provide 16 separate groupings or types of individuals, such as extroversion – introversion (EI), sensing – intuiting (SN), thinking – feeling (TF) and judgement – perception (JP).
  - **Extroversion – introversion (EI)**: The individual’s fundamental thoughts and orientation are revealed in this group. An extrovert is oriented inwardly and is likely to use judgement and perceptions on concepts of ideas.
  - **Sensing – intuiting (SN)**: This category reflects the person’s insight function. The sensing process is reliant on visible intention and incidents which are processed through the senses. Intuition is based on “feelings” about relationships, things and occurrences and is beyond the scope of the conscious mind.
Thinking – feeling: This category is known as the critical guide. Thinking lets the offender reflect on the probable outcome of the choice that has been made. The basis for person or social values is provided by the feeling.

Judgement – perception (IP): A lively and confident offender who enjoys being with other people falls into this category. This category also reflects on how the offender contracts with the outer world. Medical officials can identify the dominant, auxiliary, tertiary and inferior function of type indicators.

The results of all of these tests by the medical officer and psychologist, together with information from the pre-sentence investigation report, the offender’s criminal history and reports submitted by custodial and other correctional officials will be combined by the classification committee to provide a description that gives useful information about the offender (Walsh, 2001:150).

4.5 ASSESSMENT

Assessment refers to planned performance of a professional who describes the characteristics, motivations and needs of clients requiring correctional intervention. Assessment ranges from a simple description, such as recording behavioural observation collected in an admission interview, to complex analyses involving investigation of potential causes of criminality (Enos & Southern, 1996:57). It is important to identify needs such as academic, education, vocational training, substance abuse treatment and other programmes (National Institute of Corrections, 2003:5).

Hepworth and Larsen (1990:193) define assessment as the process of gathering, analysing and synthesising salient data into a formulation that includes the following:

- The client problem;
- His/her function (including strengths and limitations);
- The inspiration issues that have a say in offender problems; and
- Available resources that are required to deal with these problems.
Assessment has to do with a definite formulation or statement at a particular time concerning the life of the client (offender). The appropriate data is analysed by the assessor and also manufactured into a working definition of the problem, after identifying associated factors and clarifying how they work together based on present data. It is helpful to consider this recognised assessment as a working hypothesis according to which treatment goals and intervention can be planned. Assessment can also be made at any time while services are being rendered in the light of new information attained (O’Neil, 1993:6).

In correctional institutions, assessment is essential for sustaining a multidisciplinary approach in rendering services to offenders. The product of the initial assessment therefore needs to be modified as the process of assessment continues over time. Therefore assessors can ensure that offenders have spoken needs. It is very important as a professional official to develop trust with an offender before they can reveal the truth about themselves (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:201). In correctional institutions assessment can take the form of a verbal or written statement or report. Custodial correctional officials must attend to offenders, understand their feelings and be competent to identify offenders’ needs in order to refer them to treatment such as an educationist or social worker and psychologist (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:201).

The fundamental goal of assessment has to do with identifying appropriate offender characteristics in order to put together different answers. The correctional officials and other staff members who are involved in interviewing and assessing offender information should be conscious that what they have written during assessment will be witnessed by the offender and also discussed with the pertinent official who deals with offender assessment (Cilliers et al., 2008:108).

Assessment methods have moved from the subjective and extremely flexible form into a more objective and practically based approach. The improvements that emphasise this development are as follows (Walsh, 1997:115):

- The case managers and the case management team identify the important risk and need factors of the offender. These factors include the offender’s age at first adjudication or confidence, criminal history, i.e. number and types of arrests, incarceration, probation and
parole periods prior to the current offence, history or extent of drug or alcohol use, education and vocational skills, potential and history of employment, family life constancy, emotional stability and intellectual ability of the offender.

- The above characteristics can be assessed by the relevant role players.
- The information will point to a preferred response across a range of offender management issues, only if accurate assessment has been completed.
- In order for the unit manager to know his/her offender base and the needs that are related to specific correctional resources, assessment must be done for large groups of offenders (Walsh, 1997:115).

Quay and his colleagues developed three assessment techniques that are used to make a behavioural diagnosis of each offender. These tools are as follows (Hippchen, 1975:95):

- A 100-item true-false questionnaire, completed by the offender;
- A behavioural problem checklist, completed by the correctional counsellor who has observed the offender; and
- Checklist for the analysis of case history data completed by the caseworker after he/she has reviewed the pre-sentence report.

4.5.1 Areas of assessment

Assessment is known as a process of correction that is directly associated with but separate from correctional classification. There are two areas that typically cover correctional assessment: risk and offender’s needs assessment (Sun, 2008:27).

4.5.1.1 Risk assessment

- The risk refers to the threat to self, others and society that is presented by the offender. The offender’s criminal history, violation, dangerousness of the crime, such as violent crime, and current conviction(s) are considered. Sex offenders are regarded as more dangerous than violent and non-sex offences (Sun, 2008:27).
• This system allocates offenders to correctional institution or community-based correctional options on the foundation of the security principle. “A critical question for risk assessment instruments is how successful they are in predicting individual offender’s outcome behaviours” (Brennan, 1993:47).

• Risk assessment covers the areas of employment, alcohol and drug abuse, attitude and present and past criminal behaviour. The assessment of the client helps to determine levels of supervision, i.e. maximum, medium and/or minimum level (Matshaba, 2006:36).

4.5.1.2 Needs assessment

• Needs assessment can be referred to as internal classification, since needs assessment tools identify the rehabilitation need of offenders. This is an argument for the management classification system and offers direction for correctional officials who are responsible for programming (Pollock, 2006:163).

• It has to do with measurements connected to education, employment, financial situation, interpersonal relationships, family marital status, accommodation, leisure and recreation, companions, alcohol and drug abuse problems, suitability for treatment, mental health issues and attitude toward crime, conviction, sentence and criminal justice (Sun, 2008:27).

• This assessment system, which recognises offenders according to important treatment needs, is recommended as a means of further classifying the group into areas such as living units or treatment group (Lester et al., 1992:76).

Both risk and needs assessment systems are considered to answer correctional organisational concerns about matching an offender with suitable programmes and services, staff, correctional resources and security arrangements within correctional institutions (Enos & Southern, 1996:57). Lester et al. (1992:75) also mention that risk assessment systems are the most popular systems for classifying offenders.

Correctional classification is directly allied with assessment in that the offenders’ scores and assessment tools often serve as one of the important bases for conclusion in the initial classification and reclassification (Sun, 2008:27).
4.5.2 Process of assessment

After the offenders have been sentenced by the court, they will undergo a thorough assessment process to determine how they will serve their sentence. During early assessment interviews and testing, correctional staff should elicit from the offender’s background what they need to become fruitful citizens. This will reveal the fact that offender perceptions of their needs are somewhat subjective (Walsh, 2001:154). The assessment process consists of the following (Cilliers et al., 2008:109-111):

- **Gathering the information about the offender.** During the interview it is the responsibility of the correctional official to tell the offender what to expect generally. The responsible official makes a case documentation checklist to verify the information on the offender that has been requested or received and will collect the most important information for parole options for the case management committee. All this information will be essential for the needs of general assessment and will also be used in case management meetings.

- **Dealing with the offender’s urgent needs.** During this stage, the immediate concerns of the offender will be established and suicidal offenders, violent offenders and those whose personal safety may be at risk as a result will be identified immediately.

- **Analysing the criminal record and assessing risk.** Correctional officials should know the offence and the risk the offender poses during this process.

- **Identifying criminogenic requirements.** The basic areas of need in terms of employment, associates, community functioning, attitudes, marital/family status, substance abuse and emotional and personal situations are fully explored by the correctional official.

- **Handing over offender security.** The admission assessment information is summarised as part of the transfer of an initial security classification, e.g. normally minimum, medium, maximum or super maximum per offender.
4.6 CLASSIFICATION COMMITTEE

In order for an initial determination of the programme that is to be followed during the period of incarceration, the social service department must also send the case to the classification committee with the material contained in the admission summary. The purpose of the classification committee is to work out a realistic programme to aid in the rehabilitation of an offender (Hippchen, 1975:154). At the classification meeting the offender will be formally evaluated once the background classification report has been prepared. The classification meeting involves the development of an integrated work assignment or permanent housing, and educational, vocational and social improvement programmes for the offender (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:25). The main aim of the classification committee is to produce the separate reports or admission summary in order to determine the offender’s assets, deficiencies and liabilities, how he/she became the way that he/she is, and how the assets can be capitalised upon, the defences corrected, and the needs met.

Therefore before the classification committee makes its final conclusion, the offender also has the opportunity to discuss his/her programme with the committee. The offender should be allowed to be involved in the early classification meeting, and during the interview the offender should be made to feel comfortable with the classification committee. The committee may have to make decisions on the following basics (Reid, 1981:240):

- Whether the offender needs to be transferred to another institution;
- How much custody will be required;
- Work assignment for the sentenced offender;
- What academic programme is needed for the offender; and
- On the chaplain’s recommendation, religious classes and counselling, Alcoholics Anonymous, or other such organisation, only in cases that are special (Reid, 1981:240).

The information that will be collected during admission and orientation by the correctional staff will be forwarded to the institution’s classification committee or a unit team for use in the classification process (Bales, 1997:112).
4.7 CLASSIFICATION PROCESS

Classification of offenders means the division of offenders into groups according to individualities they share in general (Stinchcomb & Fox, 1999:226). Classification can be also regarded as a good mechanism for grouping types of offenders which belong together. Successful classification systems may ensure good safe custody and proper administration of rehabilitation programmes (Cilliers et al., 2008:104). “Classification is essential to the operation of an orderly and safe prison. It is a prerequisite for the rational allocation of whatever program opportunities exist within the institution. It enables the institution to gauge the proper custody level of an inmate to identify the offender’s educational, vocational, and psychological need and to separate nonviolent inmates from the more predatory. Classification is also essential for any logical future planning” (Solomon & Camp, 1993:5).

Classification of offenders has always reflected the philosophy of a particular era. In the previous chapter the philosophy of punishment was discussed. Classification reflects these philosophies such as retribution, deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation (Cilliers et al., 2008:103). Cilliers et al. (2008:104) consider the following purposes and actions that were defined by the American Correctional Association:

- To consider the collection of offenders for the purpose of choosing security and custody;
- To establish programmes and services such as medical and mental health services, vocational programmes, educational programmes, work programmes based on offender need and the ease of use of services and to diagnose offenders;
- To allocate offenders suitable accommodation or appointment within a provision or institution;
- To schedule reviews of security, custody and programme placement and to reassess the need for possible reclassification; and
- To assess the offender for assignment in society change programmes and for special needs.
During classification, the dangerousness and mental stability of offenders are evaluated and usually those with similar characteristics are sent to similar locations. Most classification systems consider risk factors such as prior convictions, current convictions, escape or attempted escapes, length of sentence and institution. Age, education level, history of substance abuse and history of violence may also be considered (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:366).

They are two separate ways that offender classification has been measured:

- The classification is merely the separation of types of offenders in different institutions or programmes.
- The concept of individual treatment approaches for the assignment of individual offenders to different programmes according to their needs within the institution or system (Hippchen, 1975:3).

The following types of information are utilised in making classification decisions (Du Preez, 2003: 200):

- Sentence information: the crime the offender has committed and the sentence received for the crime.
- Criminal history: the number of prior periods of parole supervision. This includes the number of prior convictions: convictions for burglary, theft, vehicle theft and assault offences within the last five years.
- Institutional history: the attitude of the offender during previous imprisonment; where the offender was imprisoned, with reference to records from that institution to assess the general behaviour of the offender.
- Personal history: the age of the offender at first conviction; the number of address changes in the last 12 months as well as the percentage of time employed in the last 12 months.
- The offender’s security classification: the security classification of an offender can range from minimum, medium to maximum security. The higher the security classification, the higher the risk that the offender poses.
- Offender motivation to participate in a treatment programme: if programmes formed part of the case plan of an offender, how motivated was the offender to participate in these programmes?

Correctional system classification in most countries in the world may be regarded as assessment, but according to Sun (2008:27), assessment is known as a process of correction that is directly associated with but separate from correctional classification.

Today, the most important plan of classification is to determine and develop better knowledge concerning the general cause of criminal behaviour, the specific set of factors in each offender’s life and developing approaches and methods which can effectively help the offender to change their behaviour and develop their potential as human beings. The promising notion of classification views the offender as a human being with behaviour which could be understood and possibly corrected ((Hippchen, 1975:1).

Clear and Cole (1997:136) identify three common principles that are used to classify offenders:

- **Offence criteria**: These must be classified as the weightiness of the crime committed according to offence criteria.

- **Risk criteria**: Offenders are classified according to the probability of future criminal conduct.

- **Programme criteria**: Offenders are classified based on the character of correctional institution treatment suitable to the individual’s needs and conditions.

There are three types of classification procedures according to Cilliers et al. (2008:114):

- **Anamnestic procedure**

  This procedure has to do with offenders’ historical conduct, such as conduct before being sentenced in the institution or in society and/or the conduct during the previous custody, if he/she was in prison before. All of this is recorded during the interview by the case manager.
Clinical procedure

The professional people in the correctional institution are responsible for the clinical procedure that is based on expert diagnosis and evaluation, such as the social worker and psychologist who use the assessment tools to diagnose offenders. The experts will evaluate the results and give advice in the classification procedure regarding the clinical state of the offender.

Statistical or actual procedure

This type of procedure is based on the offender’s conduct patterns in conjunction with similar behaviour patterns of the offenders.

Other major types of classification processes should include:

- A method for initially assessing and periodically revising inmates’ security categories that are established in parallel with the security features of the system’s institutions;
- A means of assuring that custody assignment is imposed consistently, and never as a form of punishment;
- Offender understanding of and participation in the classification system;
- A method for providing sufficient latitude of staff to override system-generated classification, based on their professional judgement;
- A process that provides for ongoing review and validation of the system, and that ensures its reliability and objectivity (Henderson et al., 1997:16).
Matshaba (2006:38) states that the classification category is determined by a fixed set of clearly specified factors. It can be distinguished by three development strategies:

- **The actuarial models**

  These models are categorised by the function statistically derived table using personal data to predict future behaviour. This approach is used extensively in many fields. It has been used to predict parole and probation outcomes and risks of future criminal behaviour.

- **The typological models**

  These models are general and constructed without reference to particular criteria. Individuals are sorted into categories according to their similarities on a particular profile or variables. The variables employed may be those empirically available for the aims which are derived from a theory. These models can be based on any set of data about individuals. They tend to be based on personality and motivational behaviour to criminal history data. They have multiple predictive implication and use.

- **Consensus models**

  These models determine the criteria for decision making. They are consistent, fair and equitable by establishing the criteria which are used by classification experts. These models are not, however, based on prediction of risks and their validity remains an issue requiring empirical resolutions.

4.7.1 **Subjective and objective classification systems**

According to Duckitt and Du Toit (1986:7-8), classification of offenders may be divided into two systems, namely **subjective** and **objective** systems. The characteristics of these two systems are as follows:
4.7.1.1 Subjective classification system

Subjective classification tends to be expensive and wasteful and rest upon an unnecessary amount of data. It lends itself to inconsistency, arbitrary and unfair decisions. Classification personnel may differ on important factors. Offenders thus cannot be offered clear and reasonable explanations concerning decisions that are taken. This system is regarded as subjective since each specialist bases his/her decision on personal experience, judgement and preconception. Different specialists can thus possibly reach different conclusions about the offender (Neser, 1993:255:6). According to Sun (2008:26), the subjective classification system mainly relies on the experience and judgement of the prison administration. Correctional officials would decide where to detain offenders and under what type of supervision and security.

4.7.1.2 Objective classification system

Neser (1993:256) describes the objective classification system as being based on the set of fixed and clearly defined factors to which standardised values are allocated. The characteristics of these systems are validity, consistency, fairness and intelligibility for effective and acceptable classification (Duckitt & Du Toit, 1986:13). Objective classification systems are important for the construction of new prisons and the development of the offender programmes (Hardyman, 2001:1).

One of the possible strong points of objective classification systems is that they are particularly open to evaluation and validation, which is important for the following (Solomon & Camp, 1993:13):

- Providing a detailed description of how the system is functioning;
- Comparing how the system is functioning with the original design;
- Determining what effects the system has on key indicators (i.e. assaults, escapes, staff morale and operational costs); and
Determining whether an objective system increases the consistency and reliability of the decisions being made.

The following description of an objective classification system was given by Sun (2008:28):

- Reliable and valid conditions that have been observed through empirical research are used to launch prison safe keeping.
- Fine-trained and specific specialised personnel perform classification activities, as well as suggestions that the safekeeping level of an offender be increased, decreased, or maintained, or recommendations regarding transfer of the offender.
- Each classification resolution and concern used to make each verdict is recognised and stored for analysis and examination.

Carlson and Garrett (2008:77) emphasise that there must be validity and reliability in an objective prison classification system. Reliability means that the classification tool does what it purports to do time and time again, meaning that, no matter which correctional official makes use of the classification tool for a particular offender, the same result will be accomplished. Validity means that the classification tool is correct in assessing an offender’s future behaviour and tendency for violence. Hence, objective classification instruments should:

- be used lawfully on prison populations;
- make use of the same standard for each and every offender;
- use a reasonable, straightforward process that is based upon factors that are related directly to the classification decision;
- advocate a classification conclusion that is based on the offender’s background;
- encourage dependable decisions for the same placed offenders; and
- make use of a procedure that is easily understood by the correctional official to supervise the offenders efficiently and effectively (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:77).

Cilliers et al. (2008:106) point out that while objective classifications are a central function of a correctional system, they may be improved through a good classification system. The following are requirements for a good classification system (Neser, 1993:255):
• It must be broad and mainstream offenders must be classified.
• Every offender must be allocated to a category, therefore there must be a clear definition of the classification category.
• If the offender is assessed by a range of people, the classification must be reliable and various people should all come to the same conclusion.
• There must be a suitable classification. It must be clear that the offender does in fact have the characteristics which are associated with a range or group.
• The classification must be vibrant and must take into account any transformation which may take place.
• There must be some suitable treatment programme that must follow the classification process. For a great number of offenders to be dealt with at minimum expense by the smallest number of potential correctional officials, the classification system must be economical.
• The classification system must be plain and comprehensible.
• Correctional officials and offenders must experience the classification system as reasonable, natural and just.

Aiken (1993:34) lists three keys to create and maintain a successful classification system:

• **Information**

This entails contribution and acceptance of information concerning the expectations of the public and correctional institution. This information and the principles of the classification system assist in creating value and focusing on the problem better, creating an increased opportunity for buy-in from correctional officials and other key role players, and identifying potential obstacles that serve as an early warning system.
• **Organisation**

Many people within the agency are involved in the improvement of a logical management process. Problem solving and decision making activities reduce discord, set priorities and increase the likelihood of informative decision making. All groups must be included by the organisational makeup in an effective way. Exclusion of one or more group is affected by the energy required to effect desired change, whether or not the exclusion was intended. For instance, a successful male offender classification system will not automatically have the same results among female offenders.

• **Integrity**

The responsibility of top management is to sustain the priority of the classification system, once the value has been created and process of classification has been implemented. This phase is found by many officials as difficult to practise, particularly when the person who is in power requests offender movements that infringe the dictates of available facilities to be utilised. No matter how good classification systems may be, however, they have some disadvantages. Inciardi (1987:552) identifies the following disadvantages of a classification system:

• These systems sometimes experience a degree of resistance from correctional officials since they take away the members’ discretion and decision making powers.

• These systems depend upon accurate and complete data in their functioning and as such incorrect data can lead to incorrect classification with destructive outcomes.

• The systems have been mathematically formulated and their correct usage depends on avoidance of human error.

• The determination of a cut-off point that can differentiate between the various custodial categories is based purely on practical police decisions of practical considerations. When the cut-off point between maximum and medium custody is too high, it can lead to incorrect classification where the offenders who are in fact maximum categories land in medium security facilities and medium categories end up in maximum security facilities.
Bales (1997:114–115) mentions that irrespective of what type of classification system is applied, classification policies must include at least the following:

- A membership account of the unit, team or institutional classification committee(s), as well as the responsibility and contractual obligation of each correctional official;
- Featured explanation of the process for classifying and reclassifying offenders and for certifying the results of the procedures;
- Process for transferring offenders from one programme to the next or from one correctional institution to another; and
- Prerequisite for a dictation or some other record of the classification or team action on every case. These records can assist parole authorities in weighing up whether an offender can or should return to society as a law-abiding citizen.

4.7.2 Criteria for objective classification

Courts have believed that in general classification criteria must be realistic and reasonable as opposed to arbitrary and unpredictable (Belbot & Del Carmen, 1993:25). The criteria for classification should be understandable by inexperienced persons and should be objective. This will make things easier for correctional officials who are dealing with administration and for the offender and will also benefit them. For correctional officials, if the criteria for classification personnel are easier for them and different classifications are understandable, the decision making process will be easier for them and different classification personnel will be more likely to attain reliable results for similar offenders if they have a thorough understanding of the application of the system. Criteria will serve to lessen the need for correctional officials to reverse use of the classification tool. This allows offenders to have a better understanding of why they are classified (Pollock, 1997:98).

Several model systems have been developed and are in use. The following are the criteria commonly found in objective classification systems (Pollock, 1997:100). None of these criteria are found in all systems.
### HIGHLIGHT 1: CRITERIA USED IN OBJECTIVE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

#### HIGHLIGHT 4 – 2

**Criteria Commonly Used in Objective Classification System**

1. Severity of current offense
2. Degree of violence
3. Use of weapon in current offense
4. Nature of sexual offense
5. Current offense
6. Type of sentence (i.e., death, life, consecutive)
7. Length of sentence
8. Expected length of incarceration
9. Type of detainer
10. Severity of prior commitments
11. Number of prior commitments
12. Number of prior convictions
13. Number of prior felony convictions
14. Number convictions for violence against person
15. Number of convictions for burglary / theft
16. History of violence
17. History of institutional violence
18. History of escape
19. History of prior supervision
20. Institutional adjustment
21. Behaviour characteristic during incarceration
22. Demonstrated skills in escape / assault
23. Pre-commitment status (own recognizance, voluntary surrender
24. Psychotic
25. Substance abuse
26. Age
27. Education
28. History of employment
29. Program / services needs (Buchanan and Whitlow 1987)

Source: Adapted from (Pollock, 1997)

The characteristics of objective classification systems are as follows:

- Test and classification tools that have been validated for prison populations;
- Similar mechanisms and classification approaches for all offenders;
- Decisions based only on application of factors shown to be related to placement decisions;
- Offenders allocated to security classifications consistent with their background;
- Similar decisions among individual classification analysts on similar offender cases;
Involvement of offenders;
Easily understood by both correctional officials and offenders; and
Systematic and well organised (Buchanan, Whitlow & Austin, 1986:273).

Correctional systems “must be able to demonstrate that objective classification systems are objective, logical, and fundamentally fair and have been designed to meet the needs of both offender and correctional system” (Solomon & Camp, 1993:13).

The American Correctional Association adopted standards that are important to an objective classification system. It should entail comprehensible principles for classifying offenders and the classification of each offender and the classification plan itself should be subject to episodic reconsideration.

The standards for objective classification adopted by the American Correctional Association are as follows:

HIGHLIGHT 2: STANDARDS FOR OBJECTIVE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-4399</td>
<td>There is a written plan for inmate classification which specifies the objectives of the classification system, details the methods for achieving the objectives, and provides a monitoring evaluation mechanism to determine whether the objectives are being met. The plan is reviewed at least annually and updated if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4400</td>
<td>There are classification policies with detailed procedures for implementing them; these policies are made available to all staff involved with classification, and reviewed at least annually and updated if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4403</td>
<td>The written plan for inmate classification provides for maximum involvement of representatives of relevant institutional programs and the inmate concerned in classification reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4404</td>
<td>The written plan for inmate classification specifies that the program status review of each inmate occurs at least every 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4405</td>
<td>The written plan for inmate classification specifies criteria and procedures for determining and changing the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Status of an inmate, the plan includes at least one level of appeal

2409 The written plan for inmate classification specifies that, prior to a parole hearing, pre-parole material is made available for the paroling authority including a current and compete history of the inmate’s activities in the institution and a proposed parole plan. (Adapted from American Correctional Association, 1981)

Source: Adapted from (Pollock, 1997:98)

Silverman (2001:158-159) found the following positive impacts of objective classification systems:

- An important drop off in over-classification was noticed where the percentage of offenders classified at minimum or lower custody levels was much higher than believed in the past. Most classification systems maintain that 20 to 40% of their offenders could be safely detained in minimum custody.
- In reliable classification decision making, correctional official errors and misinterpretations of classification policy were reduced.
- There were no increases, and even some reductions, in escape rates and organisational wrongdoing.
- In a classification system detaining offenders according to level of risk, there were important improvements, but there continue to be difficulties in developing criteria that are predictive of risk.
- Correctional officials have acknowledged the objective classification tool as a positive means in managing a quickly growing offender population.
- Classification criteria predict offender misconduct. In a California study it was found that the institution environment may be an equally if not more important contributor to offender bad behaviour.
- Potential resource needs, including staffing levels, offender programmes and types of services have been improved.
4.7.3 Offender classification for treatment needs

The purpose of classification systems (in modern correctional systems) is to develop and rehabilitate the offender. Classification systems try to differentiate between offenders on the basis of their needs, attitudes, motivations and attributes, and then provide the necessary programmes to bring about the desired changes in values, attitude and skills (Walsh, 1997:165).

In Hippchen’s opinion (1975:13), the primary standard of offender classification is straightforward:

- Offenders are individual persons and should be treated as human beings.
- The correctional institution should carefully plan the offenders’ rehabilitation so that they can become law-abiding citizens after they are released.
- Within the correction of defects, capitalisation of assets and retraining of those who are to be released, it is important that all available facilities be utilised.

Hlongwane (1994:71) also says that the purposes of classification are accomplished through the following characteristics:

- Individual offender problems are analysed through social investigation, psychiatric, psychological examination, educational and religious studies.
- The programmes of treatment and training are chosen during personnel meetings.
- Programmes are placed into action.

These characteristics that are discussed above bring about the classification of offenders where it serves as a rehabilitation tool.

Classification may improve decision making and help in the allocation of resources and meeting the needs of offenders. Therefore to place the offender in the correctional institution most suitable to his/her individual need is the goal of the classification process, whilst ensuring that the security risks posed by the offender are recognised and tackled (Cilliers et al., 2008:113).
Modern correctional systems implement the new approach of social and behavioural sciences and the training of practitioners in the fields of social work, psychology and psychiatry in offenders’ rehabilitation. The new classification plan is based on medical, psychiatric, religious and disciplinary phases of individual offenders’ lives, together with the assignment for placement in housing, for treatment and for work (Hippchen, 1975:20).

Classification can assist in recognising common descriptions of the prison population and these can in turn be used to make decisions about what treatment programmes might be most appropriate at the facility. In addition, it can provide administrators with information about recent and future populations that can be useful in facility and programme planning. Classifying offenders for treatment may be described as dealing with the need of the individual for rehabilitation. This progression is not entirely independent of the security and custody classification because offenders in the higher levels of management classification will have limited access to rehabilitation programmes. An offender custody and security risk generally supersede their treatment and programming needs (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:147). However, identifying the rehabilitative needs of offenders can enhance the management classification system and provide direction for correctional officials who are in charge of programming (Pollock, 2006:163).

The modern-day of treatment of offenders has to do with new principles in classification such as:

- Offenders should be treated as human beings. People are not the same and that also applies to offenders as well. Individual offenders should be treated as distinctive people with unique needs and problems. Grouping offenders together with the common kinds of problems and needs can be achieved by classification. This allows offenders to identify with one another.

- Offender rehabilitation should be designed in such a way that the offender will fit in well in the community when the punishment is concluded. When the offender is released into the community as a law-abiding citizen, he/she must make use of the skills that he/she was equipped with and trained in during his/her imprisonment through the programmes presented.
All accessible services should be exploited in the correction of failing and retraining of those who are to be released. The facilities at the prison should be available and used to assist the offender in the rehabilitation process.

Programmes that are constructive in the rehabilitation of the offender need to form part of the individual approach (Cilliers et al., 2008:112).

As the early corrections period called attention to separation by category, and the middle period emphasised diagnosis and programme planning, the new development in correctional rehabilitation has the tendency to emphasise a more holistic approach to the treatment of the offender. One of these new areas of development that become suggestive of this development is the use of treatment teams. The development of the treatment teams, instead of more formalised classification committees, is a structural and procedural development of the past decade in corrections. Treatment teams are viewed as integrating all of the treatment and advantages of the classification committee structure and at the same time improving on some of its inherent disadvantages. The treatment teams consist of a group of specialists, such as trained staff from the areas of psychology, social work, academic education, vocational education and correctional counsellors (formerly called guards) (Hippchen, 1975:21-22). The advantages of the team structure over the classification committee structure appears to be that the teams offer more frequent, closer personal interactions between staff and offenders over a longer period of time. Team members will understand the prisoners and their problems more intimately, will be more specifically aware of their needs for treatment and will be more accurate in determining when each prisoner has progressed to the point where parole would be a good risk (Hippchen, 1975:23).

Alarid and Reichel (2008:146) state that internal classification for programming needs is carried out to assess cell allocation, work allocation and some programming needs, such as education, vocational skills and counselling, once the offender has been assigned to a unit or a level of supervision. Internal classification also monitors offenders who have medical issues, psychological problems or learning disabilities that first must be addressed; therefore they can fully involve themselves in treatment using this data. Correctional officials can assign
programmes among correctional institutions, determine specific and justified budget needs for programmes, or identify the need for problem-specific programmes, such as one for sex offenders or those who are severely mentally ill (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:147).

For generally different treatment programmes, there are at least three offender groups (Fox, 1977:89).

- The deviant personality type involves intensive psychological, psychiatric and social case work diagnosis and remedial work.
- The occasional, accidental offender type needs systematic training in some regular job specialty and opportunities for counselling and guidance.
- The high grade white collar or political offender type, including those with intellectual or religious views contrary to the views predominant in present society, need a transformation of values.

Schmalleger and Smykla (2005:430) assert that offender classification should separate terminally ill offenders from others and prevent homosexuality. The issue of homosexuality within correctional centres is a reality.

Offenders’ progress towards their rehabilitation can be monitored easily if they are grouped together according to the demands that they impose on the correctional system. The need for medication will also be identified easily, which is not the case when there is no effective classification system.

The following table shows how offenders are classified in specific characteristic groups. Some treatment selections based on discrimination of known offender groups include their responsiveness to treatment and criminogenic needs (Du Preez, 2003:230).
Table 1: Characteristic behaviour by classification category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAVY</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive or sly</td>
<td>Not excessively aggressive or dependent</td>
<td>Dependent or afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly or indirectly confrontational</td>
<td>Reliable or cooperative</td>
<td>Unreliable or anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily bored or untrustworthy</td>
<td>Industrious</td>
<td>Passive or easily upset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile to authority</td>
<td>Does not see self as being criminal</td>
<td>“Clinging” or seeks protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinaries: high to moderate rate</td>
<td>Disciplinaries: low rate</td>
<td>Disciplinaries: low to moderate rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little concern for others or manipulators and con artists</td>
<td>Concern for others</td>
<td>Self-absorbed or explosive under stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisers</td>
<td>Avoids fights</td>
<td>Easily victimised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Du Preez (2003: 230)

**Heavy** needs offenders include those who are classified as: (a) being aggressive or sly; (b) directly or indirectly confrontational; (c) easily bored or untrustworthy; (d) being hostile to authority; (E) having little concern for others or are manipulators and “con artists”; (f) victimisers (g) and discipline should be high to moderate.

**Moderate** needs offenders include those who are classified as: (a) being not excessively aggressive or dependent; (b) reliable or cooperative; (c) industrious; (d) not seeing themselves as being criminal; (e) having concern for others; (f) avoiding fights; and (g) discipline should be low.
Light needs offenders include those who are classified as: (a) being dependent or afraid; (b) unreliable or anxious; (c) passive or easily upset; (d) “clinging” or seeking protection; (e) being self-absorbed or explosive under stress; (f) easily victimised; and (g) discipline should be low to moderate.

After this internal classification is done, the results will help the case manager to classify the different programmes which will suit the behaviour characteristics of the offenders. These programmes are shown in table 2 (Du Preez, 2003:231).

**Table 2: Differential programming by classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME AREA</th>
<th>HEAVY</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1. Individualised</td>
<td>1. Classroom lecture</td>
<td>1. Classroom lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1. Non-repetitive</td>
<td>1. High level of responsibility</td>
<td>1. Repetitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Short-term goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Team-orientated goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>1. Individualised (behavioural contracts)</td>
<td>1. Group and individual (problem orientated)</td>
<td>1. Group and individual (personal orientation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. No nonsense</td>
<td>2. Direct only as needed</td>
<td>2. Supportive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Du Preez (2003:231), if an offender is classified as requiring a heavy structure, the education, work, counselling and staff approach will differ significantly from an offender classified as requiring a moderate structure. The same principles apply to an offender who is classified as requiring a low structure in comparison with an offender who is classified as requiring a moderate or high structure.

The classification omnibus model presents some treatment options based on characteristics of known offenders, including their responsiveness to treatment and their particular criminogenic needs, which must be considered by the authorities of the correctional institution (Enos & Southern, 1996:103). According to Van Zyl Smit (in Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:822), the goal of treatment programmes is to decrease offending, therefore the focus has to be upon criminogenic needs. It is very important to differentiate between the different criminogenic factors which contribute directly to criminal behaviour. These factors can be anti-social attitude, drug dependency, illiteracy, poor vocational skill, or those factors which have a less direct relationship with offenders; if the teaching style matches the offenders’ learning style, positive results can be obtained. Most of the offenders prefer an active participatory teaching style, for example role play. They tend to have difficulty with unstructured or overly dedicative teaching methods (Andrews, 1995:27). Rehabilitation decisions can be based upon careful consideration of criminogenic needs (Enos & Southern, 1996:102).

Bartollas (2002:307) explains that the reintegration model is incorporated into the classification process. It is also concerned with the total need of the offender such as medical, vocational, educational and religious needs. Inciardi (1987:552) states that the offenders are informed about prison activities during the classification process where education, vocational, custody and treatment needs of an individual offender are determined.

According to this philosophy (reintegration model), offenders are processed through three stages: Assessment, programming and evaluation.
• **Assessment**

The offender’s total needs are revealed in the first stage. These include whether offenders need vocational skills, are lacking in reading ability, or other educational needs, or whether they need medical or dental care. All these questions are asked taking into consideration offender rehabilitation.

• **Programming**

After the assessment process has come to an end, the correctional counsellor goes over the basic classification findings with the offender. The correctional counsellor will find out what the offender’s goals are and what kind of programme the offender believes that he/she needs to accomplish these goals. If the preferred programme has an opening, the institutional classification committee has the same opinions. The offender agrees on a programme with the correctional counsellor. If the first alternative is not available, the offender will choose another programme or elect to begin an alternative programme until the first choice becomes available.

• **Evaluation**

Offender management flow evaluation should take place every four to six weeks during the offender’s stay. If the offender requests a programme change, the counsellor presents this request to the classification committee.

