A review of the Integrated Youth Offender Programme piloted in Boksburg Juvenile Correctional Centre with the “Inkanyezi yentathakusa”

1 Inkanyezi yentathakusa (Zulu): Morning Stars (English), “Ikhwezi lomso” (Xhosa)
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A. INTRODUCTION: WHY AN INTEGRATED APPROACH?

South Africa has seen a growth in the number of children and young people arrested, charged and convicted of crime over the past few years. In 1999, 114,773 children were arrested, compared to 170,224 in 2002. The number of sentenced and unsentenced children in Correctional Centre's (prison) has also grown, though not as dramatically, from 3,776 in 2001 to 4,449 in 2003. The problem of youthful offending is starkly illustrated by the statistics of young offenders in Correctional Centres. In June 2003, 72,427 offenders under the age of 25 were held in South Africa's Correctional Centres. These young offenders constitute 41 percent of the Correctional Centre population whereas they form 26 percent of the general South African population.

Although many of these offenders are charged and convicted of serious crimes, most of them will return to the community after serving a term of imprisonment. It is crucial, then, that their period of imprisonment attempts to assist these individuals to turn away from their criminal lifestyle so that they can lead a law abiding and productive life when they are released from the Correctional Centre. It is also important that they learn the skills necessary to function effectively while in the Correctional Centre and after release without engaging in further crime or violence.

The United Nations Rules for the protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (Resolution 45/113 December 1990) provides the international protocol regarding the focus of incarcerated sentence options:

79. “All juveniles should benefit from arrangements designed to assist them in returning to society, family life, education or employment after release. Procedures, including early release, and special courses should be devised to this end.

80. Competent authorities should provide or ensure services to assist juveniles in re-establishing themselves in society and to lessen prejudice against such juveniles. These services should ensure, to the extent possible, that the juvenile is provided with suitable residence, employment, clothing and sufficient means to maintain himself or herself upon release in order to facilitate successful reintegration…”

Section 23 of the proposed South African Child Justice Bill states that the purpose of sentencing is to:

a) encourage the child to understand the implication of and be accountable for the harm caused;

b) promote an individualised response which is appropriate to the child’s circumstances and proportionate to the circumstances surrounding the offence;

c) promote the reintegration of the child into the family and community; and

d) ensure that any necessary supervision, guidance, treatment or service which forms part of the sentence assist the child in the process of reintegration”.

The focus is therefore on the reintegration of juvenile offenders within a human and child rights framework. This applies to all sentence options: community-based sentences, restorative justice sentences, sentences involving correctional supervision, sentence with residential requirements (prison or a residential facility), or a postponed or suspended sentence.
Although these principles are stated in respect of children, between the 14 to 18 year age group, they apply as much to young people in conflict with the law in the 18 to 21 age group – defined by the South African Department of Correctional Services as “juveniles”. Not only are many of this age group committing crime as a child and experience the criminal justice system during this phase, but also the historical and present macro socio-economic dynamics have impacted on aspects of youth development and young peoples’ participation in the economy, community structures and governance of South Africa.²

The Department of Correctional Service (DCS) is responsible for implementing sentences of the courts, and in line with international protocols and the new policy approach towards child justice, the department has initiated policy and strategic steps to effect positive outcomes in offenders during their sentences through a focus on rehabilitation of offending behaviour.

The new policy shift has resulted in an 'Integrated Support System' for offenders, which focuses on delivering programmes with non-government and community-based organisations where there is joint care for offender development and rehabilitation to meet individual needs of the offender in the community. The White Paper also calls for families and communities to take greater responsibility for providing for the destitute and finding employment for ex-offenders.

There are a limited number of programmes currently available to offenders offered by members of the Department of Correctional Services, as well as by non-government, faith-based and community-based organisations. Yet, there is no programme that offers an integrated or holistic programme for offenders – mainly because no single organisation can do it alone. The Integrated Youth Offenders Programme (IYOP) aimed to pilot and review a holistic approach to dealing with the problem of offending and re-offending amongst young offenders. It aimed to build resilience among young offenders to enable them to choose a non-criminal life, and to address the factors associated with re-offending. From a review perspective, the intention was to determine whether an integrated approach is an appropriate and effective way of preventing re-offending in young offenders.