Classification for treatment can be enabled by the use of a needs assessment instrument or by a psychological classification instrument. These are discussed in detail below (Pollock, 2006:163).

• **Needs assessment tool**

This tool tends to place more importance on dynamics such as academic ability, emotional problems, alcohol and drug abuse and educational background. Needs assessment instruments
are related to risk assessment instruments in that they are objective and focused largely on the past information concerning the offender.

- **Psychological classification tool**

These systems are founded on a range of theories of individual conduct. One type is carried out by a third person who explains the offender description. The offender will be interviewed by professionals such as a psychologist, social worker or counsellor, and professionals will complete the instrument based on the interviewer's personal inspection and reactions. The advantage of psychological instruments is that they can collect more personalised information concerning the offender and permit the interviewer to request follow-up questions in areas of particular interest. The disadvantage of these instruments is that they are labour intensive, because the professional can only interview one offender at a time and sometimes the interview can be long. The evaluation may also differ greatly according to the skill of the interviewer.

Classification as a treatment function depends on the philosophy of the correctional or prison systems. There are some conditions that are made in nearly every correctional system for treatment of offenders even though the correctional system differs. There are a range of particular treatment programmes that are offered by the correctional institutions in order to ensure the assignment of offenders in institutions where they may benefit from the available treatment programmes. For this, correctional services make use of classification as part of an assessment process (Cilliers et al., 2008:105). Through classification the offenders’ needs are determined and offenders are assigned to programmes which are evaluated for how well they meet the offenders’ needs. There is a specific connection between a need and a programme (Hippchen, 1975:71). Therefore classification surely can make other positive contributions to corrections. In addition, the treatment of offender classification as a rehabilitation tool has confirmed that offenders will be pleased about the real effort to help them and the opportunities for self-improvement provided (Reid, 1981:241).
The following diagram shows how classification procedure flows for treatment needs.

![Diagram showing classification procedure]

**Figure 1: Flow of classification procedure**
Source: Adapted from (Proctor 1994:256)

### 4.7.4 Classification of special needs cases

In modern correctional institutions more attention is given to the classification of special cases such as the mentally ill, the elderly, disabled, substance abusers and women (Henderson et al., 1997:19). Most offenders have different problems, descriptions and needs that set them apart from others in the prison populations (Silverman, 2001:170). The following special needs offenders are identified by Henderson et al. (1997:19):
4.7.4.1 Mentally ill

In the past there was no consideration for mentally ill offenders and there were no treatment programmes available for them. Offenders of that kind were generally hidden everywhere in the system except when they demonstrated serious management problems. Most offenders of this class require some form of special management programmes specifically designed for them (Silverman, 2001:171). The special needs of the mentally ill offenders are unique, and the programme models are few. The models that do exist are limited primarily to special education programmes geared more to needs of individuals with learning disabilities other than those of the mentally ill person. Allen and Simonsen (1986:330) point out that the environment of the treatment of mentally ill individuals is frequently suitable to some arrangement of the treatment philosophy and economics of the era. In the past the mentally ill were detained without any differentiation, even though there are important differences in their disorders.

Mentally ill offenders may require isolation in a specialised unit depending on the severity of their illness. Where the unit is under the support of medical, psychiatric, or corrections professionals, the Department of Correctional Services should provide a connection to ensure that sound correctional practices are complied with or medical or human services professionals and correctional officials will control the unit simultaneously and regularly (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:365). Mentally ill or developmentally disabled offenders may also require assignment in a specialised unit. Since serious attention must be given to the ability to function independently, daily living or survival skills will be fundamental, in tasks that may give the impression that they are out of place in a correctional environment. Such activities might involve cooking, shopping, or doing laundry depending on the levels of functioning of the offenders. Offenders might stay in specialised units until they return to the outside world as law-abiding citizens (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:365).

Classification decisions must not be made exclusively on the foundation of a disability or special need, but they should be made along with many issues measured (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:366).
4.7.4.2 Elderly offenders

In correctional institutions offenders who are becoming old are a reality. Offenders who are over 70 years old are called elderly offenders (Allen & Simonsen, 1986:337). Older offenders are admitted in prison with a wide range of health problems and the duration of their imprisonment is increasing in most systems. They are the most vulnerable group. Many systems have set up unique aged units to assist these offenders in dealing with daily prison life (Henderson et al., 1997:19).

Older offenders can be classified into three groups based on their imprisonment histories:

- **First group** – consists of offenders who are generally imprisoned for their first crime late in life. They have usually committed offences such as manslaughter, murder, rape or other sexual offences. These types of offenders are inexperienced about prison life, as new arrivals to the correctional environment, and they might not adjust to the difficulties that they face in prison.

- **Second group** – forms a component of the long-term offender. This cluster consists of offenders who committed very serious offences at an early stage, were sentenced to long terms, and have grown old in prison. These types of offenders have already adjusted to prison life, and there is a poor relationship with their family and friends, due to their long imprisonment. Together with a lack of suitable work experience, their readjustment to the community after they are released from prison is difficult (Silverman, 2001:179). Long-term offenders’ classification should be reviewed every six months. They are usually allocated to more security institutions and classified as close custody on admission (Silverman, 2001:181).

- **The third group** - consists of career criminals who are sentenced to life imprisonment. Generally they are well adapted to the institution (prison) and cause few management
problems. They also lack the necessary social, life and coping skills to be successful on the outside, which contributes to them being rearrested and imprisoned (Silverman, 2001:179).

Older offenders differ from one institution to another. Programmes for them may centre on sports and recreation, education, arts and crafts (Silverman, 2001:181). Classification of elderly offenders should take place in cooperation with mainstreaming or placement of mature offenders in general population, with segregation for older offenders who need a safe environment. Existing programmes are few for these offenders (Silverman, 2001:189).

4.7.4.3 Disabled offenders

In correctional institutions there are disabled offenders that the correctional institutions are dealing with effectively and their needs are being met. Some disabled offenders miss out on taking part in various programmes within the institution and do not have access to programmes and are not given the full range of services that are available. Current-day correctional institutions are required to take affirmative steps to ensure that disabled offenders’ needs are met in a reasonable manner, and not ignored (Henderson et al., 1997:19).

4.7.4.4 Substance abusers

In correctional institutions, for generations, offenders with substance abuse have been a reality. Given the increasing number of drug offenders admitted into correctional institutions and with recognition of extended drug-related sentences, mandatory minimum terms and abolition of parole in most jurisdictions, the number of persons sentenced to prison for drug and substance offences has increased significantly. In the past there was a low number of treatment programmes for this type of offender, but currently most correctional institutions offer or need to have, specifically, much larger-scale programmes to assist offenders who struggle with drug or substance abuse (Henderson et al., 1997:19). The well-known programmes in the community are Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous. Other treatment programmes and groups exist. For correctional officials, a few general points are worth nothing such as:
Firstly, most drug offenders have already undergone many treatment programmes; they are aware of the support available and they frequently make use of the programme for their own intentions. The professional view of counsellors and other staff with regard to offender development and programme guidelines is that these should be administered properly by the correctional staff; nevertheless they should not relax security or supervision rules. Offenders who participate in a programme of any type must be required to comply with the organisational tasks, and correctional officials must make those roles compulsory.

Secondly, professional staff in some treatment programmes in the past have allowed the offender to insist on the rules of the group or unit. This can lead to a totally unacceptable practice such as offenders being in control of the institutional programmes.

Thirdly, no area not accessible to correctional officials must be free from staff searches. In the programme areas, all correctional officials must ensure that weapons, escape paraphernalia and drugs are not found. Staff should always be aware of the need to devote additional supervision and search activity to a group of drug offenders. It is never safe to take for granted that offenders in drug treatment programmes truly want to refrain from using drugs. Officials should always apply accepted practice, and additional attention to these procedures is usually worthwhile (Henderson et al., 1997:19).

An escalating number of drug-free outpatient treatment programmes include case management services as an adjunct to counselling (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:405).

Carlson and Garrett (2008:369) provide a guideline for correctional officials to work with special needs offenders:

- Have an open discussion with the offenders. Offenders with hearing problems or speech disabilities can often read lips.
- Concentrate on conversations with the offenders and avoid talking around them as if they are children.
• Have a discussion at eye level with the offenders. If there is an indication of a longer conversation, also sit or bend down to be eye level with offenders in wheelchairs.
• Clearly speak, in a low tone. Avoid talking loudly or in a harsh voice.
• Use understandable terms when talking to offenders.
• Simplify information; in order to avoid confusion give one piece of advice at a time.
• Establish and maintain familiar routines so that offenders do things in the same sequence, e.g. get up, tidy cell, have breakfast, go to pill line and so on.
• Talk in optimistic terms, discussing what can be done.
• Try to be more tolerant – set aside more time to finish tasks.
• Be flexible and innovative when providing programmes, services and tasks.
• Use large type so the font is easier to read.
• When state changes are made, use the public address system and read out memorandums regarding changes.

4.7.5 Classification of women offenders

Women should also be classified into specific treatment groups, with religious instruction, work education and preparation for employment after release (Silverman, 2001:195). The small number of female offenders has been used as an explanation for the lack of education and vocational programmes for them (Reid, 1981:293). According to Allen and Simonsen (1986:287), classification systems should be investigated to determine their applicability to the female offender. If necessary, systems should be modified or completely restructured to provide information necessary for an adequate programme. A large number of female offenders are survivors of incest and sexual abuse as children, and this must be taken into account. The number of female offenders who share these conditions is more than the number of women in the overall population and more than the percentage of male offenders who suffered such abuse because more female than male offenders have serious drug problems (Pollock, 2006:185). Women are accountable for children. They have a higher chance of becoming drug addicts and a higher chance of being unemployed prior to imprisonment (Silverman, 2001:212).
The improvement in women’s classification rests not only in the development of better female-oriented risk classification, but in how classification is applied or supported with regard to emphasising rehabilitation (Fowler, 1993:42).

Classifying female offenders is not the same as classifying male offenders because classification systems are powerfully influenced by the crime of which the offender was convicted. As a result of a serious offence that the offender has committed, the offender may be assigned to a high security institution. In the case of most female offenders, they do not need to be imprisoned in high security units since women who have committed serious crimes may not actually be as violent, dangerous, or as prone to escape as a man who has committed the same crime (Alarid & Reichel, 2008). The classification system also must take into account authorised management and security needs of female offenders, which are different from those of male offenders (Henderson et al., 1997:16).

4.7.6 Reclassification of offenders for treatment needs

It is very important that if classification is to be effective, then the classification must change since the offender’s needs change. The offender’s goals that were set initially may not be real and offenders may be experiencing too much stress or may not be challenged because the goals are easily accomplished. Officials should be aware of the need to reclassify when the situation changes adequately, no matter what problems the offender has had throughout his/her imprisonment (Reid, 1981:240). Therefore a reclassification review must be programmed at regular intervals to modify the classification and possibly reassign the offender to a different prison (Seiter, 2002:162). Alarid and Reichel (2008:148) also suggest that the offender be reclassified every three to six months as changes are made according to positive or negative behaviour while under correctional supervision. There are some qualities that predict offender behaviour such as gender, age, history of violence, mental illness, gang membership, involvement in prison programmes and recent disciplinary reports. Factors that are less valid in predicting behaviour are current offence severity, sentence duration and use of drugs and alcohol.
Correctional officials and offenders interact at the regular reclassification review, reviewing the progress toward intended programme goals in research of release (Seiter, 2002:162). These objectives involve education participation, substance abuse programming, or psychological counselling. Since different correctional institutions have various programmes for the offenders’ needs, mental health and medical status of the offender are also reviewed. Any change in these conditions could authorise a transfer to another prison which is better equipped to deal with the offender’s condition.

Offenders are also reclassified to lower levels of supervision through good conduct or through participating in correctional treatment programmes. The unit teams that handle most of the classification committee functions are responsible for making almost all of the initial and reclassification decisions regarding offenders, as well as parole recommendation. This unit team consists of the unit manager, case manager, unit officer education representative and unit psychologist (Bales, 1997:115). According to Reid (1981:241), it is essential to think about reclassification before parole release. Prior to the offender going before the parole board, a progress report should be arranged. If parole is not granted to the offender, there must be a clear explanation made by the parole board for this. There must be teamwork between the institutional officials and parole board, in order to make all essential records available to the board. In the case of parole violation the parole officer should provide sufficient information to the institutional staff, which should then receive the case and make a decision on what type of programme is most effective for the returning parolee.

4.7.7 Issues in programme supervision

In current correctional institutions special needs offenders require special attention, particularly each of these classes discussed above. Nevertheless the treatment programmes for these offenders should not ignore security practices such as visiting programmes for families that require supervision, being aware of the need to properly and safely handcuff a pregnant offender, training security in special techniques for working in mental health or any similar situation. The correctional institution’s security operations cannot and should not be custom-tailored to serve
the general requirements of the correctional institution and the special needs offenders, without making public safety vulnerable (Henderson et al., 1997:19).

Whether an offender is allocated to a specific or specialised unit or a personalised living cell in the broad spectrum of inhabitants, programmes, services and activities must be available. Should an offender be provided work allocation involving pay or the possibility of sentence reduction, the same things must be also available to offenders with special needs. If programmes such as boot camps and work release are offered, personalised or alternate programmes should be designed for special needs offenders. A tutor could come to the living unit, if the education section is difficult to get to. Correctional officials should also think about involving special needs offenders in the design process of programmes as these offenders know their own potential the best (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:365).

Bales (1997:127) cautions that each and every programme activity requires proper supervision, especially alcohol and drug treatment classes. Depending on the layout and procedure of each correctional institution, there may be exceptional supervision issues, but the usual guidelines are appropriate to nearly every circumstance. The following are guidelines applicable to programme supervision in most situations (Bales, 1997:127):

- No programme is off limits to staff supervision or searches.
- Officials assigned to supervise offender spectators of recreational activities should not become so engrossed in the game as to neglect their job of custodial supervision of every offender.
- If outside visitors or players are present, officials should take care to prevent unnecessary contact between offenders and visitors.
- Officials should ensure that programme activities are carried out only during the time specified.
- Staff should be careful not give too much authority to offender clerks or assistants in programme areas (offenders should not supervise other offenders).
- Except for open yard time, most programmes will have approved participant lists, which can be checked against call out sheets or other tally systems; correctional staff assigned to posts
that control traffic into programme areas need to be aware of those systems and be ready to stop unauthorised offenders.

- Officials need to be aware of unusual traffic in or out of an area, such as large numbers of a minority group at the usual time, or the mass exit of many offenders. All these may be a sign of trouble and should be reported to supervisors immediately.
- Programme areas can be used as “stashes” for contraband, escape paraphernalia, or weapons. Searches of offenders moving in and out of programme areas are important, as are regular searches of the area itself.
- Staff offices should be searched periodically, particularly when they are shared by offender clerks.
- Some programmes have mail and packages delivered to them from outside organisations. These items should go through the usual institutional search process, and offenders never should be sent to pick up packages of this type. Similarly, any outgoing correspondence for a programme should be controlled by staff and subjected to normal institution mail processing (Bales, 1997:127).

4.7.8 Offender classification for security

Since we do understand that classification for treatment needs of the offender has to do with programmes that rehabilitate offenders, these programmes should not impact on the need to infuse those programmes with sound security practice (Henderson et al., 1997:19). Cilliers et al. (2008:113) also state that the goal of the classification process is to meet individual needs (to rehabilitate the offenders), at the same time ensuring that the security risks posed by the offenders are acknowledged and attended to.

According to the Judicial Inspectorate of Prisons (2006:25), the security classification used by correctional institutions is intended to assess the security risk of all sentenced prisoners. Depending on the nature of their offence, the accounts of past convictions, escape and length of sentence, every offender is categorised at the time of first admission with scores being
automatically awarded. The length of the sentence determines which security classification is
given and has a big impact on the scoring. The offender’s security classification can range from
community, minimum, medium, closed and maximum (Henderson et al., 1997:17). The higher
the security classification, the higher the risk the offender poses (Cilliers et al., 2008:117).

If offenders with high security requirements are assigned to a low security facility, there are
strong possibilities for offenders to escape. Offenders requiring minimal security facilities could
be exposed to potential harm if high-risk offenders are also assigned there, and this could also be
a waste of expensive resources (Henderson et al., 1997).

In Silverman’s opinion (2001:161) classification and security systems are essential for good
prison management, but they are not perfect systems, since they assign like offenders jointly.
They also place offenders in facilities with only the necessary amount of security to keep the
offenders safe and the community well protected. The security classification used by the
Department of Correctional Services is designed to evaluate the security risk of all sentenced
offenders depending on the nature of the crime, the number of past offences, escape attempts and
length of sentence (Matshaba, 2006:40). The most important aspect of classification is the
determination of which offenders are most likely to be dangerous to others or which present
severe escape risks. This process is referred to by various names: security screening, custody
determination and escape potential assessment.

Classification of custodial levels consists of minimum, medium and maximum levels of security.

- **Minimum custody**

According to Henderson et al. (1997:18), this category is for offenders who pose a comparatively
low risk of escape or few management problems. Offenders may pass through the correctional
environment during the day under broad-spectrum custody, but at night, they should be under
general supervision. Offenders of this level may be eligible for escorted trips and supervision
assignments outside the facility perimeter. Observation by correctional officials must be
occasional and appropriate to the situation (Cilliers et al., 2008:115).
- **Medium custody**

This category consists of offenders who pose a risk to the safety of the community in an environment which promotes and tests the responsible, socially acceptable behaviour of offenders through moderately restrictive freedom of movement and association and privileges. It facilitates the delivery of programmes and activities designed to motivate offenders to adopt continued responsible behaviour within the limits of a closed environment (Neser, 1993:252-250). Correctional officials should observe offenders frequently and directly (Cilliers et al., 2008:115). These offenders should be placed in handcuffs and accompanied by an escort when they move outside the correctional environment. Offenders of this group are qualified for all programmes and activities inside the perimeter (Henderson et al., 1997:18).

- **Maximum custody**

This custody level is an extremely secure environment. Offender movement and activity are controlled tightly. Offenders in this category characteristically are secured in their solitary cell 23 hours each day, with one hour for recreation and a shower (Carlson & Garrett, 2008:62). Since this type of offender requires constant supervision, they pose a serious escape risk or serious threats to themselves, to other offenders or to the members of the correctional services. This custody level of offenders should be detained one to one cell and managed individually. They should be always be locked in their cells, unless they are authorised to participate in activities. They should always be placed in full physical restraints, including handcuffs and chains, and should be escorted by at least two armed escorts, supported by other armed officers, as the situation dictates (Henderson et al., 1997:18).

The following table below illustrates the classification criteria for security levels. These levels refer to the degree of supervision the offender will receive (Cilliers et al., 2008:114-115).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation by staff</td>
<td>Occasional; appropriate to situation</td>
<td>Frequent and direct</td>
<td>Always supervised when outside cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day movement inside facility</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>Observed periodically by staff</td>
<td>Restricted; directly observed or escorted when outside cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement after dark</td>
<td>Intermittent observation</td>
<td>Restricted, with direct supervision</td>
<td>Out of cell only for emergencies. In restraints when outside housing unit, or as approved by direct supervision officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After evening lockdown</td>
<td>Intermittent observation</td>
<td>Escorted and only on order of direct supervision officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal periods</td>
<td>Intermittent observation</td>
<td>Supervised</td>
<td>Directly supervised or in cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to jobs</td>
<td>Eligible for all, both inside and outside perimeter</td>
<td>Inside perimeter only</td>
<td>Only selected day jobs inside perimeter, or directly supervised within the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to programs</td>
<td>Unrestricted,</td>
<td>Work and recreation,</td>
<td>Selected programs/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visits</strong></td>
<td>Contact periodic supervision, indoor and/or outdoor</td>
<td>Contact, supervised</td>
<td>Non-contact or closely supervised (1-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leave the prison</strong></td>
<td>Unescorted/escorted</td>
<td>Direct staff escorts, handcuffs, with chains and leg irons (optional)</td>
<td>Minimum of two escorts with one armed, full restraints; strip search prior to departure and upon return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furlough</strong></td>
<td>Eligible for unescorted day pass and furlough</td>
<td>Eligible for staff escorted day pass or furlough</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Adapted from (Cilliers et al., 2008:115).

A day pass permits offenders to be away from prison only during daylight hours. A furlough authorises overnight absence from the prison.

This custody classification system is used as a guideline to determine the following:

- Assignment is made to a prison that provides the level of security consistent with the offenders’ custody requirement.
- Assignments are made to institutional programmes that are consistent with custody needs. These assignments include housing, working and other programmes such as education, visiting and any activity that involves risk to staff, other offenders or the community (Du Preez, 2003:199).
4.7.9 Reclassification of offenders for security purposes

The reclassification system should consistently put forward a custodial need, and in some cases, may end in transfer to a lower security institution as a sentence progresses. It should also be just as consistent in assisting correctional officials to categorise offenders whose behaviour dictates the need for advanced security measures, and resulting transfer to an institution where custody and supervision levels are better (Henderson et al., 1997:19). Offenders may also be reclassified to minor levels of supervision through good behaviour. Therefore, offenders who committed a violent offence and who were originally placed in maximum security may be transferred to medium or minimum security custody with fewer restrictions and more humane or constitutional rights (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:148).

The reclassification for a probable detention level change normally does not take place sooner than six months after institutional appointment. Succeeding reclassification depends on detention importance (Silverman, 2001:155).

Seiter (2002:162) also supports this by stating that offenders who displayed good behaviour during their imprisonment can be considered for reclassification. At the reclassification review, an offender’s conduct and the parole of the sentence served is mixed into the classification score system. Good behaviour of offenders may result in a lower offender security score and resultant prison work allocation. Less security normally provides offenders with the advantage of having more privileges and results in a less stressful and less dangerous environment (Seiter, 2002:162-163).

The seriousness of an offender’s misbehaviour can also determine the first move for reclassification, as this demonstrates that the offender cannot be managed at the present security level and must therefore be detained at a higher security level. The offender will receive extra points on the security instrument, if he/she commits a severe disciplinary infringement or persists in committing slight violations. This may deserve an advance to a higher security level (Silverman, 2001:163).
Security factors are taken into consideration when offenders are reclassified (Silverman, 2001:155). Each offender’s security need changes as sentences progress, time passes, detainers are dropped, conduct records are established and other factors intervene (Henderson et al., 1997:18). Offenders are scored on the following detention factors (Silverman, 2001:155).

- **Percentage of time served** – the fraction of the development imprisonment stage that the offender has already served. This is considered by actual time served and expected time of imprisonment.

- **Involvement with drug and alcohol abuse** – any past or present sign of addiction to drugs or alcohol is scored; this can also include drug trafficking.

- **Mental or psychological stability** – this can be summarised as follows:
  - An unfavourable report means that the person illustrates evidence of serious mental instability; a favourable report means there are no findings of serious mental instability and no “referral” means the case is not referred for evaluation. There must be a decision that interprets whether or not the offender is suitable for a lower custody or security importance.

- **Type and number of the most serious incident reported** – this could cover a period of 10 years, depending on the harshness of the corrective report.

- **Frequency of disciplinary report in the past years** – the score is verified by points that are given to the number of reports obtained over the last years.

- **Staff assessment of level of personal responsibility** – this is based on the offender’s general demeanour or as reflected in peer group associates, degree of programme involvement, level of dependability and nature of interaction with staff and other offenders.

- **Family or community ties** – this takes into deliberation marital status or common law relationships, family support, regularity of visits, correspondence, family stability in the community and the stability of relationships that the offender has with non-family members in the community.
4.7.10 Pre-release classification of offenders

Pre-release classifications are usually conducted within the last year of an offender’s imprisonment, and they can serve three functions (Seiter, 2002:144):

- The first function is when the correctional official starts to prepare the offender for operation in the community. The responsible correctional official may have another look at the offender’s programme need and create a continuum of suggested services that can be found in the community after the offender has been released from prison. A parole or other post-release supervision officer will monitor the offender.

- The second function of pre-release classification makes use of some principle used in the security classification process for parole or other style of flexible release decision. Definite instructions are used by parole boards to assist in their decision making, and parole officials may re-examine this material and make arrangement instructions for the formal parole board deliberation.

- The third function of this pre-release classification may be used to verify whether the offender is in need of a residential business from the correctional institution to the community.

4.7.11 Classification of offenders in the community

Community classification categorises offender risks and is associated with suitable supervision in order to maximise the allocation of resources and to centre on public safety (Seiter, 2002:163). A practitioner in the community who has been reclassified to lower security may be moved from intensive supervision probation to regular probation where contact with a probation officer is less frequent (Alarid & Reichel, 2008:148).

The lowest level of custody, community, is ordinarily reserved for those offenders who meet the qualification for participation in community activities. An inmate who has community custody may be eligible for the least secure housing including outside the institution’s perimeter, may work on outside details with minimal supervision, and may participate in community-based programme activities if other eligibility requirements are satisfied (Silverman, 2001:154-155).
According to Henderson et al. (1997:170), the community custody offender poses the lowest level of risk and straight supervision is not required even though irregular inspection may be suitable under certain circumstances. Community classification can be described as initial, reclassification and pre-release classification (Seiter, 2002:144). Offenders receiving probation or release from a correctional institution on parole are scored based on their criminal condition and individual description, only if they are under the supervision of an agency using statistical risk assessment (Seiter, 2002:144).

4.8 CONCLUSION

Classification is the only known way that will enable correctional administration to report to society regarding what kind of individual they are dealing with, and to answer the question as to why the individual committed the offence against society. Rehabilitation remains one of the most important purposes of sending offenders to correctional institutions. Therefore classifying offenders for treatment aims can serve as a rehabilitation tool. This chapter outlined the way correctional institutions function before offenders are classified for treatment and for security risk. There are measures that are taken into consideration such as well-organised reception, orientation of the offender, assessment for risk and needs of offender. Every programme activity requires proper supervision, especially in special needs cases. Therefore the guidelines that are applicable for correctional officials to comply with in most situations were also covered in this chapter.
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CHAPTER 5

INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS REGARDING CLASSIFICATION AS A REHABILITATION TOOL

5.1 INTRODUCTION

To gain a real understanding of offender classification, international studies are researched on the classification of offenders with regard to treatment programmes. The correctional system of each country has to be lined up with the international standards for classifying offenders in a humane manner based on treatment needs. Rule 67 of the United Nations Standards (1955:7) states that the aim of offender classification is to separate from others those offenders who, by reason of their criminal records or bad character, are likely to exercise a bad influence and to separate the offenders into classes in order to facilitate their treatment with a view to their social rehabilitation. Rule 68 states that so far as possible, separate prisons or separate sections of prisons must be used for the treatment of different classes of offenders. This chapter describes offender classification in countries such as Australia, Canada, the USA and England and Wales. Offender classification in England and Wales is influenced by the European Prison Rules with regard to the function of classification or reclassification of the offenders.

The different assessment processes of offenders will also be considered, since different countries use different assessment processes. Each country uses classification as a means to rehabilitate offenders. The treatment of special needs offenders such as young and women offenders are discussed with regard to different countries. The treatment programmes serve as a rehabilitation instrument and are not infused with sound security. Therefore, each country makes use of an assessment of security risk of all sentenced offenders, depending on the nature of their offence. All levels of security have different treatment programmes.
5.2 OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION IN CANADA

The correctional services of Canada and the national parole board has the responsibility for all offenders sentenced to two years or more. Through the Minister of the Solicitor General, provincial jurisdictions are responsible for offenders sentenced to less than two years and have exclusive responsibility for sentenced offenders who are convicted to probation (American Correctional Association, 1997:613). The federal correctional service of Canada is under the political control of the Solicitor General (Luyt, 1999:58). Provincial jails in turn fall under the control of the correctional branch of the Department of Health and Welfare or the Department of Social Services (Luyt, 2006:17). The duty of the correctional services of Canada generally involves management handling of the offender at various security institutions, as well as supervision over released offenders into society on full parole, day parole, temporary absent leave authorised by the national parole board, or offenders who are released under compulsory supervision to serve out the last part of their conviction in society (Luyt, 2006:17).

Ekstedt and Griffiths (1988:190) explain that classification in the criminal justice system of Canada assumes an extremely essential role in the correctional process, since the courts do not send offenders to specific correctional centres. The offender is only sentenced for a period of imprisonment which puts him/her under the jurisdiction of either the federal or the provincial correctional system. Classification of the offender is done prior to the consideration of a specific programme. Classification determines the type of treatment that offenders may undergo, as well as the institutional environment in which such programmes are carried out. According to Oniment (1969:311), classification is an essential element of the rehabilitation model, and a continuous process all the way through during which diagnosis, treatment planning and the execution of the treatment plan all work towards the goal that the individual offender may be rehabilitated.

According to Ekstedt and Griffiths (1998:190), in Canada it is the responsibility of classification boards and classification officers to classify offenders directly from the provincial remand centre.
to the appropriate federal institution. The classification unit is responsible for both the assessment of the offender in terms of needs, security level and the organisational placement decision. Offender classification serves several purposes, ranging from security placement to treatment planning, release decision making and supervision standards. Individual assessment is necessary to establish risk to safely manage the offender population and match women offender needs to treatment resources (Blanchette, 2001:31).

Mackenzie and Johnson (2003:8) state that on admission of an offender to a federal institution, a branch of the admission procedure involves an assessment of the offender’s overall level of need in order to produce a correctional plan. When an offender is admitted in the correctional institution, during the intake process offenders are classified on a four-point scale to specify the offender’s level of need in each of the following areas: associates, attitude, community functions, family/marital, employment, personal/emotional, and substance abuse. The offender’s need may be rated as high or low/no level of need in each area, in order to analyse and interpret it.

Members of a gang are uniquely classified as having a high level of need in the associates and attitude areas. The fact that they are more likely to demonstrate a high level of need in the joint areas is not based on an anticipated concern that they are gang members, but the fact that they demonstrate considerable differences in attitude areas. A high needs rating in the attitude areas suggests that offenders will have to experience dramatic personal change in terms of their attitudes. There is an obvious difference between gang members and non-gang members with regard to the family/marital area. Mackenzie and Johnson (2003:8) found in their study that a smaller number of gang members had a high level of need than non-gang members. The following graph provides a summary of the levels of need in all areas:
According to the research by the Department of Correctional Services of Canada (1998), has shown that effective correctional treatment requires a careful match between the needs of offenders and programmes that address these specific needs. Programmes aimed at teaching behaviour skills are most effective. Treatments that match offender need and the use of behavioural training techniques have been shown to reduce reoffending by 50% on average. On the other hand, the “get tough” programmes that rely primarily on incarceration have not been shown to produce reductions in reoffending (Luyt, 1999:139).

In Canada the principle of responsivity, which has to do with the suitable matching of offenders to programmes and staff, and the identification of factors that might mediate the effectiveness of treatment services has not been given the attention it requires. Offenders are not the same, and neither are staff, settings or treatment programmes. The corresponding of offenders to treatment and counsellors to the treatment groups that best fit their skills can improve the effectiveness of corrections. Failure to appropriately assess and consider responsivity factors may not only undermine treatment gain and waste treatment resources, but may also decrease public safety (Kennedy, 2000:57).
The need principle purposes that when offender needs are targeted well and interventions applied to meet those needs, then a reduction in the amount of recidivism should be expected. After identifying which offenders need treatment and appropriately matching them in terms of their risk level, attention should be directed to programmes that address their specific needs such as those that relate to the offenders’ risk of reoffending. Through assessment tools, needs are explicitly linked to the treatment and development of offenders. However, treatment often means cognitive behaviour interventions (i.e. anger management, personal financial skills and interpersonal communication skills) that claim to teach and not treat, as previous rehabilitative connotations suggest (Bruyns, 2007:80).

The need principle posits that correctional treatment should aim to actively acknowledge the offenders that are associated with criminogenic needs (Blanchette, 2001:31). This principle differentiates between criminogenic and non-criminogenic needs. Criminogenic needs are offender behaviour such as a subset of an offender’s risk level; they are a vibrant acknowledgment that offenders, when transformed, are related to transformation. In the likelihood of offenders resorting to crime again (Blanchette, 2001:33), it had been decided that criminogenic needs should provide the basics for offender programming and that service delivery should focus primarily on successful reintegration into the community.

According to Kennedy (2000:54), client management classification (CMC) in the correctional services of Canada is an extensively used responsibility tool in corrections. This tool was developed as part of the Wisconsin risk and needs assessment system and was formed as part of the National Institute of Corrections model probation and parole.

Kennedy (2000:55) mentions that client management classification is a symbol of an attempt to match offenders and staff based on responsibility characteristics by identifying offender decision options and recommending supervision strategies. For example, one kind of offender category of the client management classification is long involvement in criminal activities. This type of person is usually reasonably able to function satisfactorily in society; however, he/she may usually reoffend.
5.2.1 Assessment of offenders in Canada

According to the analytical rate of offender risk, assessment has led to three major findings linked to offender assessment:

- Criminal history dynamics are powerfully connected to results upon conditional release.
- A reliable relationship exists between the number and category of needs that offenders present and the possibility of their committing crime again.
- Collection assessment of both the risk level and needs can significantly improve the ability to make a distinction between cases according to the possibility of committing crime again (Luyt, 1999:64).

Luyt (1999:61) is of the opinion that the dimension of the risk of recidivism is a recent dimension that forms part of the Canadian assessment sequence, distinct from the assessment of need and risk. This form of assessment is important in many ways, as it presents a way to find out whether treatment programmes were successful in reducing the risk of recidivism and secondly results in attention being paid to the potential of committing crime again.

Standard risk concerns concentrate on risk assessment; nevertheless the treatment levels should be linked to the risk level of offenders. Therefore programme priorities should be established and implementation strategies should be applied in order to meet the needs of each offender and address their risk. Assessment should be based on incorporated information assembled from various sources such as the police, court, family, probation reports and employers. In order to obtain more information on the case as possible, information gathering techniques such as self-reports, interviews and case files should be used to facilitate the assessment process (Correctional Services of Canada, 1994:2–23).
5.2.2 The process of assessment in Canada

According to the correctional services of Canada (1993:31), the assessment process consists of several sections. These sections include the following:

5.2.2.1 Collecting information

As soon as the offender has been sentenced at the correctional institution with a warrant for the case manager to collect the information of the offender, the correctional official should interview the offender. The offender will be informed by the correctional official what is expected of him/her.

The correctional official will also address the offender about the placement decision that was made relating to him/her. That will include the reason for an offender being placed in a specific unit, for example the offender may be placed in the housing unit in which the offender attends vocational skills training such as leather work. Offenders who are classified in the same programmes are detained at the same custody level in dissimilar accommodation units in order for the case manager to assemble a planned day programme.

The case manager should put together notes with regard to suicide, security risk, medical condition or any personal concern of the offender. There will be a case file in which all offenders’ concerns will be acknowledged and this will also form part of the formal assessment that is going to take place. All this takes place during the interview.

During this interview the case manager also collects first round information for parole preferences for the case management committee. The case manager compiles a brief social and criminal history, including first round institution and/or community plans and taking note of the offender’s version of the offence.
The offender should arrive with all the applicable information at the correctional centre. All this information will be needed in case management meetings.

5.2.2.2 Addressing the offender’s immediate needs

After the first interview all newly admitted offenders should engage in an orientation process at the correctional centre. The process of orientation takes account of an interview between a case management team and the offender. The immediate concerns of the offender will be verified during this process of orientation. This will result in attention to the identification of suicidal offenders, violent offenders and offenders who are regarded as those whose personal safety may be at risk. This also consists of a medical check-up and clothing distribution.

In order to prevent any immediate possibility of a suicide attempt by the offender, a suicide screening is conducted through an interview with the offender. The psychologist will make an assessment of the offender concerning the likelihood of committing suicide. The suicide assessment and screening will contribute to the decision making process concerning the offender placement.

5.2.2.3 Analysing the criminal record and assessing risk

At this stage the offender is interviewed specifically about the recent offence that was committed. Wherever achievable, any important information provided by the offender will be established. It is an advantage for the correctional official during the assessment process to know the offence and the risk the offender poses. The correctional official must be unambiguous about the conditions which cause offenders to be in prison such as past criminal involvement and the cycle of offending.
5.2.2.4 Identifying criminal needs

The correctional official will look closely at basic areas of need, since the results from interviews with the offender as well as the information in the folder allows him/her to do so. There are seven areas that have a direct impact on criminal action, namely employment, associates, community functioning, attitudes, marital/family status, substance abuse and personal/emotional situation. The correctional official completely investigates each area with the offender and in some cases referrals are made for additional specialist contributions.

5.2.2.5 Assigning offender security

All the information that has been gained throughout the interview on admission will be included in shortened form in a statement. This statement will form part of the assignment of a first security classification such as normal minimum, medium, maximum or super maximum for each offender.

The correctional institution has valuable information with regard to the offender at this point. The recommendation for assignment in a prison appropriate to the offender’s security and programme needs is made. This can be achieved after issues that have contributed to the criminal behaviour have been identified. All the records that have been created throughout this first assessment process will form part of the offender’s case file. This first assessment process is important to the successful construction of a sentence plan for the offender (Correctional Services of Canada, 1993:31).

5.2.3 The use of elders as assessors

Elders have an important responsibility in counselling community members and acting as proud parents to the community within traditional Aboriginal societies. Elders are involved in the federal organisation and this has increased radically over the past decade. They direct ceremonies and offer more counselling to Aboriginal offenders. Several people have a strong perception
about elders since they are not used in an important aspect of the assessment of Aboriginal offenders as to their readiness to transfer, temporary absences or parole (Solicitor General Canada, 1988:37).

It has been disputed that assessment tools such as the MMPI, developed by professional non-Aboriginal society, are unsuitable for those from the different classes of society or a person from a certain social, cultural, economic and professional background to assess individuals who do not share the same culture and views.

It is believed that elders could offer a more perfect assessment of an offender’s competence and productivity for comprehensive parole for a number of reasons (Solicitor General Canada, 1988:37):

- An elder is sympathetic of Aboriginal communities and their degree of recognition of a released offender.
- An elder is sympathetic of Aboriginal spiritual and cultural programmes and can determine whether the offender has gained from those programmes.
- Aboriginal offenders can address their problems and ambitions with elders who usually listen to the offender in the correct approach.

The elders are recommended in the lead application of an offender and it is acceptable for them to be allowed to give an assessment to the national parole board on behalf of the offender. Such assessments are offered the same value as other professional offender assessments.

“...The assessment prepared by an elder should be attached to all other professional appraisals provided to the national parole board. Comments from the case management team indicating the degree of support for the elder’s assessment could be attached to the elder’s appraisal” (Solicitor General Canada, 1988:37).

5.2.4 Special needs offenders in Canada

Correctional services of Canada programmes are intended to meet the specific needs of a variety of groups such as Aboriginals and women offenders. These groups have special needs that require cautious, intentioned programmes. Some programmes assist the families of offenders and the victims of crime. The spiritual needs of offenders are tackled by the chaplaincy programmes.
The Carson report that was initiated by the Solicitor General of Canada addressed special needs offenders as requiring increased support (Winter Dyk, 2004:69).

5.2.4.1 Assessment of Aboriginal offenders in Canada

According to the Solicitor General of Canada (1988:38), the assessment of Aboriginal offenders is frequently done all the way through their sentence using a range of assessment procedures, tools and criteria. These assessments are accomplished through sustained decision making, programme assessment and case management. They may include assessment of a variety of distinctive elements such as risk, psychological state and personal need. Even though the Aboriginal offenders’ assessments are to be encouraged because they have improved objective decision making in the past, they have not, for the most part, been authorised in terms of their applicability to Aboriginal offenders. It has been argued that they may not be appropriate or effective for the Aboriginal offenders.

The Solicitor General of Canada (1988:38) recommends that the contemporary assessment tools, criteria and procedures being used should be estimated as to their legitimacy for Aboriginal offenders. The particular techniques such as psychological testing are part of it, and suitable professionals or professional institutions should seek advice from the secretariat of the Solicitor General, in discussion with the correctional services of Canada, the national parole board and the Department of Health and Welfare. They could plead for the assistance of professional societies (such as the Canadian Psychological Association) in classifying assessment and treatment techniques for use with Aboriginal offenders. Moreover, professional correctional officials who are identified to conduct offender assessment in the performance of their work should be made available with thorough Aboriginal awareness training to guarantee a degree of sensitivity to the cultural differences of Aboriginal offenders (Solicitor General Canada, 1988:38).

Van Zyl Smit and Dunkel (2001:146) assert that the correctional services of Canada has made progress in responding to the needs of Aboriginal offenders with regard to the history of Aboriginal people in Canada, their treatment by successive governments and the high levels of
poverty and unemployment in most Aboriginal communities. A recommendation has been made by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People about the development of Aboriginal justice systems as a feature of the inherent right to self-government.

Aboriginal offenders continue to be excessively represented at all levels of the Canadian criminal justice system. At the end of March 2007, Aboriginal people constituted 17.0% of federal sentenced offenders, although the general Aboriginal population was only 2.7% of the Canadian adult population (Correctional Services of Canada, 2009).

5.2.4.2 Classification of women for treatment needs in Canada

During admission of offenders every sentenced woman has to undergo the offenders intake assessment upon her arrival in a correctional centre. Psychological assessment is conducted in order to establish the needs of individuals. These assessments are formally developed to transfer the focus of psychological testing toward a holistic model of women’s strengths and needs. This has resulted in the foundation of the skills and needs inventory, which consists of various questions related to both positive and negative strategies (Goff, 1999:178).

A 1990 task force report on federal sentenced women resulted in the right to produce choices and bring about a new correctional philosophy for women offenders that covers a holistic approach to dealing with special needs. This was established on the ideology of empowerment, meaningful and responsible choices, respect, supportive environments and shared responsibility (Correctional Services of Canada, 2009).

Van Zyl Smit and Dunkel (2001:179) point out that little attention was previously paid to this group of prisoners. Section 77 of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA) now requires the correctional services of Canada to provide programmes designed particularly to address the needs of female offenders and to consult regularly with women’s groups and those with expertise on and experience in working with female offenders. However, the need for specific programmes and services was recognised in the late 1980s, when various reports emphasised the insufficiencies in both the quality and quantity of women’s programmes provided at the federal prison for women (Goff, 1999:173).
Five major parts of programming within Canadian prisons have been recognised. These programmes are as follows:

- **Maintenance programme** – this programme involves women offenders in clerical, food service and cleaning roles.
- **Educational programme** – this is essential since most offenders lack basic education and/or literacy skills.
- **Vocational programmes** - these aim to equip women offenders with occupational requirements in order for them to become employable after they are released.
- **Rehabilitation programme** - these have to do with drug therapy and psychological treatment programmes and also programmes involving medical care (Goff, 1999:173).

The current Canadian women offender programmes include the following:

- **Women Offender Substance Abuse Programming (WOSAP)**

  This programme commenced in June 2003. Every woman offender who has been assessed as having a moderate to high need for abuse intervention will have to undergo WOSAP within the correctional institution. The treatment objectives of WOSAP are to engage the women in other areas of their lives that are related to substance abuse and criminal behaviour. The programme goals are to focus on personal and emotional issues such as self-awareness and self-esteem, symptoms linked to past experiences of abuse, issues related to sexuality, emotion regulation issues, and relationship issues connected to intimates, spouse, children, friends and acquaintances. The programme element entails initial engagement, education and engagement, intensive therapeutic intervention, institutional and community relapse prevention/maintenance.

- **Education**

  Every woman who is sentenced in the correctional institution is given the opportunity to complete provincially accredited or certified programmes which meet their identified education need to assist them to return back to the community as law-abiding citizens. The women
offenders also have the chance to complete their tertiary studies at their own cost (Correctional Services of Canada, 2009).

● **Employability programmes**

Employment and vocational programmes within the correctional institution prepare the offender to be reintegrated into the community as an employable person, since it provides current marketable work skills.

In order for women offenders to develop their portfolio for certification in job safety, food handling, road signings etc., the correctional services of Canada offers various vocational opportunities to assist them. The National Employability Skills Program (NESP) for women was established to uplift offenders’ employability skills, fundamental skills, personal management skills and teamwork skills, making use of the model developed by the Conference Board of Canada.

The aim of NESP is to train offenders in skills that will enable them to be employable after being released from prison, to assist them to gain self-confidence, develop their employability skills portfolio, and assist them in achieving actual goals for development and to value employment as a means of achieving their own individual goals during their imprisonment. After completing these courses, offenders will be able to reintegrate in society and avoid reoffending (Correctional Services of Canada, 2009).

● **Programmes for survivors of trauma and abuse**

The assessments of women offenders in Canadian prisons signify that most women offenders are survivors of abuse and trauma in their original families with their personal spouse. Their treatment readiness for correctional programming targeting criminal behaviour is enhanced by the time women offenders are admitted to counselling in order to assist with issues of trauma. Therefore these organisations offer women offenders the opportunities to survive abuse and
trauma. Not every woman is allowed this type of involvement to move forward or may wish to resist past experiences of trauma. Therefore it is important to determine each woman’s need in this area (Correctional Services of Canada, 2009).

- **Mother-child programme**

The high prevalence of violence in the lives of incarcerated women has only very recently been acknowledged. Each of the women’s institutions offers services for survivors of abuse and trauma. The objective of these programmes is to assist, maintain and encourage the mother-child relationship through parenting programmes (Watson, 1995:26).

By encouraging women to establish positive attachments to their children, parenting programmes produce many benefits (Correctional Services of Canada, 2009). The decision has been made by the Department of Correctional Services of Canada that the central foundation for any decision making regarding the mother-child programme will be the best interest of the child (Watson, 1995:25).

The suitable principles for the mother include the following concerns:

- A constructive element in the relationship between the mother and the child;
- The mother’s physical and mental health;
- The approval of court/child welfare authorities and the compliance of the mother for the progress of visits between the child and other significant family members (Watson, 1995:26).

“Not all mothers will be eligible to participate in the program when they enter a federal correctional facility. If an offender has been convicted of child abuse and/or neglect she will not be allowed to participate until the custody rights are reinstated by the courts and she has received treatment and or has participated in a series of regular visits with her child or children” (Watson, 1995:24). These programmes were operational in Europe and the USA for many years before the correctional services of Canada chose to implement a mother-child programme (Goff, 1999:175).
5.2.4.3 Classification of women for risk principle in Canada

When an offender is admitted to a federal institution, part of the intake process includes an assessment of the offender’s overall levels of risk to produce a correctional plan (Mackenzi & Johnson, 2003:8). Women offenders are classified depending on the principles of risk and need or losses in terms of their offence, but there is consensus that assessment is the key to successful correctional involvement. The level of treatment and the level of risk of the offender should both correspond to one another and intensive services should be offered to higher risk offenders while lower risk offenders fare as well or better with minimal or no involvement (Blanchette, 2001:3). The Canadian offender intake assessment (OIA) indicates that this process results in the timely and systematic testing of important information that is predictive of risk and need. The information gathered throughout the offender intake assessment process forms the basis for preparing the monitoring process.

5.2.5 Classification for security in Canada

There are three broad levels of security in the classification of federal offenders. This system of offender classification is based on the degree of likelihood that the offender will escape and on the potential harm to the community should he/she do so. The following are three levels of security that are traditionally employed by Canadian correctional services (Ekstedt & Griffiths, 1988:191): maximum security, medium security and minimum security.

- Maximum security: The offender is likely to escape and if he/she has managed to do so, this would be likely to cause serious harm in the community.

- Medium security: Offenders should not cause serious harm in the community if they escape when offered that chance.

- Minimum security: The offender would not cause harm in the community if given the opportunity and is not likely to escape.
There are three main elements that determine security classification, namely institution adjustment, escape risk and public safety. Each measurement consists of various aspects, each requiring a score. The following are specific aspects of the elements:

Part 1  Institutional adjustment
- Violent incidents
- Disciplinary convictions
- Continuation of criminal activities
- Administrative interventions
- Behaviour and programme participation

Part 2  Escape risk
- Escape/attempted escape
- Sentence status
- Other concerns (unusual circumstances that potentially increase escape risk such as custody battle, gambling, drug debts etc.)

Part 3: Public safety
- Violent incidents
- Programme participation
- Mental illness or disorder
- Other public safety concerns (information suggesting that the offender will likely commit serious offences upon release)

Security classification decides the allocation of offenders, adequately unescorted temporary absences (UTAs) and work releases as well as the regularity and period of such non-attendance of offender. The consistent classification tool that the correctional institutions use to support professional and clinical assessments is planned to reduce subjective bias and assist in defining correctional strategies. The principle for offender security classification is that considerable discrepancies exist (Correctional Services of Canada, 2009).
5.3 OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW SOUTH WALES

In Australia prison regimes are the normal regime, the special regime for first offenders, a regime that permits pre-release ground works for offenders on day parole and a special regime for offenders with a disability. There are also preventive measures, juvenile imprisonment and a mother-child section with a nursery school (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:24). Male offenders are confined in an open prison for agricultural reasons.

New South Wales manages the largest correctional system in Australia. The Department of Corrective Services provides programmes, custodial and community-based supervision and services directed at reducing reoffending. Currently the department is responsible for 26 correctional centres, seven maximum security facilities, 11 periodical detention centres and two transitional centres for female offenders (New South Wales Department of Corrective Services, 2006:40).

Australia has almost 80 prisons. In New South Wales there are about 21 prisons and on the island state of Tasmania there are about 3 prisons. The Australian correctional services is decentralised at state level and the amount of autonomy each state has differs. Therefore it is not simple to explain the Australian system (Luyt, 1999:54).

During the admission of new offenders into a correctional institution each and every offender is assessed as to their security rating, which is incorporated into their initial case plan, classification and placement. The classification tool incorporates numerically weighed custody classification criteria and scored objective ratings to achieve the appropriate custody levels (New South Wales Department of Corrective Services, 2006:29).

There are programmes that address offender needs. Correctional programmes are aimed at the needs and problems of offenders in the light of the specific circumstances of their offences. These programmes should also satisfy the expectations communities have in regard to reparation, deference and protection from criminal behaviour as indicated in the assessment of the court and
releasing authorities. All suitable education, welfare and recreational opportunities and means of support should be made available and used in accordance with the individual needs of offenders (Australian Institution of Criminology, 2004:1). Programmes must prepare offenders for release into society. Therefore all programmes should aim at reinforcing services, facilities and activities, are based on the concept of individualised management and should be designed to meet individual needs of offenders. Individualised management aims to provide offenders with opportunities to earn parole and develop skills, which will facilitate effective re-integration into the community.

There are ranges of programmes and services that are offered by the Department of Corrective Services for offenders who are incarcerated in maximum security prisons in order to improve offender motivation to take part in offence related, transitional and resettlement programmes. These programmes are based on evidence of effective intervention and are mainly targeted at high risk offenders. There are additional programmes for identified offenders, which address specific problems in motivation and living skills, as well as personal and social programmes. These programmes are supplied by external organisations such as Alcoholics Anonymous and organisations discovered through the Department of Community Funding programme (New South Wales Department of Corrective Services, 2006:2).

Offenders who are classified in maximum security prisons are provided with programmes from the Adult Education and Vocational Training Institute (AEVTI), which is a registered organisation within the New South Wales Department of Corrective Services. AEVTI presents courses that are accredited and qualifications gained by offenders who successfully complete modules or certificates that are nationally recognised. The objective of AEVTI is to improve the literacy, language and numeric skills of offenders in custody to a level equivalent to school year 10. Case management committees refer the offender to take part in AEVTI programmes for inclusion in the offender’s initial case plan or review (Matshaba, 2008:79).
The following are the core curriculum included in AEVTI:

- Certificate I, II & III in General Education for Adults
- Certificate II in Communication
- Certificate I, II & III in spoken and written English
- Certificate I, II & III in Information Technology
- Certificate I & II in Koori Education
- Training and employment
- Certificate I in Vocational Education and Training
- Course in workforce re-entry skills
- Certificate in Horticulture (Parks and gardens)
- Certificate II in Music Industry (foundation)
- Certificate IV in Business (Small Business Management)

5.3.1 Classification of special needs cases in Australia and New South Wales

More focus is on the needs of specific groups of offenders. Specific groups refer to the mentally ill, young adult offenders and women including Aboriginals (Australian Institution of Criminology, 2004:6).

5.3.1.1 Classification of women offenders in Australia

The Australian Department of Corrective Services offers employment opportunities for female offenders in the needlework section, prison and officials kitchen, laundry, commercial section, garden and agriculture. There are prolonged and concentrated training courses for cooks and restaurateurs. The training department for agriculture in cooperation with the public institutions of tertiary education in agriculture also offer training sessions on agriculture and forestry. There is also the potential for chosen offenders to complete a collection of educational courses provided by the labour services. This can be offered only for parolees on day parole (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:24). The Victorian community residential and outreach programme provides opportunities for young women to identify and manage significant life issues limiting
their ability to remain drug free. Of the 55 women involved, so far, only six have returned to custody during 1999 & 2000, which highlights this programme’s success in promoting drug-free community living. Similarly the women’s programme addresses the various factors associated with substance abuse and criminality, and provides positive alternatives to dysfunctional lifestyles through outreach, referral and support services. Future programmes for addicted women need to address psychological and pragmatic issues potentially leading to relapse and recidivism (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:24).

Within correctional centres, a comprehensive hierarchically intensive and culturally sensitive treatment programme incorporating various modules would be useful. This module structure allows for individual treatment where certain modules can be provided to particular offenders based on individualised need.

5.3.1.2 Classification of juvenile offenders in Australia

The Australian Corrective Service concentrates on educating and training juvenile offenders between the ages of 14 and 19 years. Juvenile offenders are incarcerated in separate juvenile divisions, where correctional officials with particular skills for youth work are meant to be in service. The Australian Corrective Service has specialised prisons for male juveniles who are serving long sentences. The juveniles with long sentences in these prisons, in accordance with the framework of the current laws, are exposed to education, psychology and social work, to the extent that it is appropriate for young people. The vocational training and schooling takes the form of learner and advanced courses. Training is provided in 12 different career paths at the moment. The aim of the Corrective Service of Australia is to develop the ability of offenders to deal with the conditions of working life of a group that contains foreign cultures (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:25).

According to Van Zyl Smit and Dunkel (1991:11), the general regulation for the implementation of pre-trial detention applies to young offenders as well as section 56 of the Australian Juvenile Justice Act. The following are some of particular instruments:
● Juvenile offenders should be incarcerated separately from adult offenders since this is stipulated in section 36(1) of the Juvenile Justice Act.

● Section 36(3) of the Juvenile Justice Act stipulates that young offenders should be separated from adults as long as an exception is not needed regarding the spiritual, physical or mental condition of the juvenile concerned.

● Young offenders should be removed from offenders who may be harmful and injurious to them.

● Section 36(3) of the Juvenile Justice Act also stipulates that young offenders must not be detained in a single cell if it would be to their disadvantage and if there is no danger in detaining them with others.

● Young offenders must be kept busy and if possible, some education should be provided during the period of pre-trial incarceration since this is stipulated in section 36(4) of the Juvenile Justice Act of Australia.

Johns (2003:38) mentions that in April 1999 the mentoring for young offenders pilot programme was established in two places: a metropolitan site in Parramatta, and a regional site in the Coffs Harbour. This pilot programme was developed and managed as a partnership between five New South Wales government agencies, namely the crime prevention division of Juvenile Justice, NSW police, the Department of Community Services and the Office of Children and Young People in the cabinet office.

The New South Wales YWCA of Sydney won the tender for the pilot programme, making use of its big sister, big brother models of one to-one mentoring. The following three factors were relevant in the New South Wales programme (Johns, 2003:38-39).

● Referring young people - referral agents were police youth liaison officers that had cautioned young people or referred them to a youth justice conference. These youth had to reside within the catchment area, want to participate and their parent, guardian or carer had to agree to the initial referral.
- Recruiting volunteer mentors - adult volunteers were carefully screened and underwent a training programme to provide friendship, guidance and leadership to young offenders. Ideally, the mentors were to make themselves available for 12 months.
- Matching young people and mentors - meetings between young offenders and their mentors were usually held for 2-5 hours at the weekend. Ongoing support was provided for both parties and progress was monitored by trained programme staff.
- The arrangement was made for regular group outings of the young offender and their mates. A family support worker was available to assist the families of the young people enrolled in the programme.

5.3.2 Offender security classification in New South Wales

The correctional security classification of New South Wales consists of three classes: maximum security, medium security and minimum security (New South Wales Department of Corrective Services, 2006:29).

According to the New South Wales Department of Corrective Services (2006:6), the classification of offenders is the process whereby offenders are offered a security level determining the custodial environment in which offenders should be placed and managed. Classification of offenders is the most important process for ensuring the security of the correctional system. According to New South Wales procedure manual clause 10, the commissioner must classify each offender with the aim of security development programmes in one of the following classes (New South Wales Department of Corrective Services, 2006):

- **Class A**: offenders whom the commissioner regards as characterising a special risk to good order and security. At all times offenders of this type should be detained in special services within secure physical barriers that include towers or electronic surveillance equipment.
- **Class A2**: offenders who, in the commissioner’s view, should always be detained by a secure physical barrier that includes towers, other highly secure perimeter structures and electronic surveillance equipment.
- Class B: offenders who, in the view of the commissioner, should at all times be confined by secure physical barriers.
- Class C1: offenders who, in the view of the commissioner, should be detained by a physical barrier in the company of an officer.
- Class C2: those who, in the opinion of the commissioner, need not be confined by a physical barrier at all times and who need not be supervised.
- Class E-1: offenders who, in the view of the commissioner, represent a special risk to security and should at all times be confined in prison specified by the minister as being a high security prison for this class.
- Class E2: those who should at all times be confined by a secure barrier in prison specified by the minister for this class, in the view of the commissioner (Matshaba, 2006:78).

There are no offenders who are classified in D class in New South Wales.

5.4 OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION IN USA

According to Clear and Cole (1994:240), the USA has three correctional systems: federal prisons, state prisons and country jails.

5.4.1 Types of correctional systems in the USA

5.4.1.1 Federal prisons

According to Matshaba (2006:59), the Federal Bureau of Prisons was established in 1930 with the responsibility of taking care of all people charged with and convicted of offences under US law or federal law. The Federal Bureau in the Department of Justice provides correctional services and offender development at federal level. The Federal Bureau established a training school of correctional officials with upgrading education, disciplinary and industrial programmes and an inclusive classification programme. Mays and Winfree (2005:133) explain that maximum security prisons have highly secure perimeters, usually consisting of walls or strong
reinforced fences. Currently there are 13 maximum security federal prisons. Penitentiaries or maximum security prisons in America were introduced during the 1970s after the failure of administrative units to restore order in prisons (Austin & Irwin, 2001:99).

5.4.1.2 State prisons

As a result of the nature of the political system of the USA, prisons are separately operated at state level. According to the laws of state, each state has its system. There are many similarities in the way these prisons are managed, even though the state systems differ. The correctional institution contained in the prison is divided into four different levels of security prison. These correctional systems form the central part of most state correctional programmes with the combination of punishment and reform. Correctional officials are expected to transform the conduct of the offender to prevent them from committing offences again, even though most state prisons are running short of finances and personnel (Matshaba, 2006:59).

5.4.1.3 County jails and local facilities

When the Americans occupied California, for the first five years there were no fixed laws or prisons. When California became a state there were six jails in San Francisco, San Jose, Los Angeles, Monterrey, San Diego and Santa Barbara. In 1850 at the first legislative session an extensive penal code was adopted and jails were declared to be state run until such time as state prisons could be built (McShane, 2008:25).

During 1850 jails were flimsy and simple to escape from and offenders with serious offences were detained along with petty criminals (McShane, 2008:25).

Silverman and Vega (1996:476) state that jails are an incarceration service mostly administered by a local law enforcement agency intended for adults but sometimes also containing juveniles and other offenders awaiting adjudication. Jails are locally operated correctional services that incarcerate offenders before or after adjudication (Stinchcomb, 2005:126). Additional categories
of jail offenders involve probationers awaiting hearing, offenders sentenced to state prisons for whom there is no space but who cannot be released, federal offenders awaiting pick up by marshals and mentally ill offenders for whom there are no other services.

5.4.2 Models of classification in the USA

Classification models and strategies were addressed by correctional administrators and the legislative body from classification and research offices throughout the 50 states of the USA and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. A comprehensive account was obtained of contemporary practices in use for classifying women offenders (Van Voorhis, 2001:1). According to McShane (2008:103), classification in the USA consists of three basic models: the consensus model, equity-based system and predictive model.

5.4.2.1 Consensus model

This model may be implemented where departments do not have resources to collect data on which criteria are most essential in making classification decisions or departments have only one-of-its-kind populations that require non-traditional assessments. To believe in the process under this model correctional officials generally have the same opinion on the most important factors. The Federal Bureau of Prisons used this model, examining correctional officials to come up with six items to use on their classification instrument, such as severity of current offence, expected length of imprisonment, prior prison commitments, history of escapes, history of violence and the types of outstanding warrants or charges pending of an offender. Correctional systems need to be expanded to handle the large number of minimum security inmates now occupying expensive medium and maximum security based space (Austin, 1983).
5.4.2.2 Equity-based system model

Its focal point is on general, legally justifiable characteristics of past and present criminal behaviour; subjective or possible inappropriate variables are reduced from the process and are less likely to be raised in complaints of unfair treatment. In this case some correctional institutions use the equity-based model for determining housing and work status and a more predictive approach for assignment to treatment programmes.

5.4.2.3 Predictive model

This model makes use of a number of lawful, social, psychological and medical factors to develop a perfect vision of the offender and to forecast behaviour. Tools are managed to forecast risk, such as risk for suicide, or violent behaviour. Others look for potential adjustment issues. Identification of treatment needs is done by the level of supervision inventory (LSI) and risk is also assessed. Tests may be utilised to verify an offender’s education level, vocational interest or tendency toward addiction. The psychiatric assessments such as the MMPI in some structures are utilised to develop classification categories of offenders.

Results show that adoption of any of three models would produce similar results: massive expansion of the minimum security tools, increased equity and explicitness in classification on decision making. Whether or not correctional officials utilise these models will depend upon the correctional administration’s willingness to accept these models as designed. Assuming these findings apply to states, the nation’s current inventory of minimum security beds and the capacity of the community correction system need to be expanded to handle the large number of minimum security offenders now occupying expensive medium and maximum security based space (Austin, 1983).
5.4.3 The process of assessment in the USA

McShane (2008:107) lists the steps of assessment that are used in most states of the USA:

- Health: during admission offenders will be examined and their physical health problems screened for infectious diseases, dental workup, disabilities detection and fitness for work determination.
- Psychological: offenders will undergo mental health screening, risk of suicide will be determined and tests for personality disturbances and violence potential will be done.
- Intelligence: Walsh (2001:144) indicates that in the admission and diagnostic centre there are ranges of tests such as IQ tests, reading comprehension tests, a complete medical exam and tests such as the Nelson reading skills test which assess the offender’s reading and vocabulary level.
- General aptitude test battery: the tests are designed to measure aptitude and have been found to be significant in many occupations, e.g. MMPI (McShane, 2008:10).
- Academic/vocational: these test for levels of functioning, proficiencies, skills, interests and aptitudes.
- Work/training history: these test for levels of functioning, skills, adeptness, concentration, interests and talent.
- Personal/social skills: hygiene, racial compatibility, self-discipline, gang affiliation, ability to work and live with other personalities.
- Family and friends: potential visitors and family in correctional institution for formative obligations.
- Victimisation potential: known enemies.

During the process of assessment, the Department of Correctional Institutions makes use of three different types of forecast methods, i.e. clinical assessment, use of statistical or actuarial information and anamnestic forecast (McShane, 2008:10).

- Clinical assessment: This depends on a professional’s diagnosis and evaluation, such as a psychological analysis or the interpretation of personality tests. When offenders are suicidal
or in crisis, these methods are mostly utilised. There is a perception that most psychological tools that are used currently are not formed for or validated within the prison population.

- The use of statistical or actual information such as profiles or evaluations to offenders with the same conduct or experiences.
- Anamnestic prediction: This type of forecast usually relies simply on the past conduct of an offender. Thus records that show a history of violence or escape by an offender will most likely activate uncertain treatment within the correctional system.

### 5.4.4 Classification for treatment needs in the USA

According to Matshaba (2006:66), rehabilitation programmes have an essential role in offender development. Obviously the more programmes available to the offenders, the less vulnerable the facility will become, and the more likely the possibility that offenders’ negative reactions to isolation will be improved. For offenders to be rehabilitated there are programmes that are aimed at improving offender behaviour such as education, work, exercise, and that will also improve the offenders’ knowledge and skills.

Offender classification must be seen as a rough way of grouping people. It is important to be precise about the criteria used for grouping such as programme criteria. Offenders are classified according to the nature of correctional treatment appropriate to the person’s needs and situation (Clear & Cole, 1997:137). According to the American Correctional Association (1981:94), written policy and procedure provide for inmate classification in terms of level of custody required, housing assignment and participation in correctional programmes. They are reviewed at least annually and updated if necessary. Each newly admitted inmate should be evaluated in terms of personal, criminal, medical and social history. Inmates should be placed in programmes suited to their interest and their classification plan should be reviewed on an ongoing basis. Programmes should assist inmates both during their evaluation and upon their release to the community. The inmate classification plan specifies criteria and procedures for determining and changing the status of an inmate, including custody, transfers and major changes in programmes.
Classification is the assigning of individuals to classes in a manner that individuals in each class are the same. The definition is mental with regard either to the basis of classification or to the degree to which similarity is produced.

The needs assessment system as the common internal classification system consists of separate tests for key need areas or an objective system for classifying offenders according to major problems such as education, mental health, employment, substance abuse. The equally static custody classification system has had some success in forecasting offending behaviours (such as criminogenic needs) in correctional institutions and in community settings, nevertheless they cannot assist case managers and other institutional officials to make treatment related decisions. Organisations that participate in meaningful programming for correctional clients require additional needs-based classification tools (Van Voorhis, 2001:6).

According to Bonta (2002:368) and Taxman and Thanner (2006:49), looking at criminogenic needs in addition to state factors allows practitioners to better assess the level of risk posed by an offender and serves as a target for correctional treatment.

Classification systems at the same time assess risks and needs by tapping the dynamic individual description that influences a person to criminal behaviour. The correctional institutions distinguish the needs assessment function from the risk assessment function. Some argue that it is more important to keep the custody classification and the need classification process separate in correction, i.e. classification models than community correctional models. In the past 15 years there has been substantial speculative advance in the characteristics of useful rehabilitation programmes. Therefore risk and the need principle are the important principles of successful rehabilitation. Assessment tools and more general classification practices that bring together risk and needs are euphemistically referred to as third generation risk assessments. The combined assessment of both risk and needs will improve expert ability to predict who is to be expected to commit crime again and who not (Bruyns, 2007:78). According to Toch (1977:290-292), there are two different levels of classification which match both persons and settings: firstly, placing
normal offenders in common prison settings (known as routine matches) and secondly, fitting offenders with highly unusual profiles (known as special matches).

- **Special matches**

An offender who has an overriding concern for safety may simply not be able to cope in the same environment that most offenders find sufficiently safe. Such an offender can be consumed by fear, and fear can produce extremely damaging results such as unpredicted aggression or attempted suicide (Toch, 1977:292).

- **Routine matches**

Routine matching makes prison life easier. In routine matching there is a large supply of offenders with the same preference profiles and a large supply of prisons that meet those concerns. While there may be some problems with fit it is assumed that offenders with normal preference profiles are fairly adaptable (Toch, 19797:292).

In the past years recognition of the importance of need assessment has increased. Publications and conference programmes of professional organisations such as the American Correctional Association, the International Community Correctional Association, and the American Probation and Parole Association as well as National Institute of Corrections activities suggest an identifiable development towards increased treatment programmes running in correctional organisations (Van Voorhis, 2001:7).

Classification of offenders is useful to manage large numbers of cases in social programmes more successfully than they could be handled by individuals on a daily basis. Classification uses the patterns of problems and treatment. It allows better standardised grouping of offenders with the aim of programming intended on specific or narrower targets and goals. The specific age groups of offenders, IQ or intelligence groups, alcoholics or other specific groups may be regarded as homogeneous targets. The purpose could be more specific and all have the same
objective such as vocational training in mechanics, achieving functional literacy and group therapy and group living techniques to achieve social understanding and correction (Fox, 1985:209).

Fox (1985:208) reveals that the dragon state correctional institution that was opened in 1959 classified offenders according to the major source of their difficulties such as:

- Conflict with individual and social values;
- Conflict streaming from relationships with others;
- Problems caused by the need for material things;
- Problems based in self-concept.

There are suitable ways of assessing the accomplishment of such a system in that offenders should be classified as legalistic or technical offenders, national offenders, pathological offenders, vocational offenders and career offenders (Fox, 1985:208).

The systems of classification according to diagnosis that can be computerised were implemented in 1969, by the United States Bureau of Prisons. At the centre of understanding in allocating offenders into the treatment grouping of intensive, selective or minimal based on likelihood of change according to staff judgement, more classification was measured to be reasonable. The RAPS classification can develop a code that can be translated into classes I, II, or III depending upon whether there should be a great expenditure of resources above the necessary level of service. The RAPS is explained as follows:

- The “R” refers to a rehabilitation potential that is based on the correctional official’s professional opinion with regard to the change view.
- The “A” refers to age, i.e. under 30, 30 to 45 or over 45.
- The “P” refers to the number of prior sentences, ranging from none to two or more.
- The “S” refers to the nature of the sentence in terms of special classification or duration of imprisonment (Fox, 1985:2009).

The classes of treatment can be obtained by the code combinations fed into the computer. The following are treatments that are addressed (Fox, 1985:209):
• Class I offenders are re-examined every 30 days and have first priority on assignments. The treatment team makes all assignment changes, and the case workers sit in disciplinary action procedures.
• Every six months class II offenders are re-examined and do not have first main priority on handing over. With regard to the handing over changes and disciplinary action, the case worker will be advised.
• Class III individuals are re-examined once a year, have last main priority on handing over, are regularly allocated to the labour pool, are made use of as needed to maintain the correctional institution and are processed by regular procedures in disciplinary action.