The proposal (February 2004) submitted to the Department of Correctional Services explicitly stated the theoretical approach and behavioural model of the Integrated Youth Offenders Programme to be offered at Boksburg Correctional Centre, Gauteng. The IYOP was built on the theory of risk and resilience,³ and incorporated an understanding of socio-economic dynamics that impinge on a young person in South Africa and influence their offending behaviour.⁴ Known ‘protective factors’⁵ which influence effective reintegration of ex-offenders and prevent recidivism were also considered in the design of the programme. Because the focus of the IYOP was on influencing behaviour change, the Transtheoretical Model⁶ (cycle of change process) was used to model the approach, methodologies and sequencing of programmes within the overall intervention.

⁵ Social Exclusion Unit, United Kingdom (2004); Urban Institute, USA (2004).

The integrated approach differs from programmes targeting single protective factors. The benefit is that an integrated approach allows for interventions within the complex coexistence of risk factors and therefore supports the young person to identify these factors in their own lives and to understand the impact of their lives and their offending behaviour. The range of interventions takes this understanding further by providing knowledge to allow the offender to make informed choices. It also supportively challenged the offender to contemplate and dialogue possible changes, and if the young person indicated a determination to change the behaviour, it supported them in taking the necessary action within the prison setting. Environmental factors within the prison setting as well as within their communities could then be taken into consideration at the various stages in the journey of change and incarceration.

The specific objectives and outcomes of the programme, in relation to the identified resilience and protective factors are presented in Section 2 below. The targeted risk factors that negatively influence behaviour are included, as are the known protective factors that contribute toward preventing re-offending.

In addition to understanding risk, resilience and protective factors as part of the process of youth offender transformation is the need to understand issues of youth development within the context of offending behaviour, rehabilitation and within the criminal justice system. Of interest are the reintegration ‘scenarios’ relevant to young people in South Africa as this approach acknowledges youth development is integral to personal development, changing offending behaviour and the reintegration after incarceration into families and communities.

A young person may be:

- Convicted as child and released as child (14-17 years)
- Convicted as child and released as a juveniles (18-21)
- Convicted as child and released as a young adult (21-25)
- Convicted as a juvenile and released as a juveniles (18 – 21)
- Convicted as a juvenile and released as a young adult (22-25)
- Convicted as a juvenile and released as an adult (25-30)

In addition, being male or female and socio-economic backgrounds also need to be taken into account. These scenarios assume different levels of:

- Maturity and formation of self identity
- Developmental stage prior to imprisonment, while incarcerated and post-release
- Mental health and cognitive capacity
- Education levels and experience
- Family context
- Substance use
- Employment and employability
- Experience of living independently
- Experience with criminal justice system

These levels may in turn affect the young person’s experience while in prison and as part of the rehabilitation process. In addition, the experience of incarceration may affect the young person’s development. Consequently, these may affect the ability of the young person to benefit from treatment in and out of prison, to shift from a life of

---

7 Based on the following work: Urban Institute (2004). *The dimensions, pathways and consequences of youth reentry*. Editor: Mears, P. & Travis, J.
crime and ‘resume socially constructive and productive roles in society’ (United Nations Minimum Rules).

The Social Exclusion Unit\(^8\) identified specific intervention practices that are known to prevent re-offending. Key findings indicated that:

- Programmes which focus on behaviour (such as focusing on the way an offender thinks and positive techniques to avoid situations that led to offending), reduced reconviction rates by up to 14 percent;
- Reconviction rates were 11 percent lower for two-thirds of offenders who completed an alcohol and drug addiction recovery project;
- Where landlords helped prisoners to retain or terminate their tenancies of homes and advised them on financial issues during and after their sentence, only 5 percent had no home to go to after release, and 50 percent kept their tenancy with no added debt;
- Various initiatives to find job placements and job-skills training programmes for offenders found that less than 6 percent were known to have re-offended.

However, as the Unit points out, these services are not provided to all prisoners nor are they available at all prisons. In addition, resources still tend to focus mainly on security. One of the key concerns of the Unit is that no department or organisation in the United Kingdom is responsible for reintegration and there is a lack of co-ordination in services. Nor, they argue, is enough being done to engage families, communities and businesses in addressing social exclusion – to prevent crime and to improve reintegration.