The Boonville Correctional Centre in the mission Department of Corrections since 1987 has practised so-called programmatic separation by arranging offender assignments so that offenders most likely to be high risk killers are detained separately from those most susceptible to becoming their victims in the unit programmes. Programmatic separation further reduces this possibility because the recreation yard work is separated from the vocational training and job assignment. In the vocational training and job allocation areas some groups perform better in some institutional jobs than in others. For example, moderates are far superior to other offenders in clerk type job while “heavies” have a good record in food services (Levinson, 1999:85).

According to Sechrest (1987:3), there is a lack of theoretical rationality for treatment classifications for offender rehabilitation in general. Most correctional authorities have a tendency to allocate individual offenders to explanatory classes that have power over little or no direct relation to treatment programmes. The achievement of rehabilitative goals can be damaged by the disparity between the classification system and treatment programmes. There are two types of treatment programmes: the treatment programme that provides services as a wrap up, and those from which services are selected from a menu of possible options. More study on classification for treatment is needed on the relation between offender needs including post-release need and treatment programmes before the goal of rehabilitation can be realised.
The programmes that are accessed by offenders of the custody levels of minimum, medium and maximum are as follows:

- Jobs and programmes by the medium custodial classification offenders are inside the perimeter only and these offenders also have access to recreation programmes inside the perimeters and also outside the perimeters but only as approved by the CAO. Medium security offenders are provided with a wide variety of programmes and activities depending on an offender’s custody status and are also provided with greater freedom (Silverman & Vega, 1996:365).

- Minimum custodial offenders are eligible for all job programmes both inside and outside the perimeter. Their access to programmes is unrestricted including community-based activities (Walsh, 2001:142).

- Access to jobs and programmes of the maximum custodial classification in maximum and super maximum institutions is provided in different ways around the USA (Silverman & Vega, 1996:365). Some correctional institutions allow television in the cells and provide education and self-help programmes through intra-institutional cables. Some institutions balance this with instructors providing assistance through cell visits, other institutions offer small classes in a day room or special room in close proximity to the housing units. At some institutions there is no treatment or programme at all. Most of these institutions do not allow work opportunities, even though they offer some work in transition programmes for offenders being prepared to leave maximum conditions (Mears, 2006:27). Offenders are offered only selected day jobs inside the perimeter, or directly supervised within the housing unit. The CAO is responsible for the approval of selected programme activities inside the facility perimeter (Silverman & Vega, 1996:365).

Riverland (1999:17-18) indicates that in most maximum and super maximum facilities, offenders are limited to exercise between three and seven hours in a week, usually in an internal space or small, secure internal room. Most of the time one offender is offered a chance to exercise at a time under the supervision of two or more correctional officials to and
from the exercise place. Most other types of programming offered in these services include programmes such as substance abuse treatment, anger management and vocational training offered through television, correspondence or written materials. A number of correctional institutions operating transitional units provide congregate programming, usually focusing on education, substance abuse treatment and behavioural control such as anger management (Riverland, 1999:18). In most maximum and super maximum institutions the correctional institutional chaplains offered offenders religious programmes through cell front visits by authorised clergy or in some cases authorised religious volunteers. A number of correctional institutions in the USA provide religious services and information through closed circuit television available in the cell only. Few correctional institutions permit a small number of offenders to take part in congregate services usually in or immediately neighbouring the housing unit (Mays & Winfree, 2005:136).

5.4.4.1 Classification of women for treatment purposes in the USA

Assessment for specific or special needs provides a further comprehensive depiction of offender needs and could enable the assessment of substance abuse, mental health, intelligence and educational background. The assessment tools should also be applicable to women. Modern assessment has found correctional officials and practitioners stressing the importance of programmes responsive to the specific needs of women offenders, such as treatment counselling, nursery programmes to enable mothers to keep their babies near them while they are in custody, mentoring and self-esteem programmes, gender-specific health education programmes, gender responsive substance abuse and mental health programmes and gender-specific cognitive skills programmes (Van Voorhis, 2001:7).

Most feminists criticise the correctional institution with regard to the issues of women offender treatment. They argue that little focus has been paid to the development of a separate and perhaps more perfect classification system. Most correctional authorities agree that female offenders need more treatment than more security and control within an institution. Therefore,
the custody-based model is more complex in gathering information on the extensive treatment needs of women offenders (McShane, 2008:103).

There are exceptional needs which women offenders have that should be discussed by correctional administrators. These needs involve assisting in dealing with problems of trauma and abuse, self-esteem and assertiveness, vocational and job skills, medical care, mental health, child care and relationships (Van Voorhis, 2001:14).

Only eight states in the USA have made some prerequisites to assess the needs of men and women in a different way. Some states in fact have made changes that do not concentrate on the subject and concerns encountered in classifying and managing women offenders. Only 10 states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons deal with the problems and issues of over classification and failure to think about gender responsive needs. These states are as follows: Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and Wyoming (Van Voorhis, 2001:17).

Kesselbaum (1999:40) states that the Centre for Substance Abuse (CSA) treatment identifies 17 programme areas that reflect a comprehensive treatment model for women offenders:

- Gender space issues related to addiction (including social, physiological and psychological consequences of addiction as well as factors related to the onset of addiction);
- Low self-esteem;
- Race, ethnicity and cultural issues;
- Gender discrimination and harassment;
- Disability related issues;
- Relationships with family and significant others;
- Attachments to unhealthy interpersonal relationships;
- Interpersonal violence including incest, rape, battering and other abuse;
- Eating disorders;
- Sexuality including sexual function and sexual orientations;
- Parenting;
• Grief related to loss, to the loss of the substance that was being abused and the emotional losses related to women’s children, family members or partners;
• Appearance and overall health and hygiene;
• Isolation related to lack of support systems which may or may not include family members and/or partners and other resources;
• Life plan development; and
• Child care and child custody.

Many prison programmes have been implemented which make use of the CSA treatment model, including the Choice Therapeutic Community (Arkansas), Baylor Women’s Correctional Institution Village (Delaware), Forever Free (California) and Recovery in Focus Oregon (Kessebaum, 2006:43).

The California Department of Correctional Services and Rehabilitation has kept an eye on the Forever Free substance abuse programme of the California institution for women. This programme was initiated in 1991 as a project of demonstration and was sponsored by the CSA. Over 4-6 months the contributors spend 20 hours per week in programming and 20 hours for the prison week programme. The aim of the programme is to minimise the number of women in prison disciplinary actions, substance abuse use and reincarceration following release from prison. Programme services include assessment, treatment planning, individual and group substance abuse counselling, relapse preventing, problem solving, parole planning, urine testing and case management. The programme of study highlights deterioration, avoidance and cognitive behaviour skill building and is designed to assist women in identifying systems of withdrawal and relapse and to teach the skills and strategies needed to deal with them. The programme includes particular women issues and is also created as a complete programme. The following are specific women issues that the programme offers:
• Self-esteem, addiction and anger management; and
• Assertiveness training, healthy versus disordered relationships, physical and sexual abuse, post-trauma, stress disorder, co-dependency, parenting, sex and health (Kessebaum, 2006: 46).
5.4.4.2 Classification of young offenders for treatment purposes in the USA

The rehabilitation of young offenders is of paramount importance in the US. Young offenders have special treatment opportunities, development is used to the maximum and family relationships are promoted (Coyle, 2002:126).

An important US federal government initiative that has a crime prevention objective is the Juvenile Mentoring Program (JMP), which is operated by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency. Prevention (part of the US Department of Justice) in 1992 amended the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to establish JUMP. By 1998 the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention supported 93 mentoring projects under JUMP, in addition to mentoring initiatives funded through its grants programme. Nearly 300 initiatives were founded in 1997. The main aim of JUMP is to be concerned about youth at risk of poor academic performance, dropping out of school, or becoming involved in gangs, substance abuse, firearms and violence (Johns, 2003:44).

5.4.5 Classification for security in the USA

Classification and security systems are essential for good management of prisons. Placing high security offenders in low security settings presents understandable problems of escapes, assaults, intimidation and other internal management problems. Detaining an offender in a too high security setting for his/her actual needs also results in problems. It is dangerous for offenders who are classified for low security to be confined in a high security setting. It is more expensive than compulsory to continue to hold lower custody offenders in a maximum security institution (Henderson et al., 1997:15).

The level of security and custody are two classification decisions that must be made for each offender (Silverman, 2001:150). The characteristics of security and custody are not always clear. Most states and the federal government at present use objective classification systems, but may not use standardised descriptions for security and custody levels (Silverman & Vega, 1996:362).
There are six criteria to distinguish between security levels (Silverman & Vega, 1996:363):

- Physical barriers that surround the boundary;
- Armed guards within the gun towers;
- Movable patrols;
- Detection devices such as TV cameras, high mask lighting, electronic sensing devices in the ground or fences;
- Types of housing; and
- Internal architecture/security.

These dimensions describe the constraints separating offenders from the public and minimising the possibility of escape.

The American Correctional Association refers to five different facilities of security levels, namely community, minimum, medium, close and maximum; however, this is by no means the only facility securing scheme that can be utilised. Some correctional institutions in the States have a lower facility security level and use offender grade classification to determine the supervision level needed for offenders. The facility security levels use names and letter grades (such as AA, A, B, C, D,) to signify degree of offender custody of supervision.

Each correctional institution has its own decisive factors for classifying facility security levels. Ordinarily they rely on a re-examine of factors such as the following: type of perimeter security existence and operation of towers.

According to Leech (1997:255), after offenders have been admitted they are classified and placed into one of the following four security categories:

- Category A: These are offenders who are extremely dangerous to the public and who may threaten national security.
- Category B: These include offenders who do not require the highest security classification but who might still pose a threat to the public if they escape.
- Category C: These are offenders who cannot be trusted in completely free conditions but who do not have the will or resources to make determined escape attempts.
- Category D: Offenders who can be trusted to serve their sentence in the community.

5.5 OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION IN EUROPE

According to the European Prison Rules, the functions of classification or reclassification of offenders are as follows:

- To separate from others those offenders who, by grounds of their criminal records or their personality, are likely to benefit from others who may exercise a bad influence.
- To assist the correctional institution in housing offenders to facilitate their treatment and social resettlement considering the management and security requirements (Muncie & Sparks, 1991:191).
- To allocate offenders to different institutions or administrations (These can be unsentenced or sentenced offenders, first offenders or habitual offenders, short sentences or long sentences.) Their special requirements for their treatment, medical needs, their sex and age are taken into consideration.
- To incarcerate male and female offenders separately even though they may both take part in organised activities of an well-known treatment programme.
- To house unsentenced offenders separately from sentenced offenders, except when they are given approval to be accommodated or involved together in organised activities beneficial to them.
- To imprison young offenders under conditions which require descriptions of their needs (Muncie & Sparks, 1991:191).

The basic rationale of modern penal treatments in custodial institutions depends on their usefulness in the demarcation of the organisations, the improvement of administration and a valid process of classification and allocation of offenders to those institutions that are most suitable to their personal needs. Therefore, it is essential that in supplying the facilities available to the prison system, in establishing the treatment regimes and training correctional personnel to
make the most effective contribution to them, prisons and administrations should support the overall strategy with consistent and systematic principles and the essential administrative machinery to carry it out (Council of Europe, 1987:23).

Most correctional systems in Europe make use of the basic objective of allocating offenders to a correctional institution near to their homes and suitable to their treatment needs. This option will be reserved in some cases by the likelihood of unsafe or disruptive behaviour. A more positive emphasis has been by the European Prison Rules. They also introduce the concept of reclassification so as to underline the need to keep under review the cases of those offenders whose treatment and allocation has been influenced adversely by such concerns. Ideally, classification and allocation of the offender should be based on observation of an offender rather than analytical judgement. Sometimes there will be some very difficult cases in which prison and administration have a clear responsibility for the public interest and correctional officials’ safety, which may lead them to err on the side of caution even if that apparently goes against the offender’s own welfare. This is the important argument in such cases and, as necessary, reference to higher authority (Council of Europe, 1987:23).

Most European countries do not have special high security prisons. One reason for this has been the growth of criminal gang activities in prisons in several systems. It is risky to concentrate high numbers of dangerous criminals in special high security sections in ordinary prisons around the country and to rotate dangerous criminals between them. For this reason most new prisons built in Europe are multifunctional (regional) prisons. Whilst having an ordinary security category, they contain a pre-trial detention section and high security section, often also a low security section or prison in neighbourhood. All types of offenders could be allocated near to their home and costs for transfer or prisoners are minimal. Most European prisons do not have special institutions for pre-trial detainees. It is obvious that pre-trial detention and sentence serving constitute a single system, with joint administrative and jointly deployed guards, offering a degree of interchangeability. The changeover to regional prisons improves significantly the opportunities and quality of cooperation between the prison, court, prosecutor’s office, police and probation supervision authorities (Council of Europe, 1987:23).
A good reclassification system is provided by Fushe-Kruje and Korea prisons and Durres pre-trial detention centres and also existing prisons according to the districts principle. Analysis should precede the separation of offenders according to their region of residence and the reclassification of high security offenders to ordinary security. High security sections are also constructed in most existing ordinary security prisons. The services section for each prison is decided by the minister of justice in Albania when also deciding on the categories of prisons and services (Council of Europe, 1987:26).

- In Korce, Albania, the institutions for serving criminals convicted should be classified ordinary security prisons with a high security section and pre-detention section for detainees and prisoners from Korce, Progradec, Dell and Kalonja.
- In Burrel the institutions for saving sentenced offenders should be classified ordinary security prisons with a high security section for offenders from Mat, Diber and Bulqize regions.
- In Pegin the institutions for serving sentenced offenders should be classified ordinary security prisons with a security section for offenders from the Pegin, Elbasan-Librazhd and Gramsh regions.
- In Inshekruja the institutions for serving sentenced offenders should be classified ordinary security prisons with a high security section for offenders from the Krunje, Kurbin and Durres regions.
- In Tepelena the institutions for serving sentence offenders should be classified ordinary security prisons with a high security section for offenders from the Tepelana, Permet and Gjirokastra districts.

5.6 OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES

The meaning of classification has a tendency to show some discrepancy in the penal systems of various countries and the stage of development of the system. In its primary phase it may be used simply to mean the separation of offenders into groups according to the convicted objective principle, usually relating to their legal status such as untried and convicted. Classification may also be utilised to separate men from women, adults from young offenders. The other part of
classification comes or develops from the modern conception of individualised treatment and training (Rees, 1977:29).

5.6.1 The process of offender assessment in England and Wales

All local prisons in England and Wales have an observation and classification unit for the assessment of men serving sentences of three months or more. For offenders who are imprisoned for a period of five years or more or in the case of first offenders, more than four years, a decision is made on what type of training is suitable, and a more lengthy and comprehensive assessment is necessary. The process of assessment is performed at regional allocation centres located in the local correctional centres at Liverpool, Birmingham, Wandsworth, Warmwood Scrubs and Bristol (Rees, 1977:28). The processes of assessment in England and Wales has four aims:

- To obtain and record certain basic information about each offender and about his/her family background;
- To identify offenders’ needs and, if possible, the factors that may have led to their criminal behaviour as an important initiative to any challenge to deal with them during their incarceration;
- To determine offender security category; and
- To recommend where offenders should serve the first part of their sentence in the light of these factors and of the resources available in the area.

5.6.2 Classification for treatment needs in England and Wales

According to Rees (1977:27), sentenced offenders are classified for the individualisation of treatment and training as well as for the utilisation of specialist staff and facilities. This part of classification based on treatment and training goes further than the purely negative groupings of the first part and becomes a constructive process of ensuring that as far as possible offenders as individuals are housed in a group in which they will receive the treatment and training most
suitable to their personal aptitude and needs. This type of classification is practised in the USA, to cover the initial diagnostic and prognostic assessment of the individual on the basis of which a treatment programme can be planned for him/her. Rule 68 of the prison rules, 1964, provides that the aim of “training and treatment of sentence offenders shall be to persuade or assist them to lead a good and valuable life after they have returned from prison to society as law abiding citizens”. The aim of correctional systems in England and Wales is to ensure that classifications are done before treatment (Rees, 1977:27).

To ensure that offenders spend their 24 hours a day in custody engaged in purposeful activity such as work, training and education as well as physical education to prevent physical deterioration, offence-focused offender programmes are included as part of their treatment and training programmes (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:223).

Treatment and training incorporate the following critical aspects (Rees, 1977:29):

- To provide offenders with work that will assist them to have practical experience in order to fit in the outside world or after they are released from prison. This is critical to the treatment training of the offender in custody. Being organised and productive, with payment related to the offender’s effort or output, can help to reveal the circumstances of life in the community after he/she is released. The aim is to provide an eight-hour working day with minimal interruption. Therefore it should be persistent and interesting. Offenders are provided with work such as technical training in skilled trade (Rees, 1977:33).

The purpose of the work is to assist offenders to obtain and keep jobs after they are released from the correctional system. The second aim is to make the best possible economic use of prison labour (Rees, 1977:55).

- To offer special attention to education (Rees, 1977:29). Teaching methods, literature and apparatus are essential. Every modern method, type of the literature and apparatus are to be found throughout the correctional system. Education for offenders in custody, whether remedial, academic, social, cultural or recreational, is by position offered by local education
authorities at the expense of the Department of Correctional Services. Every adult offender is allowed to participate in education or not. Offenders who are lacking in basic skills of reading and writing are offered a chance to receive daytime education, since most of it takes place outside working hours. It has also been utilised for promoting experience in general education for selected offenders, particularly those who are competent in advanced academic work (Rees, 1977:37). Most important is the need to relate offender education more closely to all other characteristics of offender treatment and to integrate the educational services more closely with the management structure of the establishment. An offender’s education needs to broaden his/her scope and stimulate reflection, especially where it involves the acquisition of specific skills, or including teaching to contain academic standards to be related to his/her prospects after release (Rees, 1977:29).

- To exercise personal influence on the individual by correctional officials (Rees, 1977:29). Except in open prison, the prison rules require that every prisoner not employed on outdoor work must be given exercise in the open air, if weather permits, for not less than one hour each day. In special circumstances the prison department may otherwise reduce this daily exercise period to half an hour and physical exercise may be given indoors (Rees, 1977:33).

- To provide an opportunity for the acquisition of skills and to ensure that offenders are physically competent to maintain the demands of outside employment. Offenders are provided with opportunities to do physical recreational activities and thus to achieve a sufficient level of ability to allow them to make more constructive use of their spare time. Usually this may lead to externally recognised proficiency awards and sometimes it may allow offenders to find jobs after they are released from correctional institutions. Most adult institutions have insufficient physical education resources even though the subject is extremely popular, perhaps because most offenders, or young men, enjoy physical fitness and physical skills. Correctional officials are the ones who train offenders as physical education instructors can promote their proficiency advantage for both staff and offenders (Rees, 1997:33).
To stipulate all possible opportunities for the development of a sense of personal responsibility including for suitable prisoners training in open conditions (Rees, 1977:29).

5.6.2.1 Treatment programmes for women offenders in England and Wales

Female offenders are usually detained separately from male offenders, since there are comparatively few prisons in England and Wales for women offenders. The provision of sex offender space in treatment programmes that are designed to promote offender accountability and enhance skills and competencies is an important component of managing sex offenders in order to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. Female offender treatment should address elements and factors in the offenders’ personality functioning that contribute to and/or increase the likelihood that the offenders will sexually reoffend (Gelsthorpe, Sharpe & Roberts, 2007).

Since 1991 England and Wales have initiated the so-called sex offender treatment programme (SOTP). The programme is based on a cognitive behavioural model and includes topics specific to certain types of offender’s behaviour, victim empathy and the development of person and relapse prevention plans, even though it has undergone a number of revisions since then. The first version of the programme included 80 hours of treatment, but this has been extended to 170 hours. Facilitators are needed to take part in ongoing training sessions and are trained in the programme modality. Offenders who have participated in this programme have shown a lower recidivism rate than those who did not take part in these programmes (Gelsthorpe, Sharpe & Roberts, 2007). Holloway prison in England consists of units of special treatment that offer treatment programmes such as those for drug addicts, alcoholics or women suffering from severe diseases or needing obstetric or gynaecological treatment.

In England and Wales, there are three prisons for women. Women in these prisons learn self-control, to take responsibility for themselves, to conform and to accept an ordered life (Rees, 1977:102-103).
5.6.2.2 Treatment programmes for young offenders in England and Wales

Juveniles are usually detained in specific young offender institutions, of which there are currently 14 closed and 3 open for males, divided into those for 15- to 17-year-old offenders and 18- to 20-year-old offenders. Juveniles are occasionally remanded to ordinary local prisons and there is particular concern about this arrangement, not the least because one or two juveniles have committed suicide in the circumstances (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:232).

Young offenders are free to engage in education or not, as they wish. They undergo borstal training. Borstal training usually includes a four working hour week with the opportunity for suitable trainees to undertake vocational training and construction industrial training, physical education and educational activities usually as determined by the borstal rules. Young offenders can sometimes be given opportunities for recreation and for reading and writing and will engage in education activities for six hours a week (Rees, 1977:18).

Young offenders and juveniles may be sent to one of four types of establishment:

- Security training centres provide education, and are focused centres for offenders up to the age of 17.
- Local authority security children’s homes are run by social services and focus on attending to the physical, emotional and behavioural needs of vulnerable young people.
- Juvenile prisons run by the prison service accommodate 15 – 18 year olds and have lower ratios of staff to young people than the above two institutions.
- Young offender institutions are run by the prison service and accommodate 18 – 21 year olds and have lower ratios of staff to young people than juvenile prisons (Wikipedia, [s.a.]).

5.6.3 Classification for security purposes in England and Wales

Male adult offenders are given a security categorisation soon after they enter prison. These categories are based on a combination of the type of offence committed, length of sentence, the likelihood of escape, and the danger to the public if they did escape. Classification of offenders is
the most important process for ensuring security of the correctional system. There are four categories in which offenders are placed for security purposes (Rees, 1977:5-6):

- Category A prisoners are those whose escape would be highly dangerous to the public or national security.
- Category B prisoners are those who do not require maximum security, but for whom escape needs to be made very difficult.
- Category C prisoners are those who cannot be trusted in open conditions but who are unlikely to try to escape.
- Category D prisoners are those who can reasonably be trusted not to try to escape and are offered the privilege of an open prison. Prisoners of this category are, subject to approval given, released on temporary licence to work in the community or to go on home leave once they have passed their full licence eligibility dates, which is usually a quarter of the way through the sentence (Wikipedia, [s.a.]).

5.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter focused on the issues of international offender classification, in particular on dividing offenders into classes in order to facilitate their treatment with a view to their social rehabilitation. Offender classification of the USA, Canada, England, Wales, Australia and Europe was discussed. The Prison Rules in Europe are also in line with United Nations Rules 67 and 68 which determine the purpose of classification. Offender classification for security purposes was also discussed in this chapter with regard to the abovementioned countries as well as special case offenders for treatment needs, such as young offenders and women offenders.
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CHAPTER 6

CLASSIFICATION PROCESS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES IN SOUTH AFRICA

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The South African Correctional Services has gone through many changes since the 1900s. This chapter provides a summary overview of the origins and development of prisons in South Africa. The focus is on the periods in which significant changes were made such as the early 1900s, the 1947 Lansdowne Commission on Penal and Prison Reform, which also introduced the first classification system since from 1910 to 1957. That type of classification system during that period was practised purely on subjective principles and was closely related to the consensus model. During 1971 the depth offender classification was introduced for individual offender rehabilitation. After 1994 the depth classification system was abolished as a result of democracy, because the classification system had to be applied to offenders of all race groups.

This chapter will also focus on the admission of offenders and the orientation given by the Department of Correctional Services in South Africa and how orientation rules and regulations are addressed within South African prisons during admission of offenders. The assessment tools are discussed in detail in this chapter. Assessment must include the physical and emotional well-being, education and training needs of the offenders in terms of the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa. This type of assessment is found on form G303 and G303(A) known as the Admission Risk and Needs Assessment form, which is completed within 24 hours of admission, as well as Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment form which is completed after admission and within 21 working days. A summary is given of the risk and needs assessment that is also used to complete the sentence plan, given that rehabilitation is best facilitated through a holistic sentence planning process that connects the offender at all levels – social, moral, spiritual, physical, work, educational, intellectual and mental – within the correctional environment.
The offender classification for treatment needs within South African Correctional Services is also the main focus of this chapter, given that offender classification makes it possible to match an offender treatment programme with those offenders receiving the same treatment. Classification examines the problems of the person through the use of every available technique, through social investigation, vocation, religious and recreational studies. Classification for work and conditional work is also discussed in this chapter. In terms of the White Paper on Corrections the offender must be offered work which is based on the principle that it forms part of the sentence plan of the offender, it considers the nature as well as the characteristics of the offence and its contribution towards the human development of the offender. Classification for special needs offenders as a treatment tool is also discussed in this chapter. Classification for security forms part of this chapter, given that security is the core business of the South African correctional system. Classification which is used to match offenders on parole or probation with the level of supervision that they require will be dealt with in this chapter.

6.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM

Robben Island is assumed to be the first prison to be recognised in the Cape during 1781. During that time prisons were characterised by cruel punishment. By 1848 in the Cape there were 22 prisons which had been developed. The administration of panel institutions in the Cape was the duty of the Colonial Secretary up until the time the country become a Union. Between the years 1838 and 1842 the first prison was established in Pietermaritzburg (the then Natal). Shortly after 1854 the Orange Free State also built their prison and in 1865 the first prison was constructed in Pretoria. There were already 33 prisons in the Transvaal (Muthaphuli, 2008:119).

6.2.1 The South African prisons in the early 1900s

In 1908, Jacob de Villiers Roos was appointed as the Secretary of Justice and Director of Prisons for the Union. He had, at the time, been working as the Director of Prisons for the Transvaal. Roos also held the position of Vice-Secretary of Justice. Both positions were directly in control
of prison departments. His main responsibility was to formulate the legislation that would regulate the operations of prisons. The result of this work was the Prisons and Reformatories Act 13 of 1911 which was introduced shortly after unionisation in 1910 (Muthaphuli, 2008:118).

According to the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa of 2005, the Prisons and Reformatories Act 13 of 1911 was put in place to regulate not only prisons but also reformatory schools. The Act made provision for the care of sentenced offenders as well as awaiting trial offenders.

The Act was regarded as containing the most modern principle of modern penology by Roos. The essence of the Act was to reform the criminal through religious and moral instruction, based on the belief that every person is able to change (Plaatjies, 2008:53).

The power of the Department of Justice and Prisons was divided in 1911, but again merged in 1930. The government was forced to streamline its activities because of the Great Depression. From 1934, farmers were offered a chance to have offenders work for them in terms of section 35(3) of Act 13 of 1911, for the utilisation of medical restraint (Plaatjies, 2008:53).

The period of 1910 was characterised by cruel punishment methods. With the development of a union prison system, in terms of Act 13 of 1911, all prisoners fell under the control of one system (Union system). The aim was effective administration without any major attention to the prison (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:56). One of the characteristics of this period was disciplinary measures. The offender who had infringed prison rules was disciplined according to prison rules. The disciplinary measures included the deprivation of privileges, reclassifying the prisoner, additional labour, corporal punishment of not more than six lashes, solitary confinement with reduced rations and solitary confinement in an isolated cell (Cilliers et al., 2008:10).
6.2.2 The 1947 Lansdowne Commission on Penal and Prison Reforms

The Lansdowne Commission was appointed in 1941 and only released its findings in 1947. The Act of 1911 had not established a new period in South African prisons; however, it had been a means of expression for sustaining the earlier harsh and unjust prison system that preceded it (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

The Lansdowne Commission held the view that offenders should not be hired out to outsiders, and asked for an increase in the emphasis on rehabilitation and the need to extend literacy amongst offenders, particularly black offenders, and was critical of the government’s decision to reorganise the prison service on full military lines which was seen to be an attempt to increase the control it had over prison officials. It warned that such a militarised system would not be conductive to various rehabilitative influences which modern views deemed essential.

According to Van Hove (1962:15-16), 1947 was a significant year for penal legislation and reform in South Africa due to the publication report of the Penal and Prison Reform Commission. The matter of penal reform had been for some time before studied by the South African Institute of Race Relations and in 1944, recommendations had been made by the committee to appoint a commission to make findings based on the following:

- The reasons for criminal behaviour and crime in the Union;
- The laws of the Union (past laws) which generated “statutory offences” that affected the volume of crime and the extent of the prison population;
- Unconventional appearance of penal treatment and its possibilities in the Union;
- Prison situation, by first-hand investigation where possible and by other means;
- Study of personality of sentences and their effects upon crime, including the study of corporal punishment and the death sentence; and
- Assessment of the Union’s penal system with systems in other countries.

The commission finally released its findings and recommendations after a few years of investigations. It made the following recommendations, amongst others: It did not support the
hiring of offenders to private institutions or individuals; it emphasised the rehabilitation of offenders and the provision of education and training and it discouraged the military approach to management followed by the department, as this was not conductive to rehabilitation efforts. Coetzee et al. (1995:31) also mention that the commission had the mandate to investigate the classification and control of offenders.

Since 1910 to 1957 South African prisons introduced the first classification system. A more personalised system was put into practice on 1 January 1958, the so-called horizontal classification system which was closely associated with the consensus model. The horizontal classification system rested on merely subjective principles and therefore a logical course of action with values and specific cut-off points were lacking. In fact, the system had a dual nature because on one hand, it provided for safe custody that was measured essentially in the case of an individual offender and on the other it provided for a number of opportunities an offender could enjoy (Neser, 1993:259).

6.2.3 The era of South African prisons from 1959 and beyond

The Prison and Reformatories Act 13 of 1911 was replaced by the Prisons Act 8 of 1959, since it failed to maintain the aim of incarceration to start with. The Prisons Act 8 of 1959 was permitted by the standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners developed by the United Nations in 1955 (Muthaphuli, 2008:120). According to Van Hove (1962:19), the Prisons Act was regarded as a balance to the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1959 and presented the impact of the modern views and research with regard to the prison system in the Union. There were two objectives of Act 8 of 1959, namely:

- Decentralisation of prisons (smaller but very modern institutions for 150 to 300 or 500 offenders throughout the country); and
- Depopulation of prisons and reform of the criminal.

Muthaphuli (2008:121) is of the opinion that Act 8 of 1959 was successful in setting up the responsibility of the department as follows: offender safe custody, development and
rehabilitation of offenders, efficient management of the department and the performance of other duties that could be assigned by the Minister.

The recommendations made by the Lansdowne Commission were the inspiration for various clauses in the Prisons Act and the Criminal Law Amendment Act. However, some recommendations connected with supervision and after-care were not regulated by constitutional regulations as had been done in some other countries (Van Hove, 1962:20).

The most important justices laid down in Act 8 of 1959 were found in 2(2)(b) and 98(1)(c), which stated that offender treatment would, as much as possible, be aimed at their reformation and rehabilitation and in developing self-respect and responsibility. Section 94(1)(w) stated that the Governor-General could make regulations in association with the subsidising and encouragement of institutions, societies and individuals approved by the Minister as furthering the objective of this Act (Van Hove, 1962:20).

However, the Prisons Act was later renamed the Correctional Services Act 8 of 1959 and also had its own shortcomings (Muthaphuli, 2008:121). Van Zyl Smit (1992:31) mentions that the racial segregation of offenders was still a problem even after the 1959 Act, which was supposed to be a replacement of the 1911 Act. Muthaphuli (2008:121) states that although the Act tried to be in line with the standard minimum rules, some stipulations were in disagreement with these rules. For example, the United Nations standard minimum rule 6(1) states that all the stipulations should be applied impartially and without any discrimination on one or more of the following grounds: race, colour, gender, language, religion or other opinion, national or social origin, property or other status.

Even though the standard minimum rules are very much against corporal punishment, the Act retained corporal punishment as a means of punishment for disciplinary offences committed by male offenders (Van Zyl Smit, 1992:31).
There have been many transformations in South Africa throughout the years, be they political, economic, social or technological. The everyday operations of prisons are influenced by these transformations. For example, political control of the past as characterised by the rule of apartheid also extended to the operations of prisons since prisons are government institutions. The separation of white offenders from non-white offenders and the governance of white people in the management of prisons were some of the examples of the apartheid rule (Muthaphuli, 2008:121).

According to Neser (1978:259), the treatment of offenders was made compulsory by law when the Act of 1959 came into effect, even though the offender classification was regarded as an essential basis for treatment. The aim was to individualise treatment within the context of classification because of the uniqueness of every prison. This in conjunction with the classification was aimed at managing the treatment of offenders on a professional basis.

According to Neser (1993:259), at the beginning of 1971, together with the horizontal classification system, a depth offender classification system was approved by the South African prison system. The aim was to advance personalised offender treatment (rehabilitation in South African prisons). Since the information was collected from the subjective judgement of professionals and then offenders were placed in specific groups, this type of classification was a customary subjective model.

Since 1984 South African prisons determined that safe custody conditions should be separated from advantaged offenders. In deference to the stipulation of the horizontal classification system, it was agreed that it should be possible for offenders in maximum security prisons to enjoy maximum privileges, depending on the facilities available in certain prisons if they demonstrated qualities such as good behaviour and cooperation. With this classification system, Neser (1993: 259) believes that a greater flexibility could be accomplished.

According to Neser (1993:259), it was additionally established that offender classification extended over three basic levels, namely safe custody, diagnosis and job allocation. The South
African prisons focused on the safe custody classification system, since the safe custody function of the Department of Correctional Services is important. The depth classification system was abolished from the South African Correctional Services, and the new system was applied to offenders of all race groups (Neser, 1993:262). “In 1985 and 1986 the safe custody classification system and the privilege classification system were implemented and the previous were abandoned” (Nxumalo, 2002:58).

6.2.4 The correctional system in South Africa since 1994

Since 1991 the Department of Correctional Services, which was the old Prisons Service, has been an independent government department. The prison system up until 1994 was a single national bureaucracy, as in 1989 the Minister of Correctional Services was a political head, and a complete member of the national cabinet. The Commissioner of Prisons held the substantive rank of General; however, as a result of the change of government and democracy, this was changed. Demilitarisation meant that not only were military ranks brought to an end, but also that only custodial staff continued to wear uniforms. Correctional officials as a whole had to change to a different way of exercising authority without much retraining. Therefore the changes were not problematic (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:599).

Immediately after the 1994 elections, important developments took place in South Africa. There was a need to develop a new set of laws that would regulate a non-racial South Africa not only within the Correctional Services, but in every government department (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:14).

In 1996, the new Minister of Correctional Services was appointed due to the changes that took place as a result of democracy in the new South Africa and this led to a whole new phase in the correctional system of South Africa. The Department of Correctional Services has since redeveloped itself into a whole new system which pays attention to the rehabilitation of offenders. In the mission to do away with the past (Muthaphuli, 2008:122), the new government “has decided that programs should concentrate on the rehabilitation of sentences of the offenders.
For this reason the concept of the so-called new generation prison is the point of departure” (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:15).

The new Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 was adapted in the process of fundamental change of the law and philosophy relating to imprisonment. This Act become law when the President signed it on 19 November 1998 but only a few of its provisions had been brought into operation by mid-1999, as a new set of regulations had to be circulated and arrangements needed to be made for the new administrative structure for which the Act provides (van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:594). The authorisation of the Department of Correctional Services is drawn from the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 and regulations, subordinate policy and institutional orders, the National Crime Prevention strategy and the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa. The introduction of both the Constitution of South Africa of 1996 and the adoption of the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 saw the Department of Correctional Services being transformed from the old system of operation (Muthaphuli, 2008:122).

According to the department’s annual report (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2006:12), the aim of the department “is to contribute towards maintaining and protecting a just, peaceful and safe society by enforcing court-imposed sentences, detaining offenders in safe custody whilst upholding their human dignity and promoting the social responsibility and human development of all offenders and persons subject to community corrections”. The activities of the department are arranged under seven budget programmes. For the department to ensure a comprehensive synergy of services from admission through the sentence plan up to and including release and reintegration, this has been managed through the after-care programme that has been changed to social reintegration.

The seven budget programmes that are currently offered by the department are as follows (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2006:12):
• **Programme 1: Administration**

The purpose of this programme is to ensure the provision of all administrative, management, financial, information communication technology, service evaluation, investigative and the necessary support functions that are important to the delivery of service by the department.

• **Programme 2: Security**

This programme is to ensure the safety of everyone affected by the activities of Correctional Services from offenders, personnel and the community at large without hampering the human dignity of offenders.

• **Programme 3: Corrections**

The purpose of this programme is to ensure that offenders’ sentences are planned in relation to their needs and also that the programmes related to their development are planned in consideration of their needs. Factors such as criminal profile, security risk and the nature of the offence committed by the offender must be considered.

• **Programme 4: Care**

The purpose of Correctional Services is to provide the necessary care to all offenders with the provision of better nutrition, psychological services and better health care services, among other things.

• **Programme 5: Development**

The purpose of this programme is to offer services necessary for personal development to all offenders.
● **Programme 6: Social Reintegration**

As offenders are provided with personal development services, the aim is to prepare them so that they can lead a normal life after their release. The department aims to ensure this by monitoring their reintegration into society.

● **Programme 7: Facilities**

The purpose is to ensure that all correctional facilities are in conditions that provide for the safe custody of offenders and are humane, and that care and development are provided for offenders as well as administration of the prison.

From the above one can conclude that the department has shifted from a top down hierarchical structure which was characterised by instructions from top management which had to be obeyed by the staff at the bottom levels. Now it believes that there should be interaction between levels and the system now also considers the rehabilitation of offenders and the upliftment of their rights as of the utmost importance.

6.3 **ADMISSION AND ORIENTATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES IN SOUTH AFRICA**

6.3.1 Admission

Offender admission within Correctional Services takes place in the admission unit. The aim of the admission unit is to admit offenders to prison. However, it could also be used to confine the offender before he/she is transferred. The admission unit cell should not form part of the official accommodation of the prison and it should always be available when needed. The admission unit is a body on its own, even though it may be combined with the orientation and assessment (Luyt, 1999:101).
Prison legislation makes provision for strict formalities with regard to the admission of all types of offenders. There are two primary types of formalities:

- With regard to the admission of the offender, particular care has to be taken as their incarceration represents a fundamental loss of their personal liberty.
- The representation process must also include various steps such as medical examination and preliminary classifications, which both initiate the treatment of prisoners by the authorities and determine, to a considerable extent, how they will be dealt with during their imprisonment (Van Zyl Smit, 1992:227).

During admission of an offender to a correctional centre, it is imperative to ensure that the offender’s custody is legal or legitimate. Legitimacy of any incarceration of an offender is provided through a warrant. The head of the prison may not admit any person to a prison if a warrant or written instruction from the court or other authorised person is not issued. A warrant must comply with the following requirements (section 6 of the Correctional Services Act):

- It must be made out to the relevant head of prison.
- It must be signed by a competent person.
- The offender’s name must be provided in all cases and their thumbprint must also be affixed to the warrant in all cases.
- The date on which the warrant was issued must appear on it.
- The offence or reason for detention must be furnished.
- The name of the issuing officer must be furnished.
- The warrant for detention of young offenders must indicate that no other suitable place of safety was available.
- Any amendments must be confirmed by a signature (South African Department of Correctional Services, 1988).

Every offender admitted to prison should be accompanied by a body receipt. The aim of the body receipt is to transfer the offender’s information from one prison to another. The offender must be given a prison number at the first admission and after they have been positively identified. After admission of an offender is finalised, an identification card with registration
number, name, crime, sentence and thumbprint is issued. This identification card must be in their possession at all times (Du Preez, 2003:23).

The commissioner is authorised to detain any offender by means of a warrant and without it this detention will be unlawful. During the process, the offender’s personal particulars as well as the nature of the offence and the day and hour of admission and release should be recorded in a register. While in the correctional centre, an offender has the right to consult a legal practitioner of his/her choice and if he/she is not able to afford a legal practitioner, then the state must provide one (Muthaphuli, 2008:142). The admission process itself should consist of a decent welcoming of the offender into the family of Correctional Services.

6.3.2 Orientation

All the rules that are related to the offender must be provided to the offender with some explanation and in a language which the offender understands or an interpreter must be available to interpret for him/her (Muthaphuli, 2008:143). The head of the prison or the appropriate admission officer appointed by the head of the prison must deal with or tell all new admissions, including escaped convicts and parole violators, about the orientation process. This must be done as soon as possible after admission and by using a tape recording and information from the manual. The following are the rules and regulations that the offender are told about:

- The prison rules concerning medical treatment accessibility.
- The procedure to obtain legal representation, the payment of fines and bail, modus operandi regarding complaints and request, etc. This must be done on a daily basis.
- The basis on which recognitions can be brought in.
- The method in which the opportunity system functions.
- The outcome of challenging to escape or related crimes and/or negative behaviour.
- The negative consequences of gang activities.
- The dangers of sodomy, AIDS, tattooing and hunger strikes.
Information regarding the services that are offered by the Department of Correctional Services such as social work services, educational services, psychological services and religious care.

Other features which the offender is apprehensive about such as the operation of the institution committee, parole board, safe custody classification and placement release (Coetzee et al., 1995:58-59).

6.4 ASSESSMENT OF OFFENDERS IN SOUTH AFRICAN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

It is important that the assessment make provision for the needs of the offender (rehabilitation) and risk of offenders. The classification or assessment of offenders therefore speaks about, firstly, the risk associated with the offender’s custody and secondly, the degree of security required to ensure the offender’s safe custody. Therefore the offender’s safe custody is measured only according to which offender must be classified (Coetzee et al., 1995:61).

6.4.1 Levels of needs assessment

According to Clements (1986:6), there are three levels of needs assessment to make provision for individual and group differences:

- **Admission assessment:** On admission, offenders are assessed to decide whether they must also be included in the subgroup treatment, problem-orientated and individual programmes in addition to the universal programmes.

- **Deposition assessment:** From available information on the performance of the offender, an analysis is done on the deposition of the offender and, according to this, the programmes which are necessary in addition to the universal programmes are determined.

- **Intensive assessment:** Priority areas are identified for the needs of each prisoner and individual treatment programmes are formulated.
The White Paper on Corrections (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b) states that the department must assess the following needs of offenders after admission:

6.4.2 Types of needs

6.4.2.1 The physical and emotional well-being of offenders

Assessing these needs ensures that the department establishes the types of services that have to be provided to an offender to ensure his/her rehabilitation. For example, programmes designed for older offenders will be made available to older offenders and rehabilitation programmes which include psychological services will be made available for mentally ill offenders. By assessing the offender’s physical and emotional well-being, this enables the offenders to be well prepared, both physically and emotionally, to return to their communities. Service providers such as social workers, psychologists and doctors must monitor the integration of offenders into the community. If an offender is not emotionally prepared to return to their community, chances are that he/she will return to the prison sooner than expected.

6.4.2.2 Education and training needs of offenders

The educational capabilities of the offender can be determined and that offender can be placed on a level that is appropriate for him/her. When it comes to training, the potential of the offender can be identified and an offender will be encouraged to undergo the type of training that is appropriate for him/her. In this manner rehabilitation needs of offenders, when it comes to education and training, can be met. This will not happen if the offenders are placed under programmes that are ineffective for them.
6.4.2.3 Offenders’ needs related to specific information programmes that deal with offending behaviour

The offender’s behaviour which may be problematic in the rehabilitation process may be identified in the assessment stage.

6.4.2.4 Accommodation needs

Since the state has an obligation to supply suitable accommodation for offenders, assessing them will help determine what is appropriate for them. Those with special requirements for accommodation, such as bedding, should be met so that offenders can focus on rehabilitation programmes.

6.4.2.5 The need for support after the offender has been released

It is the responsibility of the Department of Correctional Services to ensure that the offender is successfully reintegrated into the community. In ensuring that, the department offers a variety of rehabilitation programmes for offenders that will assist them after their release. By thoroughly assessing the offender, it will be determined whether the offenders require further support to ensure that they reintegrate successfully.

The following groups of criminals are classified according to specific needs as discussed below (Coetzee et al., 1995:65):

- Acute individual cases: This group with, for example, acute medical problems or mental illnesses needs particular consideration.
- Clinical subgroups: In this group the broad-spectrum needs can be fulfilled through treatment or maintenance programmes.
- Problem-orientated subgroups: The broad-spectrum need of this subgroup is related to adjustment, criminality or integration into society. This type of offender can be treated with
psychological programmes and basic education and training programmes for the improvement of broad skills.

- Management subgroups: Offenders who have common characteristics and a need for structure, control, support and confrontation require specific management approaches.
- All criminals: The programmes for all criminals are supported on ordinary needs of offenders, such as accommodation and confidentiality.

6.5 ADMISSION RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

According to the annual report (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2007:41), the Admission Risk and Needs Assessment form is a tool which has been developed by the department for managing offenders from admission and for effective administration of offenders, which will improve rehabilitation, through to their release. This tool is implemented with regard to all newly admitted offenders within 21 days of admission and is also utilised for monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the correctional sentence plan. This tool is utilised to conduct an initial analysis (within 6 hours of admission) of specific needs and risks that the offender poses to himself/herself or fellow offenders and correctional officials, i.e. vulnerability and security risks and needs (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005a:41).

6.5.1 Instructions for completion of Admission Risk and Needs Assessment form

All sentenced offenders and awaiting trial detainees are subjected to the admission risk and needs assessment process within 6 hours of admission. Sections A to E must be completed by the correctional assessment official (CAO). The section F signature and confirmation must be completed by the unit manager of the assessment unit. The goal and objective of the assessment form must be explained to offenders. Should offenders refuse to answer any question, refusal should be indicated in writing by the CAO on the Admission Risk and Needs Assessment form. The completed form must be filed in the institutional file and a copy placed in the offender’s case file. The CAO must keep case files in a lockable cabinet with the assessment unit. The assessment form is confidential and must be treated as such.
- **Section A**: verifies the details of the offender’s personal particulars such as surname and initials as well as the offender’s registration number.

- **Section B**: examines whether the offender experiences any problems informing family or close friend(s) of his/her imprisonment. Other questions are: Does the offender need any assistance to contact family or close friends(s) in order to pay a fine/bail? The offender will also be asked if he/she is the sole child caregiver and whether there are any dependants/children at the offender’s home that need immediate support/assistance.

- **Section C**: examines the offender’s emotional well-being and vulnerability risk/needs such as whether this is the offender’s first time in a correctional institution.

- **Section D**: investigates the security/escape risk/needs that the offender poses to the institution. The offender will be asked whether his/her recent conviction involves extreme or excessive violence, or escape from lawful custody, arson or fire setting. Other questions are: Is the offender a member of a gang/crime syndicate? Is the offender an illegal immigrant or a foreign national? Does the offender express fears that there is somebody who deliberately wants to harm him/her? Does the offender display violent, aggressive or hostile behaviour toward correctional officials or other offenders? Is the offender a member of law enforcement authority? Was the offender a police informer prior to incarceration? Does the offender have other outstanding charges?

- **Section E**: examines offender’s health condition on admission (to check if there are any bruises on admission) (see annexure: A).

### 6.6 COMPREHENSIVE RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT TOOL

Every sentenced offender who is serving a verdict of more than two years must undergo the wide-ranging Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment process after admission and within 21 working days. Correctional officials who are conducting the assessment must explain the goal
and objectives of the assessment form to the offenders. In cases where the offender is uncomfortable answering the question, the official who is responsible for interviewing him/her must not force the offender to answer that question. Should the offender refuse to answer any questions, the CAO should indicate this, in writing, on the Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment form. The CAO must complete all sections of the form in full.

The completed form must be forwarded to the unit manager for confirmation of the assessment and must be filed in the case file of the offender. A duplicate should be filed in the institutional file of the offender. The assessment form must be furnished as classified and treated as not to be disclosed or mentioned (Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment, G303 (A)) (see annexure: B).

“This tool is utilised to analyse, evaluate, examine, determine and assess crime and criminal behaviour of offenders in all its facets within 21 days after admission. It covers aspects associated with criminal behaviour (e.g. precursors, triggers, causes, motives, offender characteristics and influences) and is also used to determine personal needs, risks (such as escape, suicide and recidivism) and responsiveness. Some of the needs considered are: education, substance abuse, support structure, employment skills, anger management, coping skills, problem-solving skills, spiritual care, emotional well-being, leisure and recreation, associations and responsiveness” (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005a:41).

The following are the sections in the form that the CAO must complete:

6.6.1 Section A: Crime and Criminality, Childhood History

6.6.1.1 Crime History (Childhood)

This section deals with previous convictions of the offender. It investigates whether the offender has been previously placed in a reformatory school, secure care centre or placed under a programme by court. The offender will be asked about his/her school performance history such
as: Has the offender ever attended a special school? Has he/she ever been suspended from school and has the offender ever been expelled from school?

6.6.1.2 Youth History

This section investigates the youth history of the offender from 18 to 25 years of age. This includes questions such as: Has the offender ever been convicted for any crime/s as a youth? Was the victim women, girl/s, elderly person/s, animals, disabled person/s, men, boy/s, child/children, business or others specifically? The section also indicates the offender’s relationship to the victim/s and the type of weapon used on the victim during the incident.

6.6.1.3 Crime History (Adult)

This section consists of the offender’s criminal history after turning 25 years of age. This includes questions such as: Has the offender ever been convicted of any crime/s as an adult? Was the victim women, girl/s, elderly person/s, animals, disabled person/s, men, boy/s, child/children, business or others specifically? What was the offender’s relationship to the victim/s? (Did the offender know the victim before the incident or was the victim unknown to the offender before the incident?) What was the degree of harm done to the victim/s by the offender and what type of weapon was used on the victim/s, e.g. no weapon, firearm, knife, explosives or other specifically?

6.6.1.4 Current Offence/s

This section examines the offender’s current offence/s and crime specifics. It specifies the crime that the offender is currently sentenced for, e.g. murder and related offences, culpable homicide and related offences, assault and related offences, sexual offences, robbery and related offences, theft and related offences, fraud, deception and related offences, drugs and alcohol and related offences, weapons and explosive offences, property and environmental damages, public order and public welfare offences, road traffic vehicle regulatory offences, offences against justice
procedures, government security and government operations, trafficking related offences, offences against freedom of movement, miscellaneous offences and other specific offences. The form also specifies the following: What type of victim/s was the crime committed against? What was the relationship between the offender and the victim? What degree of physical harm was done to the victim? What type of weapon was used on the victim? This section also indicates the motive for the offender’s crime/criminal behaviour and indicates whether the offender was under the influence of any substances during the commission of the crime and what type of substance the offender used, e.g. alcohol, dagga and drugs. If drugs were used, the offender must specify the type of drugs, e.g. cocaine.

6.6.1.5 Gang and Criminality

This section examines whether the type of crime committed by the offender is gang or criminal related. The offender will be asked whether he/she is part of a gang, anti-social group or associated with an organised crime syndicate. He/she will thereafter be asked about the type of association and characteristics of the association (if he/she is part of an association). He/she will also be asked if he/she is associated with family member/s, friend/s, correctional centre gangs, community gangs, anti-social peers, cult gangs (e.g. Satanist, spiritualists), politically motivated gangs, mafia associated gangs, organised crime syndicate/s or criminal peers. The offender will be asked whether the current offence was committed in a group, gang or syndicate context. What was the offender’s position in the group, gang or syndicate, e.g. leader, soldier, member or runner? What is the mission objective of the group, gang or syndicate?

6.6.1.6 Substance Abuse

This section examines whether the offender has an addiction to any substance and what type of substance it is, e.g. alcohol, dagga, mandrax, heroin, cocaine and acid. At what age did the offender start using the substance? How long has the offender been addicted? Has the offender ever received medical treatment/counselling for the substance use/abuse in the past?
Section A: Crime and criminality investigates offenders distinctively about their crime history from childhood, youth, adulthood and also the current offences that were committed. The correctional official must be unambiguous about the conditions which cause the offender to be in prison such as criminal involvement and the cycle of offending. All this information that has been gathered throughout this section will form part of the assignment of a first security classification such as normal, minimum, medium, or maximum, for each offender. Therefore it is an advantage for correctional officials to know the offence and the risk the offender poses during the assessment. This section covers the areas of alcohol and drug abuse, attitude and present and past criminal behaviour. It also assists in determining the level of supervision to be decided upon and help to be determined, e.g. at maximum, medical and/or minimum level (Matshaba, 2006:36). It covers aspects associated with criminal behaviour (e.g. precursors, triggers, causes, motives, offender characteristics and influences) (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005a:41).

6.6.2 Section B: Education, Sport, Recreation and Employment

6.6.2.1 Educational background

Section B examines the offender’s educational background. In this section the offender is asked about his/her scholastic background. Questions are asked such as: Can the offender read and write? What is the highest grade the offender passed? In which year did the offender obtain the qualification? The offender will be asked about his/her skills development, e.g. is the offender trained in any specific profession, skill or trade? If the answer is yes, the correctional official must specify the skill or trade of the offender on the form. The correctional official must also indicate, in this section, the amount of experience the offender has in his/her profession, skill or trade, in years. The offender will also be asked whether he/she qualified or registered for a specific profession, skill or trade. If yes, the offender must specify. Does the offender have any tertiary education? If yes, the offender must specify the highest education achieved, e.g. degree, diploma, certificate, the field of study, and the year in which the qualification was obtained. Offenders will also be asked if they are currently studying with any institution. If yes, they must
specify the type of study or studies, name of diploma and/or degree. Does the offender have any specific education and training needs? If yes, the offender must specify.

6.6.2.2 Sports and Recreation

This section examines whether the offender has participated in any sports and recreation. Does the offender have any skills, interests and hobbies? Has the offender participated in any competitive sport (club, regional or national level)? If yes, the offender must specify. Does the offender have any formal training in sport and recreational activities, e.g. coaching, sport administration? Does the offender have any formal training in arts and cultural activities, e.g. professional dance, fine arts, graphic design? If yes, the offender must specify.

6.6.2.3 Employment history

The section investigates the offender’s employment history. The CAO will examine whether the offender was employed prior to his/her arrest and imprisonment. If yes, the offender must state the type of employment, e.g. full-time, permanent, part-time, seasonal, temporary, self-employment, consultation, contractual basis or unemployed.

The aim of Section B is to ensure that the needs of the particular offender are determined before the department can determine what programme the offender should be exposed to (Coetzee et al., 1995:11; Clements, 1986:3). The CAO will look closely at the basic areas of needs. There are areas which have a direct impact on criminal action such as employment, educational background, skills development, sports and recreation. This section will assist the CAO to compile a programme profile for the offender (Clements, 1986:6). Certain programmes must be selected for the offender and the priority for application of these programmes will be determined. This section is an area needs assessment that serves as a tool to identify the rehabilitation needs of an offender. It gives direction to the correctional officials who are responsible for programming and management classification (Pollock, 2006:163). Section B will recognise offenders according to their important treatment needs (Lester et al., 1992:76) and offers the
offender employment skills programmes and provides him/her with a range of personal development and rehabilitation programmes (South Africa Department of Correctional Services, 2002:37). Plaatjies (2008:146) also states that this section of the assessment will find out what type of rehabilitation and correctional programmes the offender has to enrol for. Some programmes may be essential for offenders in the prison.

6.6.3 Section C: Spiritual Care, Social and Emotional Well-being

6.6.3.1 Religious practice

Section C examines whether the offender is part of a religious practice. The offender will be asked whether he/she is a member or follower of any faith, religion, belief or denomination. What was the offender’s role or position in his/her faith, belief, church or denomination? Was the offender actively involved in his/her church or activities of his/her faith before his/her incarceration? If yes, the offender must specify. Does the offender need spiritual support from his/her church, faith representative or minister? If yes, the offender must specify the type of support required, e.g. religious services, baptism, counselling, visits from spiritual care workers, marriage counselling, consultations. Does the offender want to participate or continue with his/her religious activities in the correctional centre?

6.6.3.2 Social risks

This section does a check up with regard to the social risk that offenders pose. This section of the form consists of questions such as: Who was the offender living with at the time of his/her arrest? In this case, the offender must specify the relationship shared, e.g. mother, father, spouse, sister, brother. Who are the current significant family members, relative/s or friends of the offender, e.g. spouse, parents, grandparents, siblings, uncle, aunt, own children, in-laws, friends or other? The offender must specify. What type of accommodation did the offender stay in prior to his/her arrest and incarceration, e.g. own home, renting a house, renting a flat/room, or sharing accommodation with a relative or friend, living on the street, living in a shelter, shack or others?
The offender must specify. Section C.(11) of the form also examines the type of neighbourhood in which the offender grew up, e.g. informal settlement, shacks, government housing (RDP), inner city high flats, township, suburb, rural area, farm/small holdings, hostel. The form describes the type of contact, e.g. visits, telephonic contact, letter, between the offender and his/her significant others. If the offender does not have contact with family or friends, does he/she want to establish contact? Does the offender have relationship problems with significant others that need mediation? If yes, the offender must specify. Does the offender have any dependants? If yes, how many dependants (number of adult dependants or number of children)? Are the dependants related to the offender’s family? If yes, the offender must specify, e.g. mother, father, uncle, own child. The offender must provide the names of the dependants. The CAO who is conducting this interview must ensure that the offender indicates whether he/she is responsible for the maintenance of the child/children and also if he/she is the sole provider for the dependant/s. If yes, do the dependants require social assistance?

6.6.3.3 Emotional well-being

This section examines the emotional well-being of the offender. The CAO must ask the offender the questions that are related to his/her emotional well-being, such as: Did the offender ever receive any treatment for mental illness? If yes, the offender must specify when (year and month). Is the offender currently on treatment for attempted suicide, self-harm? If yes, the offender must specify. Does the offender have suicidal thoughts of harming himself/herself now? Has the offender recently experienced any flashbacks or nightmares relating to the victim or the incident? Has the offender ever been convicted for any sexual offence of any nature? The CAO must also check with the South African Police Service. If yes, the offender must specify the type of sexual offence, e.g. rape, attempted rape, sexual assault, statutory rape, indecent assault, sodomy. Before the offender was incarcerated, had he/she ever been a victim of physical, emotional or sexual abuse and/or was he/she a victim of crime such as rape, assault or robbery? If yes, this must be mentioned in this section of the form. Since the offender’s arrest and admission to the correctional centre, has he/she been physically or sexually abused? If yes, has the offender reported the incident? Did the court recommend psychological or psychiatric
treatment as part of the sentence? If yes, the offender must specify the type of treatment recommended.

The department must assess the needs of offenders after admission. Section C of the form ensures that the CAO evaluates and analyses the offender’s personal needs and responsiveness such as emotional well-being, religious issues, etc. The programme that is profiled will be compiled after the entire assessment action has been completed. It will be used to offer the correct rehabilitation programme to the offender, such as referring the offender for psychological evaluation with the aim of treating these sentenced offenders (Coetzee et al., 1995:134). This will help to maintain or improve their mental health (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:99). Since the offender is interviewed about the condition of his/her relationship with his/her family, he/she will be referred to social work services, which play an important and integral role in the treatment and rehabilitation programme of the offender under the control of this department. The aim of this assessment is to help the offender to maintain and strengthen the offender’s family relations. This is regarded as important to rehabilitate the offender (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:101). The social risk assessments which form part of this section will assist the parole boards by compelling them to consider sentencing the offender for possible conditional placement or to realise once such an offender has served the minimum part of his/her sentence as stipulated by the Act. Therefore this programme is known as reintegration into the community. The programme of reintegration is also part of the rehabilitation of the offender, preparing them for their ultimate release and assisting them in their adjustment to functioning as law-abiding citizens in the community (South Africa Department of Correctional Services, 2002:103-104).

Section C also ensures that it examines the offender to see if he/she can be referred for religious care. If the offender indicated on the form that he/she needs some spiritual support, Correctional Services will refer the offender to a religious worker of his/her choice. The religious care of the offender is an important prerequisite for the successful treatment of the offender (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:101).
The information that will be gathered in Sections B and C is based on the offenders’ needs. The information obtained in the needs assessment process makes sure that the offender is directed into the most suitable programming treatment learning, in that they point out those insufficiencies in medical, psychological, emotional and life skills with which the offender may need support. An offender may be directed toward drug treatment, alcohol treatment, educational or vocational programmes that are based on the assessment of needs (McShane & Kranse, 1993:100). To realise this, the needs of particular offenders must be identified before officials can determine what programme the offender should be exposed to. In this context a need is regarded as a lack of something essential, desirable or as a condition which requires relief (Nxumalo, 2002:69).

6.6.4 Section D: Security risk

This section determines and assesses the security risk of the offender. The CAO will examine the offender’s previous offence, comparing it with that written on SAP 69 (warrant of committal), to check the category of the previous crime to determine whether the offender is high risk, medium risk or low risk and the category of the current crime to check if he/she is high risk, medium risk or low risk. This section also covers the assessment of the length of the sentence. Is the offender serving more than one sentence? Has the offender previously escaped, attempted to escape or aided in an escape? Does the offender have previous probation placements, breach of parole or bail conditions? Does the offender have institutional offences or disciplinary action against him/her? Therefore it is very important for the CAO to check the admission detail report. The official must also assess whether the offender has ever been convicted of an offence that involves racism, racial or political conflict. If yes, the offender must specify. Does the offender have further charges against him/her? Has anyone verbally threatened to take something from him/her by use of force or by threatening to hurt him/her since the offender’s admission to the correctional centre? If yes, the offender must specify.

The main aim of this section is to ensure that the offender is placed in an appropriate level of security and to ensure that the department is aware of the type of crime committed by him/her as
well as the length of his/her sentence. It will be able to classify him/her in rehabilitation programmes that are suitable for that offence and for that length of sentence. Rehabilitation programmes will also be considered in a method that will guarantee that, after serving the sentence, the offender’s conduct has been fully changed (Muthaphuli, 2008:142). The section is also concerned with the safety of the offender against any form of threat by other offenders, since the department is concerned about the safe custody of the offenders.

6.6.5 Section E: Summary

This section makes provision for a holistic summary of the risks, needs and interventions derived from information collected throughout the assessment process from which a profile of the offender can be developed. The profile presents information about the offender’s cultural background, unique crime patterns and causes of criminal behaviour, precursors and triggers of crime and socio-economic and political influences and circumstances. The offender’s profile illustrates the biographic and social details of the offender and the causes, motives, triggers, needs, risks and offender characteristics of an individual offender (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005a:41).

The summary of the risks, needs and the decision guide for the comprehensive risk assessment tool is also utilised for completion of the sentence plan.

6.7 SENTENCE PLAN

The provision for an individual sentence plan in section 38(1) and (2) of the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 establishes that “in the case of sentence of imprisonment of 12 months or more, the manner in which the sentence should be served must be planned in the light of this assessment and by any comments by the sentencing court”. It establishes that all sentenced offenders should be assessed as soon as possible during their admission into the correctional facilities (Plaatjies, 2008:145).
The Department of Correctional Services should build up a personal offender-specific correctional sentence plan that will take the exact correctional setting, correctional centre or probation or community correctional supervision into account. Such a sentence plan will be based on the total needs of the specific offender. The following are the total needs of the specific offender (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

- Needs in terms of correcting offending behaviour (correctional plan);
- Security needs considering the human rights of the offender as an individual (security plan);
- The physical and emotional well-being of the offender needs (care plan);
- Needs for training and education (development plan);
- Needs in terms of allocated physical accommodation (facilities plan; and
- Needs in terms of the support required for the successful social reintegration of the offender (after-care plan).

The offender’s needs, shortly after admission into the correctional facilities, will be completely different from his/her needs 6-12 months into the sentence. Therefore the offender who is in the pre-release phase will differ from the offender who has been admitted to prison. This obliges the reconsideration of the correctional sentence plan after a predetermined period. It is important to understand the need for regular evaluation when offenders are involved in programmes (Plaatjies, 2008:147).

To correct an offender’s criminal behaviour, a sentence plan makes provision to address the risk and needs of offenders as recognised through the carefully planned risk assessment. It seeks to spell out what services/programmes are required to target offending behaviour and to help offenders develop skills to handle socio-economic conditions that lead to criminality. It also spells out the services and programmes that the offender needs to enhance his/her social functioning. The sentence plan sets time frames for activities to take place. It individualises who should ensure that the deliberate services programme is offered to the offender (correctional sentence plan). Plaatjies (2008:151) states that a sentence plan is a tool with which services to the offenders can be measured. The sentence plan makes provision for the offender to evaluate
services he/she has been exposed to. When the sentence plan is revised the offender should also be able to track his/her progress.

According to Du Preez (2003:85), a sentence plan identifies long-term goals, specific programmes, resources and supervision techniques for the term that the offender is sentenced. During the sentence of the offender there are some factors that can be addressed. The following achievements will be completed by the correctional assessment team:

- “The sentence plan, based on the cause of criminal behaviour and the offender assessment report, is developed;
- By making use of these reports it can be determined which of the criminal behaviour factors the offender can start working on and in what order;
- Definitions of long-term goals, specific programmes, resources and supervision techniques are compiled in this phase for the entire sentence;
- Officials in the operational level as well as the specialised level will monitor the offender’s progress throughout this phase;
- Some offenders may be given privileges such as permission to leave the prison, have private family visits and join other programmes because of their specific needs and their co-operative participation in programmes;
- The moment it has been established that the risk can be managed in the community, the offender must be prepared for release as soon as possible in the sentence;
- Correctional officials will strive to ensure that the intervention techniques and supervision approach used with each offender are as effective as possible;
- Sentence plans will be implemented and maintained in order to maintain the offender on a course intended to deal effectively with those critical problem areas that contributed to criminal behaviour;
- Correctional officials will ensure that the institution’s resources, both human and material, are used efficiently by focusing on areas most likely to reduce further criminal behavior;
- Correctional officials will make an effort to ensure consistency and continuity in case management throughout an offender’s sentence; and
• They will try to establish a behavioural baseline from which to measure progress on problem areas and make future decisions” (Du Preez, 2003:85-86).

The sentence plan form must be completed by the correctional assessment team during the admission (assessment) phase. The information must be translated from the individual offender profile. The form consists of a short-term intervention consisting of a 0-3-month period, a medium intervention of a 4-12-month period and a long-term intervention which consists of 12 months and above.

Short-term major areas of intervention are: security facilities and accommodation, corrections, social work, psychological health care, HIV and AIDS, spiritual care, formal education, skills development, sports, recreation, arts and culture, production on workshops and agriculture, social reintegration and legal services.

Short-term interventions are based on offender risks and needs and indicate major areas of intervention from 0-3 months. Medium-term interventions are based on offender risks and needs and indicate major areas of intervention from 4-12 months. Long-term interventions are based on offender risk needs and indicate major areas of intervention for 12 months and above (Du Preez, 2003:85-86).

6.8 CLASSIFICATION FOR TREATMENT NEEDS WITHIN SOUTH AFRICAN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Classification for treatment needs has to do with classifying offenders for treatment that may be distinguished as dealing with the needs of individuals for rehabilitation. According to Cilliers et al. (2008:105), classification for treatment needs is utilised as part of an assessment process to ensure the allocation of offenders in the establishment where they may benefit from treatment programmes. Institutions offer various and specific treatment programmes. However, identifying the rehabilitative needs of offenders can improve the management classification system and provide direction for correctional officials who are in charge of treatment programming.
6.8.1 Offender treatment programmes

In terms of section 2 of the Correctional Services Act, the Department of Correctional Services is not only obliged to detain convicted offenders, but to apply such treatment as to change offenders and probationers as may lead to their reformation and rehabilitation and to train them in habits of industry and labour, as far as practicable. The aim of the treatment and training of an offender is to cultivate in him/her the desire to live an honest and industrious life after his/her release from the correctional facilities and to develop self-respect and a sense of responsibility in him/her (Nxumalo, 2002:60).

Nxumalo (2002: 60) mentions that institutional treatment is the process in which all obtained knowledge applicable to the changing or reforming of the offender is processed and adapted according to the individual needs of the offender, with the aim of developing the offender in his/her efforts to realise his/her potential for growth and development, and with crime prevention as the final aim. The offender is developed by the treatment in his/her attempts to recognise the change, and treatment is also aimed at arranging for offender reintegration into society.

According to Neser (1993:251–252), different specialist disciplines make independent contributions, e.g. social workers, educators and psychologists, and their activities are also carried out independently of other treatments such as gratuities and privileges in the depth classification. The acceptance of the programme approach to treatment led to the rejection of the concepts of prognosis and compartmentalisation of treatment action as outdated. The level of a person’s behaviour, cognition and emotions is an indicator of the offender’s needs. If an offender or person is to perform productively in society, his/her needs must be in agreement with the norms of society. The Department of Correctional Services’s task is to provide need-orientated programmes in every prison. The main aim of improving the life skills of the offender is to ensure that the offender will not reoffend.
Coetzee et al. (1995:119 & 120) state: “The programme profile that is compiled after the entire assessment action has been completed is used to determine the priority of specific programmes to which each offender should be exposed. The programme profile can indicate one programme as being more important than another programme.”

Programmes are subdivided into the following categories (Nxumalo, 2002:70-71):

- **Universal programmes:** These are performances that are mainly aimed at effective control; nevertheless they still focus on the modification of the behaviour of the offender. They are activities which are appropriate to all offenders. The following are examples of universal programmes: gratification, security classification, discipline and privileges.

- **Subgroup treatment programmes:** To accommodate offenders who have ordinary qualities for structure, control, support and/or confrontation. These programmes make provision for differentiated treatment strategies. The treatment of young offenders, identified personality disorders and short-term offenders are examples.

- **Problem-orientated programmes:** These programmes consist of single or multiple actions which focus on the particular problem, for which a permanent ordinary structure and control is not necessary. These programmes are aimed at abolishing a specific adaptation, criminal or community interpretation problem. The following are examples of these programmes: job skills, alcohol and drug abuse, basic education and sexual adaptations.

- **Individual programmes:** These make conditions for offenders’ personal needs that cannot be accommodated in the subgroup treatment programmes or problem-orientated programmes. They are accessible for each prisoner irrespective of other programmes in which the offender is engaged. Examples of individual programmes are medical care, after-hours classes, consensual individual therapy and support.

One offender’s needs may be different and various offenders may have different needs. Therefore, to be able to identify a need, it must be determined first and to be able to do this
certain needs assessment schemes are used. The Department of Correctional Services has developed programmes to satisfy the wide variety of needs for these purposes. The list of needs of a particular offender is known as the needs disposition of an offender. The types and number of programmes which must satisfy the needs disposition of the offender are known as the programme profile of the offender. To compile a programme profile of the offender, certain programmes must be selected for the offender and priority for the application of these programmes must be determined (Nxumalo, 2002:69).

The information that was gathered in Sections B and C is based on the offenders’ needs. The information obtained in the needs assessment process makes sure that the offender is directed into the most suitable programming treatment learning, in that they point out those insufficiencies in medical, psychological, emotional and life skills with which the offender may need support. An offender may be directed toward drug treatment, alcohol treatment, educational or vocational programmes that are based on the assessment of needs (McShane & Kranse, 1993:100).

Treatment in this perspective involuntarily comprises training. Classification means that it is likely that an offender’s treatment programme will be integrated with those of other offenders receiving the same treatment. However, it is essential to determine the benefit that an offender would draw from a particular treatment programme to ensure the valuable use of expensive training programmes (Nxumalo, 2002:52). The main aim of offender classification is to give offenders a chance and opportunity to change their offensive behaviour to behaviour that will be accepted by society. During admission every sentenced offender is therefore screened carefully and evaluated for placement in treatment programmes and training best suited to their needs. Classification examines the problems of the person through the use of every available technique, through social investigations, medical, psychiatric, psychological examinations, vocational, religious and recreational studies. After successful assessment, a correctional official meeting will take place to plan and summarise a sound and realistic programme best appropriate to the offender’s needs, making use of available resources within the correctional institution. Therefore the classification system should help to ensure that the offender takes part in suitable, integrated
programmes that will help him/her during imprisonment and following his/her release into society (Nxumalo, 1997:106-107).

The Department of Correctional Services (2005b:72) is of the opinion that rehabilitation is best facilitated through a holistic sentence planning process that connects the offender at all levels of social, moral, spiritual, physical, work, education/intellectual and mental, within the departmental environment.

6.8.2 Training (skills development)

The Department of Correctional Services also offers skills development programmes as part of the rehabilitation service. The Constitution states in section 2A that every citizen is allowed to be educated. In these skills development programmes the offender’s labour market potential is developed as the offender undertakes activities that advance their knowledge, skills and attributes and this improves their social functioning (Muthaphuli, 2008:165). Offenders who will be part of training programmes are determined mainly by the length of the sentence, interest, aptitude and available facilities (Nxumalo, 2002:91). Skill development programmes consist of the elements of vocational, proficiency, selection of allocation and instruction training (Coetzee et al., 1995:130).

6.8.2.1 Vocational training

Since information is summarised to the offender’s profile tool, section B7(2) of the Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment qualifies whether the offender has any specific profession, skill or trade. That assessment specifies if the offender has no training in any specific profession, skills or trade. Therefore the offender will be classified for training programmes comprising vocational and proficiency training since he/she has no necessary level of education.

This involves the training of offenders in building, hairdressing for women and workshop trade. Vocational training entails training offenders in an industry to obtain a diploma or certificate
from the Department of Labour or the National Training Council on successful completion of the training. A new training system complying with the most up-to-date training developments was implemented in collaboration with various training councils. This training is in agreement with modern difficulties with regard to training and it makes it possible for the Department of Correctional Services to develop the labour skills of an offender through affordable career-orientated and market related training programmes. Nxumalo (1997:115) stresses that vocational training programmes “should be related to the job market. A variety of areas should be available, including co-operation with correctional industries, work assignments, apprenticeships, on-the-job training and other vocationally related programmes”.

Nxumalo (1997:119) also explains that vocational training has to do with training offenders in cooking, baking, meat cutting, the operation of power and filtration plants and refrigeration equipment, automotive maintenance and repairs, carpentry, plumbing, painting, bricklaying, sheet metal work, installation of electrical equipment and internal operations assignments in the hospital, laundry and dry-cleaning and clothing repair plants.

6.8.2.2 Proficiency training

Proficiency training requires specialised training and where relevant, external organisations issue certificates. Proficiency training represents those fields of training where trade status cannot be obtained.

External courses, internal courses and in-task training are utilised to improve the labour skills of offenders who are not part of the vocational training, in a market-related manner, thereby promoting entrepreneurship and self-sufficiency. External courses are offered by way of instruction from the external training partners or instructors who are trained and approved by the training boards and other external organisations to present training to offenders on behalf of such organisations.
Most offenders who end up in prison come from disadvantaged backgrounds and lack marketable skills. Therefore there is a need for the department to train them.

6.8.2.3 Selection and allocation

Offenders are allocated training and/or work according to their qualifications, previous experience, aptitude, ability, mental and physical health and length of sentence. The selection and allocation of each offender is approved by the institution committee. In this allocation offender needs and the opportunities of available offender training also play a part.

After training has been allocated, the offender will be monitored by the institution committee. Should it occur that an offender does not have the ability for a specific allocation, that offender will be re-allocated in another training direction. Should it occur that an offender is not fit for any training, he/she will be allocated for constructive labour.

6.8.2.4 Instruction

By way of external training partners, modern workshops and fully trained instructors in the building and other trade groups, training is particularly well organised. In more than 22 building and workshops in-training is offered by qualified artisans. The training involves the following: electronics, mechanics, furniture manufacturers, assembly work, welding, upholstery, etc. Classes in theoretical technical subjects are presented by qualified technical educationalists. Offenders who are competent artisans are involved in training apprentices. Offenders who also completed their training and are qualified continue to work in prison workshops (Coetzee et al., 1995:133).

“Two offenders from Pollsmoor Correctional Facility participated in an international arts contest for offenders: ‘Discover the Face of Life Arts Competition’ and won the prize for the best
artworks. Each offender received twelve thousand dollars in prize money” (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2006:34).

According to the South African Department of Correctional Services (2009:64-65), the following factors had a positive impact on the number of offenders participating in the skill development programmes:

- “Many offenders were interested in the newly introduced national certificate (vocational) and moved from formal Education to skill development to enrol for said programme. This programme enhances the learner’s chance of employment.
- Better and effective marketing of skills programmes through monitoring and evaluation visits.
- Joint implementation approach on NC (V) by both skill development practitioner and Formal Educators.
- Introduction of new skills programmes: new venture creation and SMME founded by SASSETA.
- Provision of resources for the new curriculum - National Certificate (Vocational).”

6.8.3 Education

Nxumalo (1997:111) feels that within the correctional setting, education should be an important part of the whole treatment programme. The Department of Correctional Services should maintain a good balance in academic, vocational and physical education and recreation. During admission, offenders undergo the wide-ranging risk and needs assessment process to analyse offender behaviour and their educational background is examined. If the offender, during completion of Section B(7) of the comprehensive risk and needs assessment, was shown have no specific profession, skill or trade, the offender will be classified for treatment purposes that will suit his/her needs to improve his/her level of literacy. The Department of Correctional Services should emphasise the principle of individualisation of programmes focused on individual educational needs (Nxumalo, 1997:112).
Educational programmes in the Department of Correctional Services range from courses for literacy to tertiary extension courses (Nxumalo, 1997:112). “The aim of education programmes is to give all sentenced offenders who are illiterate and wish to further their education, the opportunity to increase their level of education. Sentenced offenders who have the ability to benefit from academic and/or technical studies are the target group” (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:96). Section B(7) of the Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment form analyses whether the offender can read and write and the highest grade passed. Since this information is used for sentence planning, the offender will be referred to the relevant level of educational programme.

The Department of Correctional Services offers three programmes of education and training, i.e. general education and training (GET), further education and training (FET) as well as higher education and training (HET). Within GET, education is offered under pre-ABET literacy tuition and ABET levels 1-4. In this regard the department adheres to the guidelines set out by the Department of Education regarding ABET. FET offers offenders free education from Grades 10 to 12 as well as N1-N3 of business studies. Like GET, FET is offered in line with requirements of the Department of Education for FET. Offenders can also receive training through distance learning. Lastly, HET incorporates certificates, diplomas and professional qualifications which are offered through correspondence. To obtain these qualifications, offenders have to fund their own studies (Muthaphuli, 2008:167).

Meeting the educational needs of offenders requires a comprehensive knowledge of the offender. Close working relationships between educational and classification personnel are necessary. The procedure of improving the system should include input from the offenders and reconsideration of the education programme on a regular basis (Nxumalo, 1997:113).
6.8.4 Library

The prison library offers an opportunity for relaxation activities and also provides the offender with a link to what is happening in society outside the prison. The prison library supports the educational programme (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:101).

According to Nxumalo (1997:114), most prisons have some kind of library. Nevertheless this by and large is a collection from very terrible to average available reading material. In trying to improve sufficient libraries there is a serious problem with regard to expenditure. Since there are few institutions which set money aside in their operating budget to purchase up-to-date library materials, they must usually rely on books donated from outside sources, which are often useless and may not be of general interest to the offender/s.

Libraries are accepted as a valuable means of promoting many practical and cultural aspects of social life for offenders. There are well up-to-date libraries which include fiction and non-fiction, as well as textbooks and technical publications and offenders are motivated to use the resources or facilities that are available within the correctional system. In addition to the provision of books of general interest, the library assists offenders who are studying to obtain study material (Coetzee et al., 1995:130).

6.8.5 Recreational programme

A healthy body usually promotes a healthy mind and facilitates adaptation to the realities of the prison environment. Therefore, it is essential for the Department of Correctional Services to make provision for recreational facilities. These programmes not only offer a release from excess energy and work boredom, they also promote physical health (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:97). Nxumalo (2002:91) also mentions that the prevention of idleness and the cultivation of a well-balanced lifestyle are established through recreational programmes.
Recreational programmes include coaching in a variety of sports and teaching recreational activities such as chess, and games such as soccer and volleyball. Opportunities are provided for cultural activities such as choirs, traditional dancing, music and drama groups. Young offenders also participate in competitive sports activities such as soccer and athletics, after hours and on Saturdays. Entertainment such as videos and films are very popular with young offenders since most prisons have central broadcasts and television programmes (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:97).

“The department signed Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with the South African Football Association (SAFA), Athletics South Africa (ASA), the South African Rugby Union (SARU), Tennis South Africa (TSA) and SA Handball. The agreement is in keeping with the departmental objective of ensuring that development programmes for offenders are accredited and will be to their benefit” (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2006:34).

Owing to the 2010 FIFA Soccer World Cup in South Africa, management at Leeuwkop approached the vision of offender rehabilitation through sports (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2010:21).

6.8.6 Psychological services

By means of the Risk and Needs Assessment form, offenders are referred for psychological diagnosis and treatment (Nxumalo, 2002:81). The Directorate of Psychological Services offers psychological services which ensure that offenders are rehabilitated for them to reintegrate successfully into society. Psychological services aim to offer professional services to offenders, probationers as well as parolees with a view to promoting their mental health and emotional well-being.

During the admission of the offenders the Directorate of Psychological Services ensures that they are diagnosed as soon as possible. This is to ensure that the offenders are treated according to their needs since they can be classified for rehabilitation purposes, such as basic offender needs, attitudes, motivation and attributes so that they can be offered the necessary programme to bring about desired changes in values, attitudes and skills (Muthaphuli, 2008:160).
The psychologists make use of methods such as individual therapy, group therapy and family therapy to ensure that the treatment of the offender is effective, which will in turn strengthen their rehabilitation. These methods are applied to different types of offenders ranging from those with suicidal tendencies to those who request these services themselves (Muthaphuli, 2008:160).

The psychologists’ function within the structure of the psychological mental health programme aims to treat sentenced offenders to maintain or improve their mental health (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:99).

The psychologist assesses each offender, classifies him/her in one of the categories and treats him/her accordingly. The following are the categories in which offenders are placed:

- **Category I**: Offenders are treated mainly by the psychiatrist or district surgeon by making use of medical services and by involving them in psychotherapy for support only.
- **Category II**: Offenders are involved mainly in psychotherapy and receive medical services for support.
- **Category III**: Offenders are treated by means of the ordinary control measures of the institutional committee or are involved in other programmes.
- **Category IV**: Offenders are those whose report must be submitted to the parole board or the National Advisory Board on Correctional Services.

The psychologist is mainly involved with offenders who are classified in category II (Coetzee et al., 1995:128-135).

### 6.8.7 Social work services

“Social casework is an art in which knowledge of the science of human relations and skills in relationships are used to mobilize capacities in the individual and resources in the community appropriate for better adjustment between the client and all or any part of his total environment. Social casework is a process used by certain human welfare agencies to help individuals to cope more effectively with their problems in social functioning” (Van Hove, 1962:131-132).
There are three levels of treatment which will usually be offered: financial, employment problems to be arranged and psychosocial treatment that is needed to make achievable or facilitate the client’s adjustment to society. Individual treatment is most effective throughout the association. The professionally trained social workers make use of one of the three methods of treatment or social casework, social groupwork and social welfare planning or community organisation (Van Hove, 1962:131).

According to Nxumalo (1997:124), the Social Services Unit is an essential section of the programme of any organisation. A well-organised, well-trained and adequately staffed social service unit has contact with every individual in the institution. Hugo (1976:13) summarises the tasks of a social worker that are also relevant to offenders. These tasks are as follows:

- To help and allow offenders to understand their positions and responsibilities in their current state of affairs. The offender may not be prepared to make the necessary changes if they do not thoroughly understand their position.

- To help the offenders to accept their responsibilities towards themselves and their dependants. Therefore they must be motivated to do something about the condition and to be accountable.

- To help the offender to make accepted values in life their own, so that their lifestyle is acceptable to society.

- To assist offenders by way of a professional relationship, to take a stand on their problem and their situation. This means that the offenders must have an active share in treatment programmes, must be assisted to make a concerted effort to change and must be supported in their efforts to change.

- To ensure that after-care is carried out, thereby assisting the offenders to take their rightful place in society and satisfy the demands of a responsible existence.

- To transfer offenders who cannot be assisted within the framework of social work to another service profession where they can obtain the necessary assistance.
The aim of the Social Services Unit is to assist offenders to achieve a better self-image within the social sphere of the prison and also after being released to a society of law-abiding citizens (Nxumalo, 2002:84).

“Like psychologists, social workers also have the responsibility to determine the needs of offenders and to ensure that they are placed under programmes which are suitable for their needs. Social workers ensure that offenders are provided with programmes that help them deal with substance abuse, marriage and family, life skills and sexual offending, amongst other things. These programmes contribute positively to the lives of the offenders as they ensure that they move away from their old habits and develop a new life, thereby ensuring their complete rehabilitation” (Muthaphuli, 2008:163).

Van Hove (1962:131) identifies three processes of social casework: investigation, a diagnosis and treatment. These processes are discussed below:

- **Investigation**

The intention of investigation is to obtain sufficient information to evaluate whether the offender’s problems fall within the framework of the institution’s activities and whether the offender’s state of affairs is such that effective help can be offered to allow him/her to get to the bottom of his/her problem and solve it. The facts are, in the first instance, collected from the offender himself/herself. However, general investigations are not necessary. Certain information therefore could have been collected in every case such as age, marital status, education standard, which is not always available in the files.

- **Diagnosing**

Social casework believes that a person should have as detailed knowledge as possible of the offender’s past history for making a diagnosis of a case. When enough information has been obtained and the facts are straight, in an orderly manner, the psychosocial diagnosis will be the next step to be drawn up in order to determine the problem. This diagnosis is not static but
active in nature. Movement and change in the offender in relation to his/her problem will necessitate re-evaluations and new diagnosis. Diagnosis assists in selecting treatable problems. In most case files, no record of a diagnosis is found. However, it has been accepted that a summary diagnosis is made before treatment is planned.

- **Treatment**

There are three methods of casework treatment: administration of practical service, environmental manipulation, direct treatment or counselling.
- Administration of a practical service is one of the best known and oldest casework treatment types. This type of treatment assists the offender in choosing and using a social resource afforded by the community.
- Environment manipulation: embraces all attempts to correct or improve the situation in order to reduce strain and pressure and all modifications of the living experience to offer opportunities for growth or change.
- Direct treatment is meant as a series of interviews approved with the aim of bringing to mind or reinforcing the approach favourable to maintaining emotional balance, to making positive decisions and to growth or change to the offenders. Counselling is the most ordinary term of direct interviewing treatment, which is intentional to help offenders to deal with the issues of their situation in a rational manner (Van Hove, 1962:132-134).

### 6.8.8 Religious Services

The CAO ensures that all sentenced offenders undergo the risk and needs assessment process after admission. During that assessment it is determined whether the offender was part of a religious practice and actively involved in his/her church and whether the offender needs spiritual support from the church. If the offender is in agreement that he/she needs spiritual support, then he/she must specify the type of support required, e.g. religious services, baptism, visits from spiritual care workers.
In terms of the Correctional Services Act 8 of 1959, provision is made for the appointment of chaplains as officials and mini-services are provided to any offender or group of offenders. Therefore chaplains have been appointed in command areas to deal with the religious care of offenders (Coetzee & Gericke, 1997:1010). In the true sense of the word, chaplains’ pastoral responsibilities are in respect of personnel and their departments, prisoners, people under correctional supervision and probationers. They are also managers of religious care in a certain geographical area. Chaplains are responsible for the management of religious care provided by the churches/beliefs as partners, the marketing of religious care within and outside the Department of Correctional Services by liaising with the control bodies of churches and beliefs; public appearances at churches/beliefs; the orientation and equipment of religious workers and obtaining and managing auxiliary services for religious care (Nxumalo, 2002:87).

The vision of the Department of Correctional Services regarding religious care is to encourage the practice of religion provided that offenders have the right to practise the religion of their choice.

According to Coetzee et al. (1995:144), there are two aims of religious care. Firstly, it is a basic right to which offenders are entitled and secondly, it is an essential feature in the successful care of offenders. The aim of the Department of Correctional Services with regard to religious care is to encourage and allow offenders satisfaction regarding their religious needs and tendencies without interfering in church and belief principles or acts and with due respect for the religious beliefs and practices of other offenders and personnel.

The mission of religious care is to provide this service to personnel and persons under the control of the Department of Correctional Services in conjunction with churches/beliefs and other institutions. This mission outlines the aim of all objectives and activities which are managed under religious care with regard to the development and/or preservation of people’s religious lives and general quality of life (Coetzee et al., 1995:143–144).
Young offenders are also given opportunities to take part in or organise religious services, receive religious visits, education and/or counselling and to possess and retain the necessary books in terms of religious observance and instruction. Young offenders also have the choice not to take part in religious services, education, counselling or indoctrination (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:111).

6.9 OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION FOR WORK

The Department of Correctional Services must offer the offender work that can give him/her enough experience to ensure that he/she is fully rehabilitated and can be productive after release. The White Paper on Corrections (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b) states that offenders must be provided with productive work which is based on the following principles:

- It should form part of the sentence plan of the offender.
- The work must consider the nature of the offence as well as the characteristics of the offender.
- The work should contribute toward the human development of the offender.
- The work must meet all general requirements of labour legislation and the departmental policy regarding the remuneration system for labour performed by offenders.
- All offenders should benefit from prison work irrespective of race, class or gender so that they can all become productive citizens of society after release.
- All offenders who have done some work should be provided with proof so that it can increase their chances of being employed after they have been released from correctional facilities.

In terms of work labour purposes, offenders who are classified for specific labour must be documented as such on the offender’s identification card. The Department of Correctional Services must also take account of professional qualifications which the offender possesses, as well as physical abilities or disabilities and any special interests. Offenders who are allocated work in the kitchen must be examined and also be declared medically fit before they are
classified to execute such tasks. Offenders, who are qualified, as far as possible, must be utilised according to trade orientation. Within a week of admission, an offender must be assigned to specific work areas. If an offender is classified to a specific work team, but cannot start with this team, he/she must be conditionally classified as an ordinary labourer (South African Department of Correctional Services, 1988).

In addition, an offender must not be forced to work as a form of punishment or disciplinary measure (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:599).

“The correctional system must provide the offenders with meaningful labour that will ensure that they are successfully rehabilitated when they return to society. This labour must provide offenders with the necessary skills that will ensure their successful reintegration. Offenders will be fully focused on the kind of labour that they perform in the correctional centre if it has meaning and can help them sustain their lives. From the constitution, it is clear that forced labour is no means of punishment, hence the Department of Correctional Services cannot force an offender to perform labour unless it is for a good cause and will eventually lead to the rehabilitation” (Muthaphuli, 2008:129).

Van Zyl Smit and Dunkel (2001:599) also state that sentenced offenders have a duty to work but only if it is related to labour which is related to any development programme or is intended to promote the habit of industry. It is usual for all offenders who are regarded as mentally and physically fit to be kept busy with labour that becomes meaningful after they are released from prison to society. They should be kept busy with labour for a maximum of 10 hours every working day.

The limitations that are placed on the different categories of offenders with regard to work performance are as follows:

- Offenders who are regarded as predestined may not be expected to perform any work without their agreement.
- Offenders with additional criminal charges may not work outside the prison walls.
• Offenders who are pending the obligation of corporal punishment may not work outside the prison.
• Offenders who are physically disabled, or who as a result of old age are not physically fit to do hard labour may only do cleaning work.
• Unsentenced offenders (including judgement debtors) may only clean their own cells, toilets and eating utensils. If they are willing to perform any other work, they should apply in writing (Neser, 1993:339).

The Department of Correctional Services has found out that most South African offenders are classified as unskilled workers and lack vocational skills. The department’s primary task is to help offenders to become skilled in order to perform tasks. Therefore work and training within the correctional centres are complementary to each other and in-service training is seen as a priority. Offenders who are sentenced are classified into three categories for labour provision, and this also serves as part of in-service training. The three types of work available in prisons are artisans, specialised workers and constructive unskilled labourers. Neser (1993:335) discusses these types of labour as follows:

• **Artisans**

The work of artisans is a type of labour that the sentenced offenders may be qualified for and they are allowed to practise the trades for which they are qualified. In addition to these offenders, other offenders are selected to undergo training in artisan fields and they receive on-the-job training as artisans.

• **Specialised workers**

The specialised workers require specialised training which is usually presented over very short periods before an offender can begin his/her work. This category includes tailors, cobblers, writers, cooks and tractor drivers.
• **Constructive unskilled labour**

The offender who is allocated to this group is not offered any formal training. If the offender has never performed this type of work before, the department will offer him/her an opportunity for in-service training. Most of the work done with the correctional centre could be classified as constructive unskilled labour. This category of work includes activities such as:

- cleaning of prisons and prison premises;
- laundry work;
- agricultural work; and
- assistants to artisan offenders.

### 6.10 CLASSIFICATION FOR SPECIAL NEEDS CASES

Special concern needs to be offered to a number of groups of offenders who are not part of the consistent majority. A needs-based rehabilitation approach involves that the Department of Correctional Services should guarantee the condition of suitable facilities, services and processes for each of these categories (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

Special categories of offenders in the South African Correctional Services consist of children in detention, female offenders, offenders with disabilities, elderly offenders, offenders with mental illnesses, first-time offenders, offenders with long sentences or life sentences and detained offenders who are foreign nationals.

The above categories of offenders are discussed below and the kinds of demands they impose on the South African correctional system and what can be done to ensure their rehabilitation are also explored.
6.10.1 Children in detention

Section 7(2)(c) of Correctional Services Act, 1998 (Act 111 of 1998), stipulates that children must be kept separate from adult offenders and in the accommodation appropriate to their age, as young offenders are predisposed to negative influence. The aim of this separation is the provision of the distinctive custodial, development and treatment programmes, as well as spiritual care, in an environment conducive to the care, development and motivation of youths to participate and to develop their potential.

According to the White Paper on Corrections (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b), young offenders are part of a category of people who, even after serving a lengthy sentence, still have an opportunity to do something with their lives as individuals. The Department of Correctional Services’s view on children in custody is that different age groups of children require different services and should, as far as possible, be housed separately. The department has an appropriate policy that serves various age categories of children.

Even though there are methods to remove children from the criminal justice system, there are still instances where children are sent to prison. The Department of Correctional Services has therefore set up separate facilities for youths in prison to enhance the education, rehabilitation and development prospects of these young offenders (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2002:71).

Van Zyl Smit and Dunkel (2001:605) maintain that section 19(1)(a) of the 1998 Correctional Services Act provides that children who are subject to compulsory education programmes must attend such programmes. Moreover, the prison authority must also provide access to educational programmes to children who are not subject to compulsory education (section 19(1)(b)). All children in prison must be provided with social work services, religious care, recreational programmes and psychological services.
Young offenders have the same basic needs as those of any other person in the department. Just like any human being, they also have welfare, medical, psychological and educational needs. Each of these needs is discussed below (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:193).

- **Welfare needs**

The social work services are responsible for attending to and addressing welfare needs. In order to identify a young offender’s needs and problems, there are different techniques that are utilised to collect and analyse information. Offenders willingly receive social work treatment which may be either intensive or supportive. Youth offenders are encouraged, by correctional staff, to register their requests so that they can be attended to by social workers (Coetzee et al., 1995:158).

- **Medical needs**

The youth’s basic needs are prioritised by the Department of Correctional Services. The physical care of offenders is an integral part of the broader departmental line function. It forms a part of the legal instruction and mission of the Department of Correctional Services. As such, young offenders have the basic human rights of access to a comprehensive health system and services which allow them to develop to their full potential, even though their physical freedom is taken away on detention. For the Department of Correctional Services to maintain the health of young offenders it makes resources such as district surgeons, prison hospitals and treatment by external medical services available where necessary; therefore it is essential that means be available for young offenders’ well-being (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:193).
• Psychological needs

Youth offenders need psychological treatment in many cases since most of them experience stress and depression during their incarceration. During the observation phase that takes place as soon as young offenders are admitted, the Department of Correctional Services ensures that it carries out psychological treatment of young offenders according to the determined objectives. The clinical psychologist is involved primarily in the correct allocation of offenders to various academic and training courses. A further task is to identify and remedy study problems. The psychologist conducts group treatment gatherings, which cover subjects such as effective communication, effective study methods, time management and decision making (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:194).

The advances implemented in fundamental and developmental psychology in youth corrections associate a normative move towards emphasising human rights and legal safeguards with an expansion which seeks to maximise rehabilitation settlement. The strong emphasis on developmental psychology and its placement within a well-elaborated normative framework of youth correction demonstrates that fundamental and developmental psychology in youth corrections is safely based on the state-of-the-art legal and social science research (Du Preez & Luyt, 2004:ix).

• Education needs

According to Du Preez and Luyt (2004:194), among young offenders, there is high illiteracy or poor scholastic achievement. The assignment of educationists has to do with the identification of young offender educational and training needs as well as administration and presentation of education programmes. It is the responsibility of correctional staff to register young offenders’ requests and also to refer them to relevant staff members.
The services and programmes provided to the youth should assist them in their transition to full adulthood. The department must also address night supervision in correctional centres for the youth (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

6.10.2 Female offenders

Female offenders are incarcerated entirely separately from male offenders. In the past, female offenders were excluded from some of the training opportunities normally available to men and were instead offered courses in feminine activities such as hairdressing (Van Zyl Smit & Dunkel, 2001:603).

In order for the department to reduce the negative impact on family life, it has an obligation to imprison female offenders as close to home as possible, especially if they are mothers, and must also provide women’s units in each and every correctional institution (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

Due to the low number of female offenders, training facilities offered to female offenders have historically tended to be less well resourced. It has been argued that this goes against the principle of equality before the law and non-discrimination on the basis of gender or sex. It is essential that the growth chances that are offered to women enable them to take their place in the formal economy of South Africa and to be financially independent. Female offenders who are sentenced have a greater potential for successful rehabilitation through alternative sentences.

There are special training programmes that are designed for females in every correctional institution. Female offenders have different programmes from male offenders. This also applies to training programmes. The correctional institution must ensure that every sentenced female offender takes part in training programmes that will ensure their rehabilitation. The department must offer female offenders special skills that will ensure that they reintegrate successfully into society (Muthaphuli, 2008:108).
On the issue of female offenders with children, the department is responsible for sound physical, social and mental care as well as the development of infants and young children who stay with their mothers in prison (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2002:70).

The department provides mother and child units within correctional centres with separate sleeping accommodation for mothers and their children as well as a crèche facility in order to promote the child’s physical and emotional development and care. The department should be focused on the normalisation of the environment. Small children who are not in correctional centres with their mothers require particular access to their mothers in order to minimise negative effects of the separation from their mothers that may occur and to prepare for the ultimate release of the mother. The departmental professional child care workers and social workers must be responsible for offering services that foster the mother-child relationship (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

6.10.3 Offenders with disabilities

The Department of Correctional Services follows the national policy framework on persons with disabilities. The provision of suitable facilities must include facilities for the enhancement of rehabilitation of these offenders. It should not be limited to just the physical accommodation needs (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

The department must ensure that offenders with disabilities are treated in a suitable manner. Therefore it is essential for correctional officials to be well educated and trained in the management of disabled offenders (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

6.10.4 Elderly offenders

The subject of older offenders cannot be ignored since it has a most important impact on the function of the Department of Correctional Services. This type of offender results in heavy costs when it comes to their rehabilitation and that creates problems for correctional institutions. Their
physical, mental and medical health care has implications for prison policy makers, administration and staff (Muthaphuli, 2008:115).

In terms of the White Paper on Corrections (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b), while there are a number of the elderly who are sentenced for serious offences, the sentences, conviction and referrals of such people should be a concern once they reach a certain advanced age. Therefore the department must ensure that correctional centres are equipped to adjust structured day activities to needs of the elderly offenders.

The essential elements in the case management of elderly offenders that should be taken into consideration are as follows:

- The stipulation of recreational activities that are appropriate for the elderly;
- Facilities that can effortlessly provide for the physical demands on elderly people; and
- The stipulation of suitable medical care for elderly offenders.

These must all be integrated into the case management system (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

6.10.5 Offenders with mental illness

Offenders with mental health problems require special treatment from the correctional system and they should be able to have access to that treatment whenever they need it. It is a known fact that offenders with mental illnesses should never be admitted into a correctional centre (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

In addition, these offenders should rather be sent to institutions with the necessary knowledge to deal with them. However, because these offenders are difficult to identify during their trial or before they go to the correctional centre, some of them are only identified when they are inside the prison as being mentally ill (Muthaphuli, 2008:111).
Offenders who are sentenced and who are thought to be mentally ill must be treated in accordance with the Mental Health Act. It is necessary that the examination of the offender provided for in the Mental Health Act is not done by the management member or head of the correctional facility, but rather at the starting point of psychiatric recommendation (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

Muthaphuli (2008:112) stresses that the correctional system must ensure that every offender is screened in order to identify those who might need treatment. It is important for the department to keep track of older offenders’ progress, since they have unstable health conditions. This will assist the department in developing programmes that are successful for this group of offenders. Officials who have knowledge of mental health must avail themselves to help with the rehabilitation of this type of offender. Since psychologists have knowledge of mental illness, they can be used for the treatment of mentally ill offenders. They will be able to identify efficient ways in which such offenders can be dealt with and they will determine which rehabilitation programme will be effective. Suitable medication must be provided under the supervision of professionals. In addition, the professionals have to identify offenders which show suicide tendencies so that they can be monitored regularly. Professionals must oversee the programmes designed for mentally ill offenders on a daily basis to avoid further complications.

It is the duty of the Department of Correctional Services to ensure that its staff members are trained in the recognition of signs of mental illness and should be under strict orders to immediately report to the head of the correctional centre if an offender appears to be mentally ill. The process of referral of an offender to a psychiatric institution must involve legal representation on behalf of the offender. Any period that an offender spends in a psychiatric institution should automatically be well thought out considering the person sentenced (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).
6.10.6 First offenders

Offenders who are sentenced for less serious offences and for the first time should as far as possible be housed separately from offenders who have reoffended as in general they have better potential for rehabilitation. The criminal justice system of South Africa must consider the separation of first offenders at the beginning of the awaiting trial period. First offenders are also regarded as young offenders. They should receive priority with regard to service delivery, rehabilitation, correctional intervention and resource allocation (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

6.10.7 Offenders with long sentences or life sentences

“There has been a significant increase in the proportion of South Africans incarcerated who are to serve life and long-term sentences. This poses particular challenges to the department, as the provision of a structured day of activity and rehabilitation and correctional services to people over such extended periods of time will drain a lot of resources. Given that this category of offenders also tends to be inclined towards aggression, the consequences of inactivity of such persons are a threat to the secure, safe and orderly management of the correctional centres where they are detained” (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005:167).

6.10.8 Incarcerated offenders who are foreign nationals

The primary aim of the Department of Correctional Services is to rehabilitate offenders and to ensure their victorious reintegration into a law-abiding society. With the case of foreign offenders who are imprisoned by the South African Correctional Services, this objective is not practical. Since the foreign nationals are to be banished to their own country of origin, after they are released on parole or complete their sentences, their connection in relation to education and training cannot be achieved. For the department to classify offenders for treatment needs, it requires an assessment of the causes of offence, the nature of the community of origin, the family and social environment from which the offender came from and to which they will return. The
department will not be able to conduct good assessments for classifying foreign offenders for treatment needs (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b).

The Department of Correctional Services should be engaged in offender exchange agreements with countries from which most foreign nationals, who break into South Africa, originate. This will then smooth the progress of the urgent extradition of such offenders in order to serve their sentences in their own countries and in an environment in which rehabilitation will be possible. The department prefers to provide rehabilitation programmes to its citizens since rehabilitation of offenders is resource intensive and it is not justifiable to use the limited resources for offenders who may not benefit from them.

According to Du Preez and Luyt (2004:212), special needs can be defined as a need to which exceptional attention has to be given using out-of-the-ordinary materials and resources. Dealing with a special need also requires considerable time, patience and effort. Sometimes it is very difficult to meet a special need at the required time or with the required effort. Sometimes an extraordinary effort needs to be made.

6.11 OFFENDER CLASSIFICATION FOR SECURITY FROM A SOUTH AFRICAN PERSPECTIVE

The main aim of the department’s security services is to house offenders in safe custody under humane conditions in terms of legal warrants until they are discharged lawfully from the correctional system into a society of law-abiding citizens (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2002:64).

Section 2(a) of the Correctional Services Act of 1998 regulates security classification. In addition to the legislative requirements, the Department of Correctional Services published the White Paper on Corrections in February 2005. Security forms part of the core business of the South African Correctional Services.

There are five categories of offenders in South African Correctional Services, namely:
unsentenced offenders (mainly offenders standing trial on charge and detained in prison pending conclusion of the judicial process);
short-term offenders (offenders serving a sentence of less than two years);
long-term offenders (offenders serving a sentence of two years and longer);
unsentenced children/juveniles and youth between the ages of 14 and 25; and
sentenced children/juveniles and youths between the ages of 14 and 25.

Neser (1993:259) has found that “from research that was done into the variables that play a role in the safe custody classification of the offender, it became evident that the present crime, the effective sentence and the previous criminal record were regarded as the prime variables. There was the consensus that was the biggest single predictor of the degree of safe custody to which a offender should be subjected. The longer the effective sentence, the higher the initial degree of safe custody ought to be”. Correctional Services Order B, chapter 15, services of order (South African Department of Correctional Services 1988) provides that generally speaking, the classification of offenders incorporates three aspects: the determination of the risk involved with regard to safe custody of the offender, the degree of security required to ensure safe custody, and the allocation of appropriate privilege group to the offender and classification assignment of the offender to a specific group and/or individual programme.

Offenders must undergo safe custody classification upon admission to determine the level of security needed upon imprisonment. Therefore, the Department of Correctional Services has developed a risk classification tool that is essential for effective administration of offenders which will improve rehabilitation. The objective of the security risk classification tool is to sketch out the danger offenders pose to their family, the community, correctional officials and other offenders, to themselves in terms of self-harm and own vulnerability, future criminal and/or violent behaviour to determine a classification that will be useful for security placement, offender management, intervention and rehabilitation. Appropriate use of this tool promotes effective sentence planning (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005a:41). Every sentenced offender is subjected to security classification for proper placement in correctional centres. The CAE will complete the security classification sheet (form) within the
first 24 hours of admission. In the absence of the SAP 62 and SAP 69c, the security risk classification must be revised within 24 hours of receipt of the information. The CAO must explain the goal and objective of the assessment form to the offender and must check SAP 62 and SAP 69 for completion of some sections. If these forms are not available, the admission CAO must refer to the scoring guideline. The CAO must add up all the scores obtained by the offender and write the total in the space provided. The completed form should be submitted to the case management committee chairperson, who will sign for receipt of the completed form and make a decision with regard to the placement of the offender. The final decision will be made by the chairperson of the case management committee, taking into consideration the factors associated with compulsory overrides. A copy of the form should be filed in the case file of the offender. The assessment form is confidential. (See annexure: C)

The following are the scoring guidelines in the absence of SAP 62 and SAP 69c:

- Offence history: allocate maximum points;
- Time lapse between offence(s) and previous conviction: if offender is not a first-time offender, allocate maximum points;
- History of violence: allocate maximum points;
- Crime committed in gang context/crime syndicate or with accomplices: allocate maximum points;
- Number of victims: allocate maximum points;

In cases where an ex-offender is incarcerated but no information (clean or no SAP 69c) exists at the SAPS Criminal Bureau, the previous file and admission and release data must be used.

The sections of the form must be completed as follows by the said officials: (A) Security risk classification: the CAO/case management committee coordinator (secretary of the committee in cases where the coordinator is not established), (B) Guide for scoring: the CAE/case management committee coordinator (secretary of the committee in cases where the coordinator is not established), (C) Decision guide: Chairperson of the committee, (D) Signatures: the official
Many issues other than security classification play a role in the incarceration of the offender. For example, due to security classification, it is not always possible to detain offenders as close as possible to their homes for regular family contact (Cilliers et al., 2008:118).

In terms of the White Paper (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b), the security classification of an offender usually results in him/her having to be imprisoned at a centre which allocates the offender to such classification and which is not necessarily close to his/her family or community.

The White Paper argues that consideration should be given to classification of certain parts of prisons to allow more people to be closer to their families. The security classification for offenders is designed to ensure that the correctional system can balance the provision of security and safe custody with correction, promotion of social responsibility and human development.

Offenders are classified into minimum, medium and maximum custodial categories, depending on the category of offence committed, the length of the sentence and previous convictions. The safe custody classification of every offender is reviewed on a regular basis and if the offender’s conduct or any other aspect affecting their security risk provides an explanation for it, the offender can be considered for reclassification for security purposes (South Africa, 2007:409).

According to Matshaba (2006:90), safe custody classification has to do with physical security and control measures. Since the Department of Correctional Services should ensure that it prevents offenders in their care from escaping, offenders who are housed at maximum security prisons require a higher degree of physical security. Therefore the security custody must match the security needed for the offender. Maximum security consists of all modern resources but manpower still plays an important role in the security of these prisons. Maximum security classification is regarded as the highest level of incarcerating offenders in the correctional system.
in South Africa and internationally (Matshaba, 2006:85). The safe custody classification system may begin to show signs of a predictable percentage of inaccuracy. However, the system is flexible and an adjustment to the cut-off may be made based on the research results after a certain number of offenders have been classified (Nxumalo, 2002:59).

Classification for security is also known as a management function since it deals mainly with the orderly and cost-effective control of a prison. Offenders who are regarded as “dangerous” will be housed in maximum security institutions. Offenders who are not classified into this category must be detained in the most effective way (Cilliers et al., 2008:118). Nxumalo (2002:53) explains that the management function of classification can also be aimed at providing an orderly, safe, rational and cost-effective prison system to ensure that security offenders or offenders with low potential to escape are housed under the cheapest situation possible.

Offender security classification plans to facilitate a needs-driven approach to bring together security and rehabilitation. The proposed security classification instrument is to develop an offender profile citing the following:

- Personal particulars;
- Crime category;
- Nature of offence;
- Personality of relationship of offender/s to victim/s;
- Circumstance under which the crime was committed;
- Effective length of sentence;
- Number and nature of previous conviction/s; and
- Time elapsed since the last/previous conviction.

The above information should be balanced against the threat the offenders could impose on the community, the escape risk, threats to fellow offenders and staff, the vulnerability of the individual to others (such as predator offenders already inside) and the need for protection of both the individual offender and others (Cilliers et al., 2008:118).
According to Cilliers (2000:38), security classifications that are based on past actions of offenders mean that their past actions have present consequences. As a result, offenders may view themselves as responsible instruments that may choose to change their actions in the future, thereby changing consequences. Therefore, it was decided that the security classification guideline project would be founded on the offender’s actual conduct.

The explicit and reliable security classification decision is formed by the objective of the security classification guideline project. The inventive goal of the security guideline project is to reduce disagreement and uncertainty over security classification decisions that were very practical.

“The sole goal of the security classification guideline is the containment and the religion of the guideline is to place an offender at the lowest necessary security level” (Cilliers, 2000:35).

During the interview with a classified offender it has been observed that there are three features of the classification culture such as multiple goals of classification, the dangerous man phenomenon and different types of security risk. These features are discussed below (Cilliers, 2000:33):

- **Multiple goals**

Offenders may be classified for maximum security since they are reviewed as dangerous and their offences are such that they deserve to feel what real prison is like (punishment). If offenders behave badly and they are housed at a higher security level at their next classification, the department will predict their behaviour or punish them as part of a general system of rewards and punishments to control behaviour, since there is an element of control in such classification behaviour.
• The dangerous man phenomenon

It was in a study that it was decided that if an offender is a dangerous person, he/she is a person who is more likely than the average person to be involved in violent conduct or is less predictable in the use of violence. The dangerous person is likely to be violent in situations where the average person is unlikely to be so. The classification analyst will interview the offender and read his/her records to interpret signs of the offender’s ‘dangerousness’.

• Different types of security risk

Offenders may be dangerous to society and no danger inside the prison or vice versa. There are two types of risk, namely public risk and second institution risk.

- Public risk is a grouping of the likelihood that the offender would harm the public if he/she were to escape.
- Institution risk is the likelihood that the offender will be a danger to correctional officials or to other prisoners within the prison.

Correctional officials identify two other types of risks: self-risk and system risk.

- Self-risk is the possibility that an offender will attempt to injure himself/herself.
- System risk is the possibility that an offender, who does not fall into any of the self, institutional and public risk categories, may nevertheless be perceived as such by the public (Cilliers, 2000:36-37).

The White Paper (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b) provides that since one of the key objectives of the correctional system is security risk management, the correctional system is tasked to provide suitable ways to ensure that the public is protected from the offender. Security risk management and needs-based correction inform prison classifications and the community correctional supervision classification of the offenders.
Mnguni (2002:111) reports that incidents have revealed that a number of offenders who should not be allocated to a maximum security category are classified as such. Offenders in maximum security with a favourable prognosis should be subjected to reclassification every time they are presented before the case management committee, in order to argue against the overpopulation in this category. The case management committee must review the security classification of an escapee as soon as possible after they have been recaptured and given an additional sentence. This procedure must also be followed in the case of offenders who persist with misconduct and who will not submit to prison discipline. The same principle is also relevant with regard to the minimum or medium security category and the associated removal to maximum security prison. The head of the prison makes interim arrangements for safe custody of the prisoner, pending the decision of the removal of the delegate.

According to the White Paper (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2005b), the principle that offenders from different security categories should not be housed together is appropriate. It is argued that the entire facility should not be classified, except where it is very specifically considered, for a particular security purpose. The offenders are the ones who should be given a security classification on the whole. The section in which they are housed should then be managed according to the suitable level of security.

Neser (1993:261-262) maintains that the safe custody classification should be measured every time in the light of the offender’s behaviour. Should it appear that there are sufficient issues to indicate a reduced risk, that offender’s safe custody classification can be considered for reclassification to be reduced accordingly? This may also apply if the offender’s behaviour does not indicate a change from his/her offence behaviour and that he/she demonstrates high risk. Therefore the department can reclassify the offender for high risk security classification.
6.12 CLASSIFICATION OF THE PAROLEES AND STANDARDS OF SUPERVISION IN THE COMMUNITY

Bruyns, Du Preez, Jonker, Kriel, Mnguni, Ramabulana, Van der Merwe. (2008:IV) state: “The ultimate goal of community-based sentences is to enable offenders to lead a socially responsible and crime-free life during the period of their sentence and after release. The implementation of community-based sentences should ensure that offenders abide by the conditions imposed upon them in order to protect the community.” The main aim of the community corrections programme is to work out supervision and control over offenders and probationers and parolees who have been sentenced to or placed under correctional and parole supervision in the community (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2001). According to Seiter (2002:163), classification and risk assessments are also used to match offenders on parole or probation to the level of supervision that they require.

The Department of Correctional Services has implemented a revised classification system for offenders subject to community corrections. The objective is to align the offender’s classification with rehabilitation, requiring more interaction between offenders and their supervision officials (Louw, 2008:79). In 1996 the Department of Correctional Services has decided re-examine and modernise the revised classification system implemented at all community corrections offices (South African Department of Correctional Services, 2006:39).

The department has come up with development programmes for persons who are sentenced to correctional supervision (Neser, 1993:327). The probationer must undergo an assessment process that settles on the degree of supervision and the treatment requirement of the probationer. The various treatment programmes that the probationer will be engaged in are determined by their specific needs. The head of correctional supervision guarantees the establishment of these treatment programmes. The following are the establishment programmes:

- The use of vocational training employed by Correctional Services;
- The use of vocational programmes employed by the local prisons in consultation with the commander;
The use of vocational programmes of relevant state and state-supported welfare organisations; and

The use of volunteers.

These programmes are presented in cooperation with interested internal or external experts on an after-hours basis at the correctional office or other suitable venues within society. Neser (1993:327) also mentions that in future, it is important that a list of available programmes, together with the time that they are offered, be kept at the correctional supervision office and be constantly rationalised. The probationers will be required, when necessary, to take part in one or more of the available programmes, as part of their supervision conditions. Even though the contents of some programmes are the same as those offered to the sentenced offenders, use is made of infrastructures which already exist within the community to a greater extent (Neser, 1993:328).

Where a probationer or parolee is classified under a certain monitoring category, only conditions which are applicable to that specific monitoring category may apply. The monitoring granted will be determined by the predicted risk of the probationer or parolee or as determined by the court or relevant party and could take the form of maximum, medium or minimum monitoring (Bruyns et al., 2008:40-41).

The supervision committee during assessments and classification of offenders should follow the guidelines set out below:

- **Minimum monitoring**

Minimum monitoring is usually retained for the category of probationers and parolees who do not clearly cause an actual danger to the committee, do not misuse alcohol and/or drugs and are physically/financially cared for.
The case management committee makes recommendations to the head of community corrections with regard to monitoring, house detention, compensation (as ordered by the court) and community services (number of hours and place of performance). If this is not set by the court, or the Commissioner or his/her delegate stipulates the correctional programmes in which the offender must be involved, as well as restriction to magisterial districts, fixed address, probation on his/her abuse of alcohol, searching and other applicable conditions (Bruyns et al., 2008:37).

- **Medium intensive monitoring**

  This type of monitoring is usually retained for that category of probationers or parolees who have:
  - a constant housing record;
  - a crime record or behavioural record which does not include physical violence, sexual offences and offences against children and the aged or do not have such a record;
  - sound established social bond; and
  - a residential area and are financially independent or physically cared for.

- **Maximum intensive monitoring**

  Maximum intensive monitoring is usually reserved for the category of probationers and parolees who have:
  - previously dishonoured correctional or parole conditions, escaped, failed to act in accordance with the conditions of bail, suspension and/or postponement;
  - an unstable work and housing record;
  - an unstable social bond where aggression, impulsiveness and substance abuse form a part of his/her behavioural history; and
  - committed offences against children, the aged and committed sexual crimes.
There are some requirements that probationers or parolees who fall under the various monitoring categories must comply with. The following table summarises the monitoring and tracing procedure of various monitoring categories.

Table 4: Monitoring and tracing procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>MINIMUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be physically visited at home at least once a month</td>
<td>Be physically visited at home at least twice a month (once every two weeks)</td>
<td>Be physically visited at home, at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be contacted telephonically at home at least once a month if he/she is in possession of a telephone</td>
<td>Be contacted telephonically at home, at least twice a month (once every two weeks) if he/she is in possession of a telephone</td>
<td>Be contacted telephonically at home, at least once a week if he/she is in possession of a telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be visited/contacted telephonically at work at least once a month</td>
<td>Be visited/contacted telephonically at work at least twice a month (once every two weeks)</td>
<td>Be visited/contacted at work at least once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be compelled to pay a visit at the Community Corrections Office on a two monthly basis, according to a pre-scheduled time, for purposes of consultation, if this is financially feasible for the probationer or parolee</td>
<td>Be compelled to pay a visit at the Community Corrections Office according to scheduled times for consultation purposes, at least once a month if this is financially feasible for the probationer or parolee.</td>
<td>Be compelled to pay a visit to the Community Corrections Office or any place as agreed upon at a scheduled time for the purpose of consultation, at least once a month if this is financially feasible for the probationer or parolee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Bruyns, et al., (2008:41)
6.13 CONCLUSION

The South African Correctional Services has changed over the years. This chapter gives a clear picture of South Africa before the 1990s. Changes that have occurred in South Africa as a whole since the early 1990s have led to new developments in the functioning of the correctional services and the entire justice system. This chapter focused on the historical development of the Department of Correctional Services, which has recognised the purpose of safe custody and of encouraging good behaviour through privileges and made provision for them in the horizontal and depth classification systems. There are assessment tools that the department uses to classify offenders for treatment needs and security within correctional institutions. Offender classification for treatment needs in terms of education, social services, religion and recreational opportunities was also covered in this chapter with regard to South African Correctional Services. Since offender classification for work and conditional work is part of classifying offenders to be trained for the work industry and to survive after they have been released from prison, this was also covered in this chapter. The chapter also discussed offender classification for security within South African Correctional Services as well as within the community.
6.14 REFERENCES


CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The key requirement of a research report is that it must report conclusions as accurately as possible (Wigston, 2000:255). The scientific norms of reporting and accuracy will be met by sharing scientific knowledge with others and honesty in research. This research project was guided by primary and secondary aims. This chapter examines the validity of the aims and the degree to which they have been achieved in the study.

The aim of this chapter is to provide comprehensive conclusions of the research project and to make recommendations against the background of the investigation. In this study attention was paid to the choice of subject for research, namely offender classification as a rehabilitation tool (Chapter 5, 6).

7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The classification procedure takes place after assessment has been completed. The classification system for treatment rehabilitation is based on the concept of different treatments, and involves the needs and the problems of offenders being defined and treated on an individualised basis. Classification of offenders within the institution is closely related to programming since offenders are matched with specific treatment programmes which best address these problems and the offenders’ needs (Kratcoski, 2004:213).

The recommendations are made against the background of the stated problem (Chapter 1) and will be made in relation to aspects that may potentially contribute to the effectiveness of the classification system based on rehabilitation. None of the recommendations are prescriptive to
any correctional system, but have relevance in terms of potential implementation in the South African Department of Correctional Services (Chapter 5).

With the abovementioned being the point of departure, the researcher would like to make the following recommendations regarding **offender classification as a rehabilitation tool**:

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

It is recommended that correctional personnel be involved in the development of formal, accredited programmes or modules in order to pave the way for offenders to better themselves with the focus on successful rehabilitation and reintegration.

As was demonstrated in chapter 3 of this study (see 3.6. page 79-92) for the correctional system to be able to successfully undertake the process of rehabilitation, there are various role players that are involved in the process. They include offenders themselves, correctional officials as well as the community outside the correctional centres. The correctional institution on its own cannot be effective if the rehabilitation responsibility is borne only by them. The department must recognise the significant involvement that the community or external organisations can make. The researcher recommends that the correctional authorities allow external institutions to be involved, such as institutions of higher education and also non-governmental organisations and volunteers who provide services in the application and research of correctional programmes.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

It is recommended that the offender be allowed to play a central part in the classification decision making process.

Chapter 3 describes the process of the offender’s rehabilitation in general. The new generation prison based on principles of rehabilitation paves the way for offender involvement in the rehabilitation process. As it is a new concept for the South African correctional system, methods
and methodology should be investigated in order for this principle to materialise. This could be done by means of rehabilitation programmes such as education, recreation, counselling and case management.

Classification of offenders, on admission, is a critical step in the process of delivering effective rehabilitation. Since classification decisions are generally made at a central reception centre where newly sentenced offenders are admitted, this is a shortcoming in the correctional system (see 3.5, page 69). Offenders are rarely asked to communicate on their own future. As offenders are assigned to different programmes with the aim of bettering themselves, it is recommended that offenders be assigned to needs-based correctional programmes. There is a need for corrections and classification to do a better job of identifying offenders who can best benefit from treatment programmes such as those for sex offenders, and drug abuse, education and vocational programmes.

This will give rise to the possibility that offenders are involved in early classification meetings. This is possible if offenders are given enough opportunity to discuss the programme with the classification committee before they can make decisions on what treatment programmes are suitable for the offender.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

**It is recommended that the role of volunteers in the South African correctional system be investigated in order to streamline the classification system and to adhere to international penological standards.**

South African society is known for its cultural diversity. One internationally acknowledged and well-respected factor in South African culture is the spirit of humanity which is called ubuntu. Ubuntu is the capacity in African culture to express compassion, reciprocity, dignity, harmony and humanity in the interest of building and maintaining community with justice and mutual caring (Nussbaum, 2003: 2). It has created a conducive environment for all South Africans to
participate in different programmes for different institutions as volunteers. Many departments, including the South African Police Service, Juvenile Justice System and in the administration of criminal justice, are benefiting from the services offered by volunteers (Nxumalo, 2000:2). Therefore Correctional Services must make use of volunteers and the community at large for application of this idea. The South African Department of Correctional Services has not taken full advantage of volunteers in South Africa. That can only be achieved if the department were to come up with programmes where volunteers would be allowed to offer their services and play a prominent role in the classification, skills development and rehabilitation of offenders.

In South Africa it is believed in some communities that it takes a whole village to raise a child. Now, if the community takes ownership of raising a child, then the community, especially the leaders of the community, should also take full ownership of the wrong-doings of that child and eventually the corrective measures to correct that offending behaviour. However, there is no legal duty on any correctional authority to prescribe to the community or non-governmental organisations on involvement within the system in order to balance the equilibrium. But, there is a moral obligation on the community, volunteers and non-governmental organisations to participate in the continuous seeking of levelling the playing fields in order for offenders to reintegrate fully back into the community.

7.3 CONCLUSION

This study examines how offender classification as a rehabilitation tool is practised in the correctional institution. Particular emphasis was placed on philosophical approaches, a theoretical framework and the effectiveness of offender treatment through the utilisation of a reliable assessment tool, in order to enhance service delivery in corrections. Internationally there are massive numbers of people incarcerated on a daily basis. Therefore there is a belief that better classification procedures will enable the institution to identify the offender’s educational, vocational and psychological needs. The result will be to separate non-violent offenders from the more violent ones since rehabilitation of offenders is a central theme in the correctional
environment. Therefore, classification of offenders during admission is a critical step in the process of devising effective rehabilitation.
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ANNEXURE A

ADMISSION RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT
# DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

## ADMISSION RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

(to be completed within **6 Hours** after admission)

### PERSONAL PARTICULARS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIDEN NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL NAMES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIAS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION NUMBER:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HIGH PRIORITY REFERRAL:

| CURRENT OFFENCE |          |
| SENTENCE LENGTH |          |
| DATE OF ADMISSION |          |
| TIME OF ADMISSION |          |
| DATE OF SENTENCE |          |
| CORRECTIONAL CENTRE |          |

© Department of Correctional Services
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF ADMISSION RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. All sentenced offenders and awaiting trial detainees (ATD’s) will be subjected to the Admission Risk and Needs Assessment within 6 hours after admission.

2. Section A to E must be completed by the Correctional Assessment Official / Admission Clerks.

3. Section F SIGNATURE AND CONFIRMATION must be completed by the Unit Manager of the Assessment Unit.

4. The goal and objective of the assessment form must be explained to offenders.

5. Should offenders refuse to answer any question, refusal should be indicated in writing by the Correctional Assessment Official (CAO) on the Admission Risk and Needs Assessment form.

6. Fill-in the form in black Ink.

7. Use BLOCK letter writing.

8. Choose the correct answer by marking with an “X” on the space provided.

9. You can choose more than one answer where applicable by marking with X in spaces provided.

10. Use the space provided under each section for additional information & comments.

11. The completed form must be filed in the institutional file and a copy placed in the offender’s case file.

12. The Correctional Assessment Official must keep case files in a lockable cabinet within the assessment unit.

13. Assessment form is confidential and must be treated as such.
**A. Detailed Personal Particulars**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Surname &amp; Initials</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Registration Number</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Social Risk/Needs**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Does the offender experience any problems informing family or close friend (s) of his/her imprisonment?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Does the offender need any assistance to contact family or close friend (s) in order to pay a fine/bail?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Is the offender the sole child care giver?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Are there any dependents / children at the offenders home that need immediate support / assistance?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Emotional Well Being and Vulnerability Risks/Needs**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Is this the offender’s first time in a correctional centre?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Security / Escape Risk/Needs.**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Does the offender’s current conviction involve extreme or excessive violence?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Does the offender’s current or previous conviction involve escaping from lawful custody?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Does the offender’s current conviction involve armed or cash in transit robbery?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Does the offender’s current conviction involve arson or fire setting?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Is the offender a member of a gang/crime syndicate?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Is the offender an illegal immigrant or a foreign national?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Does the offender express fears that there is somebody who deliberately wants to harm him/her?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Does the offender display violent, aggressive or hostile behaviour towards correctional officials or other offenders?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Is the offender a former member of the law enforcement authorities?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Was the offender a police informer prior to incarceration</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Does the offender have other outstanding charge/s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Surname of Official</th>
<th>Post Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Official</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Offender</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Summary Of Risks and Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>Risks / Needs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Referral for immediate intervention:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. SOCIAL RISKS &amp; NEEDS</td>
<td>Needs assistants contacting family/friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to the Unit Manager (the Unit Manager must intervene and refer for further intervention to other services providers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children/dependents need assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. EMOTIONAL WELL BEING RISKS &amp; NEEDS</td>
<td>Incarcerated for the first time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Unit Manager for suitable housing and referral for further intervention by relevant internal service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. SECURITY RISK &amp; NEEDS</td>
<td>Risk for aggression or violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Unit Manager for possible treatment as a maximum offender until he/she is classified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escape risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of Arson / fire setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>Risks / Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Referral for immediate intervention:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of gang / crime syndicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression of fear / In danger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Unit Manager for suitable housing and referral for further intervention by relevant internal service providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. SIGNATURE & CONFIRMATION:**

Confirmation: Unit Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname and Initials of the Unit Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Level of the Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEXURE B

COMPREHENSIVE RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
COMPREHENSIVE RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT
(To be completed within 21 days of admission)

PERSONAL PARTICULARS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIDEN NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL NAMES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIAS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION NUMBER:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIGH PRIORITY REFERRAL:
Specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT OFFENCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCE LENGTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATE OF ADMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME OF ADMISSION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF SENTENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORRECTIONAL CENTRE

© Department of Correctional Services

Copyright subsists in this work. In terms of the Copyright Act, 1978 (Act No 98 of 1978),

No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without acknowledging the copyright.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF COMPREHENSIVE RISK AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. All sentenced offenders serving a sentence of more than 24 months must be subjected to the Comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment within 21 working days after admission.

2. The Correctional Assessment Official (CAO) will complete the following section in the form:
   - Section A: Crime & Criminality
   - Section B: Education, Sports, Recreation & Employment
   - Section C: Spiritual Care, Social & Emotional Well being
   - Section D: Security
   - Section E: Summary of Risks and Needs & Signature of CAO and the Offender
   - Annexure A: Will be utilized for completion of the Correctional Sentence Plan

3. Section F: Signature and Confirmation will be completed by the Unit Manager of the Assessment Unit and the Chairperson of Case Management Committee

4. The goal and objective of the assessment form must be explained to offenders.

5. No offender must be forced to answer any question that he/she is uncomfortable with.

6. Should offenders refuse to answer any question, refusal should be indicated in writing on the comprehensive Risk and Needs Assessment form.

7. Fill-in form with black Ink.

8. Use BLOCK letter writing.

9. All Sections must be completed in full.

10. Mark with an “X” on the most correct answer, by drawing an “X” through the provided possible answers where applicable.

11. More than one “X” can be used where applicable.

12. The completed form must be forwarded to the Unit Manager for confirmation of the assessment and filed in the Case File of the Offender. A second copy should be filed in the Institutional File of the offender.

13. The assessment form is confidential and must be completed in private and treated as such.
SECTION A: CRIME AND CRIMINALITY

1. Childhood History: (Below the age of 18)

1.1 Crime history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has the offender been convicted for any crime (s) as a child?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 If yes specify the crime and sanction (s) received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanction(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Was the offender previously placed in a reformatory school, secure cares centre or placed under a programme by a court?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 If yes provide details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate Form of Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformatory School / School of industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Care Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court imposed Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 School Performance History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Has the offender ever attended a special school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Has the offender ever been suspended from school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Has the offender ever been expelled from school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 If yes specify the reason(s)  

If yes specify the reason(s)
## Youth History: (18 – 25 years)

### 2.1 Crime History

#### 1. Has the offender ever been convicted for any crime(s) as a youth?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1.1 If yes specify the crime(s) and sanction(s) received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime(s)</th>
<th>Sanction(s) (E.g. Imprisonment, community supervision; probation, community service, suspended sentence, fine, postponed sentence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Victim(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman / Women</th>
<th>Girl(s)</th>
<th>Aged/Elderly</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man / Men</td>
<td>Boy(s)</td>
<td>Child/Children</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Others Specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Indicate the offender’s relationship to the victim(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The offender knew the victim(s) before the incident</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The victim(s) were strangers to the offender before the incident</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Indicate the degree of physical harm done to the victim(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caused death of victim(s)</th>
<th>Serious injury(wounding, maiming, disfiguring)</th>
<th>Minor injury(hitting, slapping, striking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. Indicate the type of weapon(s) used on the victim(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No weapon</th>
<th>Firearm</th>
<th>Knife</th>
<th>Explosive</th>
<th>Others Specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Adult History: (Above 25 years)

3.1 Crime History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Has the offender ever been convicted for any crime as an adult?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 If yes specify the crime(s) and sanction(s) given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime(s):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sanction(s):</strong> (E.g. Imprisonment, community supervision; probation, community service, suspended sentence, fine, postponed sentence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Victim(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman / Women</th>
<th>Girl(s)</th>
<th>Aged/Elderly</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man / Men</td>
<td>Boy(s)</td>
<td>Child/Children</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Others Specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Indicate the offender’s relationship to the victim(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The offender knew the victim(s) before the incident</th>
<th>The victim(s) were strangers to the offender before the incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Indicate the degree of physical harm done to the victim(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caused death of victim(s)</th>
<th>Serious injury (wounding, maiming, disfiguring)</th>
<th>Minor injury (hitting, slapping, striking)</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Indicate the type of weapon(s) used on the victim(s):

| No weapon | Firearm | Knife | Explosive | Others Specify: |
4. Current Offence(s)

4.1 Crime Specifics

1. Specify the crime(s) the offenders is currently sentenced for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Murder and Related Offences</th>
<th>Culpable Homicide and Related Offences</th>
<th>Assault and Related Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>Robbery and Related offences</td>
<td>Theft Related Offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud, Deception and Related Offences</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Related Offences</td>
<td>Firearms and Ammunition Offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons and Explosives Offences (other than firearms and ammunition)</td>
<td>Property and Environmental Damage</td>
<td>Public Order and Public Welfare Offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences against Freedom of Movement</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Offences</td>
<td>Other, specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman / Women</th>
<th>Girl(s)</th>
<th>Aged/Elderly</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man / Men</td>
<td>Boy(s)</td>
<td>Child/Children</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Others Specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Indicate the relationship of the offender to the victim(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The offender knew the victim(s) before the incident</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>The victim(s) were strangers to the offender before the incident</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Indicate the degree of physical harm done to the victim(s):

| Caused death of victim(s) | Serious injury(wounding, maiming, disfiguring) | Minor injury(hitting, slapping, striking) |
5. Indicate the type of weapon(s) used on the victim(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No weapon</th>
<th>Firearm</th>
<th>Knife</th>
<th>Explosive</th>
<th>Others Specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Indicate the motives for the offender’s offending / criminal behaviour (NB. See revised SAP62):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Thrill-seeking</th>
<th>Addiction</th>
<th>Sexual</th>
<th>Revenge</th>
<th>Anger and Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Racial</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was the offender under the influence of any substances when he/she committed the crime? (Check SAP62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.1 If yes, state the substance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>Dagga</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Gang / Criminal Associations

1. Is the offender part of a gang, an antisocial group or associated with an organized crime syndicate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Indicate the type of association and the characteristics of the association:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family member(s)</th>
<th>Friend(s)</th>
<th>Correctional Centre gangs</th>
<th>Community gangs</th>
<th>Anti-social peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cult (e.g., Satanist, spiritual etc)</td>
<td>Politically motivated group</td>
<td>Mafia association</td>
<td>Organized Crime Syndicate</td>
<td>Criminal peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others Specify:

3. Was the current crime/s committed in a group / gang / syndicate context?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. What is the offender’s position / role in the gang / syndicate / group?
5. What is the mission / objective of the gang / syndicate / group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence and violent activities</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>Sex offences</th>
<th>Armed robbery</th>
<th>Robbery &amp; hijacking of cars / money</th>
<th>Drug dealings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money laundering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Power &amp; intimidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Are the offender’s parents, siblings, partner or any other relatives that they reside with or interact with involved in any criminal activity (e.g., drug, etc)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Substance Abuse

1. Is the offender addicted to any substances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol</th>
<th>Dagga</th>
<th>Mandrax</th>
<th>Tik (methamphetamines)</th>
<th>Heroine</th>
<th>Cocaine acids</th>
<th>Ecstasy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cracks</td>
<td>Glue/adhesives</td>
<td>Prescription Drugs</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. At what age did the offender start using the substance/s?

3. How long has the offender been addicted?

4. Has the offender ever received medical treatment / counselling for the substance use/abuse in the past?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7. Education

7.1 Scholastic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can the offender read and write?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the highest grade the offender passed?</td>
<td>ABET Level (e.g. 1 to 4):</td>
<td>Grade (e.g. 1 to 12):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In which year did the offender obtain the qualification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Skills Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the offender trained in any specific profession, skill or trade?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 If yes, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indicate the offender's practical experience in his profession, skill and/or trade in years:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the offender qualified or registered for a specific profession, skill, trade?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 If yes, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Tertiary Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the offender have any tertiary education?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 If yes Specify the highest Degree / Diploma / Certificate (E.g. BA, Hons, Dipl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year obtained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Does the offender have any skills, interests and hobbies? | Yes | No
---|---|---
2. If yes, indicate the type interest, skills and hobbies:

3. Has the offender played any competitive sport (Club, Regional or National level)? | Yes | No
3.1 If yes, please specify

4. Does the offender have any formal training in Sport and Recreation activities (e.g. coaching, sport administration)? | Yes | No
4.1 If yes, specify

5. Does the offender have any formal training in Arts and Cultural activities (e.g. professional dancer, fine artist, graphic designer)? | Yes | No
5.1 If yes, specify

7.4 Current Studies

1 Is the offender currently studying or registered for studies with any institution? | Yes | No
1.1 If yes, specify type of studies / name of diploma or degree:

2 Does the offender have any specific education & training needs? | Yes | No
### 8. Sports and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the offender have any skills, interests and hobbies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If yes, indicate the type interest, skills and hobbies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the offender played any competitive sport (Club, Regional or National level)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 If yes, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the offender have any formal training in Sport and Recreation activities (e.g. coaching, sport administration)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 If yes, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the offender have any formal training in Arts and Cultural activities (e.g. professional dancer, fine artist, graphic designer)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 If yes, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Employment History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the offender employed prior to his / her arrest and incarceration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 If yes, state the type of employment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time / Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Consultation / Contract basis</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C: SPIRITUAL CARE, SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL WELL BEING**

**10. Spiritual Care**

1. Is the offender a member or follower of any faith, religion, believe or denomination?  
   - Yes
   - No

1.1 If yes specify

2. What was the offender’s role or position in his / her faith, belief, church or denomination?

3. Was the offender actively involved in his/her church / faith activities before his / her incarceration?  
   - Yes
   - No

3.1 If yes, please specify: 

4. Does the offender need spiritual support from his / her church / faith representative / minister?  
   - Yes
   - No

4.1 If yes, please specify the type of support needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Services</th>
<th>Baptism</th>
<th>Counselling</th>
<th>Visits from Spiritual Care Workers</th>
<th>Marriage counselling</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Does the offender want to participate / continue with religious activities in the Correctional Centre?  
   - Yes
   - No

**11. Social Risk Assessment**

1. With whom was the offender staying at the time of arrest? Specify relationship (mother / father/ spouse etc)

2. Who are the current significant family members, relative (s) or friends of the offender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Grand parents</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Uncle</th>
<th>Aunt</th>
<th>Own Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In laws</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>Others: specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. What type of accommodation did the offender stay in prior to his/her arrest and incarceration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own Home</th>
<th>Renting a house</th>
<th>Renting a flat/room</th>
<th>Sharing a flat/room with a relative or friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lived on the streets</td>
<td>Lived in a shelter</td>
<td>Shack</td>
<td>Others specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Indicate the type of neighbourhood in which the offender grew up?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal settlement/Shacks</th>
<th>Government housing(RDP)</th>
<th>Inner city high – flats</th>
<th>Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>Farm / small holdings</td>
<td>Hostel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Describe the type of contact (e.g. visits / telephonic contact / letters) between the offender and his/her significant others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Telephone calls</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>No Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Others Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 If the offender does not have contact with family or friends, does he/she want to establish contact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Does the offender have relationship problems with significant others that need mediation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.1 If yes, specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Does the offender have any dependants?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.1 If yes, how many dependants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of adult dependants</th>
<th>Number of child dependants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.2 Are the dependants related to the offender (family)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.3 If yes, please specify relationship to offender? (e.g. mother, father, uncle, own child)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of dependant</th>
<th>Relationship to offender</th>
<th>Age(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
8. Is the offender responsible for child maintenance? | Yes | No
9. Is the offender the sole provider of the dependants? | Yes | No
9.1 If yes, do the dependants require social assistance? | Yes | No

12. Emotional Well-Being

1. Did the offender ever receive any treatment for mental illness? | Yes | No
1.1 If yes specify when? (Year and month):

2. Is the offender currently on treatment / medication for mental illness? | Yes | No

3. Has the offender ever been treated for attempted suicide / self-harm? | Yes | No
3.1 If yes specify

4. Does the offender have suicidal thoughts or thinking of harming himself / herself now?

5. Has the offender recently experienced any flashbacks or nightmares related to the victim or the incident? | Yes | No

6. Has the offender ever been convicted for any sexual offence of any nature? (Check SAP69) | Yes | No
6.1 If yes specify

| Rape | Attempted Rape | Sexual assault | Statutory Rape | Indecent Assault | Sodomy |
### 7. Does the offender’s current conviction involve a sexual offence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 7.1 If yes specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Attempted Rape</th>
<th>Sexual assault</th>
<th>Statutory Rape</th>
<th>Indecent Assault</th>
<th>Sodomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Before imprisonment, has the offender ever been a victim of physical, emotional, sexual abuse and/or a victim of crime (such as a victim of rape, assault or robbery)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 8.1 If yes, please specify?

### 9. Since the offender’s arrest and admission to the Correctional Centre, has he/she been physically or sexually abused?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 9.1 If yes, has he/she reported the incident?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 10. Did the court recommend psychological / psychiatric treatment as part of the sentence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 10.1 If yes, specify the type of treatment recommended

### SECTION D: SECURITY

#### 13. Security Risk Assessment

1. Specify Previous Crime(s) (Check SAP 69):

1.1 Categorization of Previous Crimes (See Annexure A: Severity of Crimes in terms of violence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.1 Category of the current crime(s) (See Annexure A: Severity of Crimes in terms of violence)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Length of sentence

4. Is the offender serving more than one sentence? Yes No

5. Has the offender previously escaped, attempted to escape, or aided in an escape?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escaped</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Attempted to escape</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aided an escape</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No previously escape, attempted escape, or aiding in an escape e</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does the offender have previous probation placements revoked, or breach of parole / bail conditions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation revoked</th>
<th>Breached Parole</th>
<th>Breached Bail conditions</th>
<th>Absconded</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Does the offender have institutional offences / disciplinary actions against him / her? (NB: Check the Admission Detail Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Has the offender ever been convicted of an offence that involves racism, racial or political conflict?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8.1 If yes, specify:

9. Does the offender have further charges against him/ her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9.1 If yes specify:

10. Since the offender’s admission to the Correctional Centre, has anyone verbally threatened to take something from him / her by use of force or by threatening to hurt the offender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10.1 If yes, specify

SECTION E: SUMMARY OF RISKS AND NEEDS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Needs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>If yes, give a brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Criminality: Childhood</strong></td>
<td>Presence of criminal behaviour in childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously expelled / suspended from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously placed in a reformatory / school of industry/ secure care centre / development programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Criminality: Youth</strong></td>
<td>Presence of criminal behaviour during youth stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were aged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were known to the offender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were a stranger(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Criminality: Adulthood</strong></td>
<td>History of adult criminal behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were aged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, give a brief description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were known to the offender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were stranger(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Criminality</td>
<td>Current offence (s) categorized as aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current: incarceration</td>
<td>or violent crime (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current offence (s) categorized as sexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current offence (s) categorized as economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drug related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were aged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were known to the offender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims were stranger(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang and Criminal</td>
<td>Has criminal associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, give a brief description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Is a member of the gang / crime syndicate / organised crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a leader of the gang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>Is addicted to a substance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has previously received treatment / counselling for substance use / abuse (relapsed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wants treatment / counselling for substance use / abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training and skills assessment</td>
<td>Cannot read and write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is trained in a specific profession, skill, trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has practical experience for a specific profession, skill, trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is qualified / registered for a specific profession, skill, trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a tertiary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is currently studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has specific education &amp; training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports, Recreation, Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Has skills, interests and hobbies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plays a competitive sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has formal training in sports,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, give a brief description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Risk &amp; Needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was living on the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was living in a state institution/shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was renting a flat or room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not have contact with significant others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs to establish contact with significant others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a relationship problem with significant others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires mediation for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has never been employed in his / her life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was not employed prior to his / her arrest/incarceration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritual Care</strong></td>
<td>Belongs to a religious group/church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holds a leadership position in his / her church / faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs spiritual support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wants to participate / continue with religious activities in the correctional centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, give a brief description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a sole provider of the dependants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires assistance for his / her dependants / family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Previously received treatment from mental illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Is currently on treatment / medication for Mental illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has previously been treated for suicide attempt / self-harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has suicidal thoughts / is threatening to commit suicide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has committed a sexual offence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a victim of physical, sexual abuse or crime (if crime specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has nightmares / flashbacks related to victim related incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs some help with nightmares / flashbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has been physically or sexually abused in the correctional centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The court recommended psychological / psychiatric treatment as part of the sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If yes, give a brief description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Previous crimes categorized as high risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current crimes categorized as high risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serving a sentence of 15 years and above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serving more than one sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously escaped, attempted to escape or assisted in escape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously revoked probation placement, breached parole / bail conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has institutional / disciplinary charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convicted for an offence that involves racism, racial / political conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has received verbal threats or someone has threatened to take something from him / her by use of force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information**
### Name / Surname of Correctional Assessment Official

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Official</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Offender</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Section F: Signature & Confirmation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname and Initials of the Unit Manager</th>
<th>Surname and Initials of the Chairperson CMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Level of the Official</th>
<th>Post Level of the Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Number</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Annexure A: SUMMARY OF RISKS AND NEEDS AND THE DECISION GUIDE FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL (TO BE UTILIZED FOR COMPLETION OF THE SENTENCE PLAN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Needs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Decision Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Criminality: Childhood</td>
<td>Presence of criminal behaviour in childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously expelled / suspended from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placed previously in a reformatory / school of industry / secure care centre / development programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Decision Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Criminality: Youth</strong></td>
<td>Presence of criminal behaviour in youth stage</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims women</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim aged</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims animals</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims children</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim business</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims known to the offender</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims stranger</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Criminality: Adulthood</strong></td>
<td>History of adult criminal behaviour</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims women</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim aged</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims animals</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims children</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim business</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims known to the offender</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims stranger</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime &amp; Criminality Current:</strong></td>
<td>Current offence (s) categorized as aggressive or violent crime (s)</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td>Refer for anger management programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current offence (s) categorized as sexual offence</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td>Refer for further assessment and relevant intervention / sexual offenders programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current offence (s) categorized as economic</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td>Refer for life skills programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current offence (s) categorized as Drug related</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td>Refer for substance abuse programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims women</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Decision Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim aged</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims animals</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims children</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim business</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims known to the offender</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims stranger</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang and Criminal Associations</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has criminal associations</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current crime committed in gang / group / syndicate context</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a member of the gang / crime syndicate / organised crime</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a leader of the gang</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is addicted to a substance</td>
<td>Refer for substance abuse programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has previously received treatment / counselling for substance use / abuse (relapsed)</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td>Refer for substance abuse programme for relapse prevention in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants treatment / counselling for substance use / abuse</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer for substance abuse programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional programmes for past offences</td>
<td>Specify the programmes in the individual profile report and what the offender learned in the programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has attended programmes previously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Performance for Current Offences</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify the programmes in the individual profile report and what the offender learned in the programme in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has attended programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training and skills</td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot read and write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Decision Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to educationist if he/she wants to attend literacy classes in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is trained in specific profession, skill, trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile and refer to the CMC to take note for work placement (tutor's post) in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has practical experience for a specific profession, skill, trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile and refer to the CMC to take note for work placement (tutor's post) in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is qualified / registered for a specific profession, skill, trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile and refer to the CMC to take note for work placement (tutor's post) in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a tertiary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile and refer to the CMC to take note for work placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is currently studying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile Refer to educationists in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has specific education &amp; training needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile Refer to educationists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports, Recreation, Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Has skills, interests and hobbies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile Refer to sports, recreation, arts and culture practitioner in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays a competitive sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile Refer to sports, recreation, arts and culture practitioner in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has formal training in sports, recreation, arts and cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile Refer to sports, recreation, arts and culture practitioner in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Has never been employed in his/her life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not employed prior to his/her arrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Care</td>
<td>Belongs to a religious group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds a leadership position in his/her church/faith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile &amp; refer to the CMC to take note for work placement in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Decision Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|           | Needs spiritual support |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
|           |               |                | Yes | Refer to Religious Care Worker in correctional sentence plan |
|           | Wants to participate / continue with religious activities in the correctional centre |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
|           |               |                | Yes | Refer to Religious Care Worker in correctional sentence plan |
| Social Risk | Was living on the street |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile & refer to Social Worker / Social Reintegration in correctional sentence plan |
|           | Was living in a state institution |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile & refer to Social Worker / Social Reintegration in correctional sentence plan |
|           | Was renting |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile |
|           | Does not have contact with significant others |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile |
|           | Needs to establish contact with significant others |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile & refer to Case Manager in correctional sentence plan |
|           | Has a relationship problem with significant others |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
|           |               |                | Yes | Refer to the Social Worker in correctional sentence plan |
|           | Requires mediation for the relationship problem |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
|           |               |                | Yes | Refer to the Social Worker |
|           | Is a sole provider of the dependants |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile |
|           | Requires assistance for his / her dependants / family |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
|           |               |                | Yes | Refer to the Social Worker in correctional sentence plan |
| Emotional Well-being | Previously received treatment for mental illness |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
|           | Is currently on treatment / medication for Mental illness |                | Yes | Refer to Psychiatric Nurse / Psychologist in correctional sentence plan |
|           | Has previously been treated for suicide attempt / self-harm |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
|           |               |                | Yes | Refer to Psychiatric Nurse / Psychologist in correctional sentence plan |
|           | Has suicidal thoughts / is threatening to commit suicide |                | Yes | Include in the individual offender profile  
<p>|           |               |                | Yes | Refer to Psychiatric Nurse / Social Worker / Psychologist and do not put the offender in a single cell requires close supervision in correctional sentence plan |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Needs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Decision Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has committed a sexual offence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Social Worker / Psychologist / Sexual Offenders programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a victim of physical, sexual abuse or crime (if crime specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Social Worker / Psychologist in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has nightmares / flashbacks related to victim related incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Social Worker / Psychologist in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs some help with nightmares / flashbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Social Worker / Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has been physically or sexually abused in the correctional centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Social Worker / Psychologist in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The court recommended psychological / psychiatric treatment as part of the sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Social Worker / Psychologist in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Previous crimes categorized as high risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current crimes categorized as high risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serving a sentence of 15 years and above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treat as high risk for escapee in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serving more than one sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously escaped, attempted to escape or assisted in escape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Take note and inform the divisional heads security and all the unit staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treat as high risk for escapee in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case Manager to interview the offender for determination of reasons for escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously revoked probation placement, breached parole / bail conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case Manager to interview the offender for determination of reasons for revocations and breach of parole &amp; bail conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Risk &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Decision Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has institutional / disciplinary charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convicted for an offence that involves racism,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile / take cognisance for housing / refer to Social Worker / Psychologist in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has received verbal threats or someone has threatened to take something from him / her by use of force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in the individual offender profile  and refer to the Case Manager in correctional sentence plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANNEXURE B: CRIME CATEGORY (SEVERITY OF CURRENT CRIME / CONVICTION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes of which extreme violence was an element</td>
<td>Crimes of which moderate or no violence was an element-</td>
<td>Non-violent crimes where no bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intend to cause and or grievous bodily harm was done or the victim died)</td>
<td>No serious bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Murder</td>
<td>• Assault Common</td>
<td>• Alcohol Law Violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conspiracy to Murder</td>
<td>• Assault with intent to commit GBH</td>
<td>• Attempted robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serial Murder</td>
<td>• Domestic Violence</td>
<td>• House breaking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Genocide</td>
<td>• Attempted Murder</td>
<td>• House breaking with the intent to commit crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mass Murder</td>
<td>• Attempted Rape</td>
<td>• Shoplifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family Murder</td>
<td>• Common Assault</td>
<td>• Petty Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Murder</td>
<td>• Common Robbery</td>
<td>• Conspiracy to theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner Murder</td>
<td>• Bag snatching</td>
<td>• Pick pocketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patricide (Killing of Parents)</td>
<td>• Conspiracy to perform robbery</td>
<td>• Traffic Offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ritual Murder</td>
<td>• Housebreaking with intent to Rob and Robbery</td>
<td>• Evasion of payment of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attempted Murder</td>
<td>• Smash and Grab</td>
<td>• Theft by false pretences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Killing of Government Officer in Execution of his / her duty</td>
<td>• Culpable homicide</td>
<td>• Theft of intellectual property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rape</td>
<td>• Attempted robbery</td>
<td>• Computer software piracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attempted Rape</td>
<td>• Housebreaking with intent to Rob and Robbery</td>
<td>• Bridge of bail conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statutory Rape</td>
<td>• Robbery</td>
<td>• Extortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serial Rape</td>
<td>• Smash and Grab</td>
<td>• Tax Evasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gang Rape</td>
<td>• Culpable homicide</td>
<td>• Embezzlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marital Rape</td>
<td>• Attempted robbery</td>
<td>• Possession of housebreaking implements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• House Breaking with intent to Rape</td>
<td>• Intimidation</td>
<td>• Trespassing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Rape</td>
<td>• Child Abuse (Non-violent, not sexual)</td>
<td>• Failure to give account of possession of goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Molestation</td>
<td>• Public Violence</td>
<td>• suspected of being stolen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conspiracy to rape</td>
<td>• Illegal Abortion</td>
<td>• Receiving stolen property /goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sex Crimes Against Children (Use of Force or Violence)</td>
<td>• Euthanasia (Mercy Killing)</td>
<td>• Possession of stolen goods / property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procuring children for Pornography</td>
<td>• Physical Child Abuse</td>
<td>• Possession of money from sale of stolen property / goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Prostitution</td>
<td>• Hijacking (Bicycle/Motorbike)</td>
<td>• Illegal use of property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indecent Assault</td>
<td>• Malicious injury /damage to property</td>
<td>• Piracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arson</td>
<td>• Vandalism</td>
<td>• Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common Law abduction</td>
<td>• Cruelty to animals</td>
<td>• Uttering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offences under the Sexual Offences Act:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### High Risk
Crimes of which extreme violence was an element
(intend to cause and or grievous bodily harm was done or the victim died)

- Statutory abduction
- Armed Robbery
- Robbery with aggravating circumstances
- Public Violence
- Weapons And Explosives Offences (Detonation- Potential Risk of Injury, Possession, Transportation)
- Kidnapping
- Extortion
- Escape From Lawful custody
  - Closed Institutions
  - Bridge of Bail Conditions for high risk crimes
  - Absconding
- Assault GBH
- Hi-jacking (Car, Truck, Aeroplane, Train, Boat)
- Cash-in-transit (Heist)
- Bank Robbery
- Crimes against the security of the state
  - Treason
  - High Treason
  - Sedition
  - Sabotage
  - Terrorism
- Non Listed Crimes with intent of causing grievous bodily harm
- Trafficking of humans and Human body parts
- Harbouring persons wanted by law enforcement agencies
- Import and Export of Weapons and Explosives
- Sell, Possess and Use of Weapons/ Explosives
- The manufacture and modification of Weapons/Explosives
- Unlawful Possession of Weapons/Explosives
- Arson
- Bomb Threats
- Escaping from custody
- Aiding/Harbor ing an Escapee
- Accessory to escape
- Phone Tapping for Espionage purposes
- Selling/disclosing National Secrets
- Trafficking in Human Beings
- Child Trafficking
- Cross border Trafficking of Foreign Nationals
- Extortion
- Participation in Criminal Gangs
- Taking Hostage(s) in a Siege situation
- Kidnapping
- Industrial espionage
- Unlawful removal of property
- Contempt of Court
- Forgery
- Stock Theft
- Motor vehicle Theft (stationary)
- Theft motor vehicle parts / contents
- Pointing of a fire arm
- Non-listed crimes of a moderate nature
- Drugs Trafficking
- Pointing of Firearm
- Environmental pollution
- Unlawful Riots, Picketing and Strikes
- Possessing Contraband
- Supplying Contraband
- Violation of the Protection of Information Act
- Offences Related to Immigration and Emigration
- Stalking
- Trafficking in animals, trees and or endangered species
- Trafficking in Fishes or Crustaceans
- Trafficking in Foreign Currency across Borders
- Dealing/Trafficking in precious Metals/Gems
- Violating a grave
- Violating a corpse (non-sexual)
- Defeating / Obstructing the ends of Justice
- Perjury
- Computer hacking
- Bribery
- Concealment of birth
- Conspiracy to defraud
- Money Laundering
- Corruption
- Impersonation
- Concealment of death
- Counterfeiting Currency
- Bigamy
- Offences related to registration of marriages
- Offences relating to marriage
- Manufacture or Cultivation of Prohibited Drugs
- Possess and/or use Prohibited Drugs
- Possession of money from sale of Prohibited Drugs
- Conspiracy to import, export, manufacture, or sell Prohibited Drugs
- Alcohol and Tobacco Offences
- Public Drunkenness
- Sale of Liquor and Tobacco to minors
- Sale of Alcoholic products without a license
- Sale of Alcoholic Products in contravention of license conditions
- Unlawfully Possession of Firearms and Ammunition
- Unlawfully Possession of Firearms and Ammunition
- Unlicensed Import and Export of Firearms and Ammunition
- Misuse of Firearms and Ammunition
- Dealing or Trafficking of Firearms and Ammunition
- Disposing/selling of Firearms or Ammunition to unlicensed person
- Sale Firearms/Ammunition without a license
- Storage offences
- Lending of Firearms/Ammunition to minor/unlicensed person

### Low Risk
Non-violent crimes where no bodily harm was done to the victim

- Exhibitionism
- Voyeurism
- Necrophilia
- Incest
- Bestiality
- Prostitution
- Public Indecency
- Concealing a grave
- Defeating/Obstructing the ends of Justice
- Perjury
- Computer hacking
- Bribery
- Concealment of birth
- Conspiracy to defraud
- Money Laundering
- Corruption
- Impersonation
- Concealment of death
- Counterfeiting Currency
- Bigamy
- Offences related to registration of marriages
- Offences relating to marriage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>High Risk</strong></th>
<th><strong>Medium Risk</strong></th>
<th><strong>Low Risk</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes of which extreme violence was an element (intend to cause and or grievous bodily harm was done or the victim died)</td>
<td>Crimes of which moderate or no violence was an element - No serious bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
<td>Non-violent crimes where no bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The unlawful modifying or altering of Firearms
- Damage / kill flora and fauna
- Trespass
- Crimen Injuria
- Violating a Grave
- Violating a Corpse
- Gambling Offences
- Censorship Offences
- Unregulated Gaming
- Non payment of Maintenance
- Road Traffic and Vehicle Regulatory Offences
- Failure to comply with the conditions of Bail
- Failure to comply with Parole/Correctional Supervision conditions
- Perjury and Subordination of Perjury
- Defeating or Obstructing the course of Justice
- Obstructing Police in the performing of Duty
- Breach of Domestic Violence Order
- Breach of periodic Detention Orders
- Breach of Restraining Order
- Breach of Suspended Sentence
- Concealment of knowledge of Crime
- Contempt of Court
- Intimidation
- Blackmail
ANNEXURE C

ADMISSION SECURITY RISK CLASSIFICATION TOOL
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

ADMISSION SECURITY RISK CLASSIFICATION TOOL

(to be completed within 24 hours by Corrections Assessment Official)

PERSONAL PARTICULARS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURNAME:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FULL NAMES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALIAS / MAIDEN NAME:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION NUMBER:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT OFFENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCE LENGTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF ADMISSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF SENTENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRECTIONAL CENTRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>MAXIMUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ADMISSION SECURITY RISK CLASSIFICATION TOOL

CLASSIFICATION SHEET FOR SENTENCED OFFENDERS

A SECURITY RISK CLASSIFICATION SHEET: (To be completed by the Corrections Assessment Official (CAO) / CAT Coordinator / (Secretary of CMC in cases where the CAO is not appointed and CAT not established) * reflect risk factors for escape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECURITY RISK CLASSIFICATION SHEET</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. *Crime Category (Severity of Current Conviction) (Annexure A) (Warrant)</td>
<td>High Risk 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Risk 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Risk 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. *Effective length of current sentence (Warrant)</td>
<td>More than 20 years including life 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 yrs to 20 years 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yrs to 10 yrs 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 5yrs 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offence History (Number of previous convictions) (SAP69)</td>
<td>More than 3 Convictions 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 convictions 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 *Current multiple offences (Number / Counts) (Warrant)</td>
<td>More than 3 offences / counts 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 offences /counts 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 offence /count 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 *Current multiple offences (Categorization) (Attached Annexure)</td>
<td>More than 1 High Risk offence or Combination of High Risk, Medium Risk &amp; Low Risk offences 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 1 Medium Risk offence or more than 1 Low Risk offence or Combination of Medium Risk and Low Risk offences 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 offence (Any category) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time lapse between current offences(s) and previous convictions (SAP69)</td>
<td>Less than 5 yrs 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 yrs up to 10 yrs 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 yrs 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Time offenders 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. History of violence (Prior conviction(s) for violent offence(s) within last 5 years)</td>
<td>2 &amp; above 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. GUIDE FOR SCORING:

(To be utilized as a guide by the Corrections Assessment Officials CAT Coordinator, CAT and Chairperson of CMC)

The lowest possible score is **11** (denotes low risk)

Highest Possible Score is **73** (denotes high risk)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Classification</th>
<th>Minimum: 11-28</th>
<th>Medium: 29-47</th>
<th>Maximum: 48-76 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(SAP69)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Escape history</em></td>
<td>2 and above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SAP69)</td>
<td>1 and attempted escape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SAP69)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age at admission on current sentence</td>
<td>30 yrs or younger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50 yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 or older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Motive/Circumstances under which crime was committed (Annexure B)</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Crime committed in gangs context/ Crime syndicate or with accomplices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SAP62)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Number of Victims (Human)</td>
<td>3 or more victims</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SAP62)</td>
<td>2 victims</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 victim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL
C. DECISION GUIDE: (To be utilized by CMC Chairperson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum (11 to 28)</th>
<th>Placement in Medium Correctional Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Scores (29-47)</td>
<td>Placement in Medium Correctional Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Scores (48-76) &amp;</td>
<td>Placement in Maximum Correctional Centre or Placement in Maximum Sections or Unit(s) within a Correctional Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory or Compulsory Overrides: Escape Risk: (Factor 1=10; Factor 2=20; Factor 4.2=10 & Factor 7=4) = 44

Lifers, Offenders serving sentences longer than 20 years and offenders who pose an escape risk must be placed in Maximum Correctional Centre for the first five years before they are considered for reclassification.

D. SIGNATURES: (To be completed by the officials who completed the Risk Classification Guide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname and Initials of the Corrections Assessment Official / CAT Coordinator / CMC Secretary</th>
<th>Post of the official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. CONFIRMATION AND DECISION: (to be completed by the CMC and signed by the Chairperson of CMC)

The Chairperson of the CMC is allowed to disregard the final scores and utilize the conditions for Mandatory overrides stated in Section C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score obtained</th>
<th>Classification Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for the decision if it is contrary to the decision guide which is in line score ranges
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF ADMISSION SECURITY RISK CLASSIFICATION TOOL

1. All sentenced offenders are subjected to Security Risk Classification for proper placement in a Correctional Centre. The form must be completed within the first 24 hours after admission. In the absence of the SAP 62 and SAP 69c, the Security Risk Classification must be revised within 24 hours after receipt of the information.

2. The goal and objective of the assessment form must be explained to offenders.

3. The form must be completed with black pen.

4. Check SAP62, SAP 69 for completion of some sections. If these forms are not available on admission please refer to the scoring guideline in the absence of SAP62 and SAP 69c below (11)

5. Add all the scores obtained by the offender and write the total on the space provided for the total.

6. The completed form should be submitted by the CMC Chairperson who will sign for the receipt of the completed form and make a decision with regard to the placement of the offender.

7. The final decision will be made by the Chairperson of the CMC taking into consideration the factors associated with mandatory overrides.

8. A copy of the form should be filed in the case file of the offender.

9. Assessment form is confidential and must be completed in private.

10. Scoring Guidelines in the absence of SAP62 and SAP69c:

   - Offence History: Allocate Maximum points
   - Time lapse between the current offence(s) and previous convictions: If the offender is not a first time offender, allocate maximum points.
   - History of Violence: Allocate maximum points
   - Crimes committed in gangs context/ crime syndicate or with accomplices: allocate maximum points
   - Number of victims: allocate maximum points
   - In cases where an ex-offender is incarcerated but no information (clean or no SAP 69c) exist at the SAPS Criminal Bureau, the previous file and Admission & Release data must be used.

11. The following sessions must be completed as follows:

   A  Security Risk Classification Sheet: The Corrections Assessment Officials / CAT Coordinator (Secretary of CMC in cases where the CAT is not established)

   B  Guide for Scoring: The Corrections Assessment Officials / CAT Coordinator/ Secretary of CMC in cases where the CAT is not established
**C. Decision Guide:** Chairperson of CMC

**D. Signatures:** The official who completed the Security Risk Classification Guide

**E. Confirmation and Decision:** Chairperson of CMC

Annexure A: The Corrections Assessment Officials, CAT Coordinator and Chairperson of CMC

Annexure B: The Corrections Assessment Officials, CAT Coordinator and Chairperson of CMC

*NB: The SAP62 and SAP69 should be obtained within the period of one month after admission and the offender should be reclassified with this tool for proper placement.*

**F. ANNEXURE A: CRIME CATEGORY (SEVERITY OF CURRENT CRIME / CONVICTION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes of which extreme violence was an element</td>
<td>Crimes of which moderate or no violence was an element</td>
<td>Non-violent crimes where no bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intend to cause and or grievous bodily harm was done</td>
<td>No serious bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or the victim died)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Murder</td>
<td>• Assault Common</td>
<td>• Alcohol Law Violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conspiracy to Murder</td>
<td>• Assault with intent to commit GBH</td>
<td>• Attempted robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serial Murder</td>
<td>• Domestic Violence</td>
<td>• House breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Genocide</td>
<td>• Attempted Murder</td>
<td>• House breaking with the intent to commit crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mass Murder</td>
<td>• Attempted Rape</td>
<td>• Shoplifting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Family Murder</td>
<td>• Common Assault</td>
<td>• Petty Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Murder</td>
<td>• Common Robbery</td>
<td>• Conspiracy to theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner Murder</td>
<td>• Bag snatching</td>
<td>• Pick pocketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patricide (Killing of Parents)</td>
<td>• Conspiracy to perform robbery</td>
<td>• Traffic Offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ritual Murder</td>
<td>• Housebreaking with intent to Rob and Robbery</td>
<td>• Evasion of payment of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attempted Murder</td>
<td>• Smash and Grab</td>
<td>• Theft by false pretences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Killing of Government Officer in Execution of his</td>
<td>• Culpable homicide</td>
<td>• Theft of intellectual property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her duty</td>
<td>• Attempted robbery</td>
<td>• Computer software piracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rape</td>
<td>• Intimidation</td>
<td>• Bridge of bail conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attempted Rape</td>
<td>• Child Abuse (Non-violent, not sexual)</td>
<td>• Extortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statutory Rape</td>
<td>• Public Violence</td>
<td>• Tax Evasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serial Rape</td>
<td>• Illegal Abortion</td>
<td>• Embezzlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gang Rape</td>
<td>• Euthanasia (Mercy Killing)</td>
<td>• Possession of housebreaking implements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marital Rape</td>
<td>• Physical Child Abuse</td>
<td>• Trespassing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• House Breaking with intent to Rape</td>
<td>• Hijacking (Bicycle/Motorbike)</td>
<td>• Failure to give account of possession of goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Rape</td>
<td>• Malicious injury /damage to property</td>
<td>• suspected of being stolen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Molestation</td>
<td>• Vandalism</td>
<td>• Receiving stolen property /goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conspiracy to rape</td>
<td>• Cruelty to animals</td>
<td>• Possession of stolen goods / property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sex Crimes Against Children (Use of Force or</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Possession of money from sale of stolen property / goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Illegal use of property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procuring children for Pornography</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Piracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Prostitution</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indecent Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Uttering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arson</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offences under the Sexual Offences Act:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common Law abduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### High Risk

Crimes of which extreme violence was an element (intend to cause and or grievous bodily harm was done or the victim died)

- Statutory abduction
- Armed Robbery
- Robbery with aggravating circumstances
- Public Violence
- Weapons And Explosives Offences (Detonation-Potential Risk of Injury, Possession, Transportation)
- Kidnapping
- Extortion
- Escape From Lawful custody
  - Closed Institutions
  - Bridge of Bail Conditions for high risk crimes
  - Absconding
- Assault GBH
- Hi-jacking (Car, Truck, Aeroplane, Train, Boat)
- Cash-in-transit (Heist)
- Bank Robbery
- Crimes against the security of the state
  - Treason
  - High Treason
  - Sedition
  - Sabotage
  - Terrorism
- Non Listed Crimes with intent of causing grievous bodily harm
- Trafficking of humans and Human body parts
- Harbouring persons wanted by law enforcement agencies
- Import and Export of Weapons and Explosives
- Sell, Possess and Use of Weapons/ Explosives
- The manufacture and modification of Weapons/Explosives
- Unlawful Possession of Weapons/Explosives
- Arson
- Bomb Threats
- Escaping from custody
- Aiding/ Harbor an Escapee
- Accessory to escape
- Phone Tapping for Espionage purposes
- Selling/disclosed National Secrets
- Trafficking in Human Beings
- Child Trafficking
- Cross border Trafficking of Foreign Nationals
- Extortion
- Participation in Criminal Gangs
- Taking Hostage(s) in a Siege situation
- Kidnapping

### Medium Risk

Crimes of which moderate or no violence was an element

- Industrial espionage
- Unlawful removal of property
- Contempt of Court
- Forgery
- Stock Theft
- Motor vehicle Theft (stationary)
- Theft motor vehicle parts / contents
- Pointing of a fire arm
- Non-listed crimes of a moderate nature
- Drugs Trafficking
- Pointing of Firearm
- Environmental pollution
- Unlawful Riots, Picketing and Strikes
- Possessing Contraband
- Supplying Contraband
- Violation of the Protection of Information Act
- Offences Related to Immigration and Emigration
- Stalking
- Trafficking in animals, trees and or endangered species
- Trafficking in Fishes or Crustaceans
- Trafficking in Foreign Currency across Borders
- Dealing/Trafficking in precious Metals/Gems

### Low Risk

Non-violent crimes where no bodily harm was done to the victim

- Violating a grave
- Violating a corpse (non-sexual)
- Defeating / Obstructing the ends of Justice
- Perjury
- Computer hacking
- Bribery
- Concealment of birth
- Conspiracy to defraud
- Money Laundering
- Corruption
- Impersonation
- Concealment of death
- Counterfeiting Currency
- Bigamy
- Offences related to registration of marriages
- Offences relating to marriage
- Manufacture or Cultivation of Prohibited Drugs
- Possess and/or use Prohibited Drugs
- Possession of money from sale of Prohibited Drugs
- Conspiracy to import, export, manufacture, or sell Prohibited Drugs
- Alcohol and Tobacco Offences
- Public Drunkenness
- Sale of Liquor and Tobacco to minors
- Sale of Alcoholic products without a license
- Sale of Alcoholic Products in contravention of license conditions
- Purchase of Alcoholic Products in contravention of license conditions
- Unlawfully Possession of Firearms and Ammunition
- Unlicensed Import and Export of Firearms and Ammunition
- Misuse of Firearms and Ammunition
- Dealing or Trafficking of Firearms and Ammunition
- Disposing/selling of Firearms or Ammunition to unlicensed person
- Sell Firearms/Ammunition without a license
- Storage offences
- Lending of Firearms/Ammunition to minor/unlicensed person
- The unlawful modifying or altering of Firearms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>High Risk</strong></th>
<th><strong>Medium Risk</strong></th>
<th><strong>Low Risk</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes of which extreme violence was an element (intend to cause and or grievous bodily harm was done or the victim died)</td>
<td>Crimes of which moderate or no violence was an element- No serious bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
<td>Non-violent crimes where no bodily harm was done to the victim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Damage / kill flora and fauna
- Trespass
- Crimen Injuria
- Violating a Grave
- Violating a Corpse
- Gambling Offences
- Censorship Offences
- Unregulated Gaming
- Non payment of Maintenance
- Road Traffic and Vehicle Regulatory Offences
- Failure to comply with the conditions of Bail
- Failure to comply with Parole/Correctional Supervision conditions
- Perjury and Subordination of Perjury
- Defeating or Obstructing the course of Justice
- Obstructing Police in the performing of Duty
- Breach of Domestic Violence Order
- Breach of periodic Detention Orders
- Breach of Restraining Order
- Breach of Suspended Sentence
- Concealment of knowledge of Crime
- Contempt of Court
- Intimidation
- Blackmail
## G. ANNEXURE B: MOTIVE/CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH CRIME WAS COMMITTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Medium Risk</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Racially Motivated</td>
<td>- Domestic Abuse</td>
<td>- Under the Influence of Prescriptive Drugs/Medication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Revenge</td>
<td>- Under The Influence of Alcohol</td>
<td>- Poverty Driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gang related</td>
<td>- Under The Influence of Narcotic Drugs</td>
<td>- Self defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Syndicate Related</td>
<td>- Provocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Politically motivated</td>
<td>- Administering Prohibited Drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acts against the state of terrorism</td>
<td>- Adultery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Genocide</td>
<td>- Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beliefs (Ideology)</td>
<td>- Carelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mental illness</td>
<td>- Drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sexually motivated</td>
<td>- Financial gain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intent / premeditated</td>
<td>- Ethnic Cleansing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>- Economical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Anger</td>
<td>- Ignorance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dangerous Act</td>
<td>- Irresponsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Domestic Violence</td>
<td>- Labour Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Excitement and Status</td>
<td>- Lack of social skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family Related conflict</td>
<td>- Muti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Group Think</td>
<td>- Material acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impulsivity</td>
<td>- Negligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Passion</td>
<td>- Opportunity driven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paedophilia</td>
<td>- Provocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peer Influence</td>
<td>- Public Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Politically Motivated</td>
<td>- Stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Road Rage</td>
<td>- Tribal Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sexually Motivated</td>
<td>- Witchcraft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Psychopathy (lack of guilt, inability to learn from punishment, egocentricity, inability to express emotions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Racially Motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reckless Behavior amounting to Intention or Malice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Racially Motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recklessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Revenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>