The \textit{Intensive Aftercare Programme}\(^9\) in the United States of America aimed to reduce recidivism by providing targeted services and counselling to youth offenders ‘throughout correctional supervision, pre-release, community re-entry, and community supervision’.\(^10\) The evaluation highlights the following guiding principles for effective programmes aimed at reducing recidivism. Programmes should:

- ‘Be carefully designed to target the specific characteristics and problems of offenders that can be changed in treatment (dynamic characteristics) and that are predictive of future criminal activities … such as antisocial attitudes and behaviour, drug use, and anger responses."
- Be implemented in a way that is appropriate for the participating offenders and that uses therapeutic techniques known to work …
- Require offenders to spend a reasonable length of time in the program considering the changes desired (deliver sufficient dosage).
- Give the most intensive programs to offenders who are at the highest risk for recidivism.
- Use cognitive and behavioural treatment methods based on theoretical models such as behaviourism, social learning, or cognitive behavioural theories of change that emphasize positive reinforcement contingencies for pro-social behaviour and are individualised as much as possible.’

Similarly, a meta-analysis\(^11\) of juvenile delinquency programmes in the USA indicates that the more effective programs:

\(^8\) Social Exclusion Unit (2002). \textit{Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners}. United Kingdom.
‘Provided larger amounts of meaningful contact (treatment integrity) and were longer in duration (more dosage).

• Were designed by a researcher or had research as an influential component of the treatment setting.

• Offered behavioural, skill-orientated, and multimodal treatment.’

The Gottfredson and Barton\textsuperscript{12} study on \textit{What works What doesn’t in Crime Prevention} suggests that the amount of treatment and quality of the intervention may be the important factor in reducing recidivism, regardless of whether it is offered in an institution or in the community setting.

Spence and Jones-Walker\textsuperscript{13} emphasise the importance of the following elements in designing and implementing effective re-entry pathways:

• Accurate risk and needs assessments.

• Cognitive-behavioural interventions.

• Customizing services to address the specific need of each offender, taking into account their strengths, limitations and learning style.

• Comprehensive treatment and services to address all risk and needs.

• Continuity of these services after release.

• Community involvement and resources.

In addition, the Urban Institute\textsuperscript{14} process highlighted the ‘critical importance of re-entry strategies that increase the psychosocial maturity, competencies, and resilience of youth so that they can successfully overcome diverse sets of challenges and go on to obtain employment, education, and close relationships with others.’

B. REVIEW OF THE IYOP

The IYOP is committed to developing an effective evidence-based intervention for young offenders and staff in South Africa. Therefore, an integrated review and evaluation was built into the entire IYOP. The overall purpose was to determine if the Integrated Youth Offender approach is an appropriate and effective way of preventing re-offending in young offenders. Three questions were specifically developed to frame the review. These were:

1. What has changed in the young offender as a result of the programmes individually and collectively

2. What impact did the training focused on Correctional Centre staff have, and did this have an effect on their treatment of offender participants of the programme

3. Is the IYOP model of intervention appropriate and has there been the correct selection of component programmes

The IYOP is complex in the levels of monitoring, assessment and evaluation required for the review. These include the individual learning programme interventions for staff and offenders (assessment both at an individual and group level), the monitoring of the integrated approach, and the evaluation of six independent organisations working


\textsuperscript{13}Urban Institute (2004). \textit{The dimensions, pathways and consequences of youth reentry}. Editors: Mears, P. & Travis, J.

\textsuperscript{14}Urban Institute (2004). \textit{The dimensions, pathways and consequences of youth reentry}. Editors: Mears, P. & Travis, J.
together. In addition, the programme set out to achieve a number of core objectives and address a critical range of protective factors with specific outcomes and indicators.

**Methodology**

A review of evaluative and research material pertaining to evaluations and reviews with young offenders was undertaken to provide a sound methodological approach for the evaluation. As stated in the commentary accompanying the UN Beijing Rules (1995) Part Six Article 30, the following is stated: ‘**A constant appraisal of the needs of juveniles, as well as the trends and problems of delinquency, is a prerequisite for improving the methods of formulating appropriate policies and establishing adequate interventions, at both formal and informal levels. In this context, research by independent persons and bodies should be facilitated by responsible agencies, and it may be valuable to obtain and to take into account the views of juveniles themselves, not only those who come into contact with the system.**’.

According to Save the Children (1995) there are three key research principles which must be addressed when undertaking research with children. These are:

- **Relevance** – ‘Information from and about children is needed to make sure the objectives and activities of projects and programmes are relevant to them, their lives and their needs.’
- **Effectiveness** – ‘Assumptions about children’s behaviour and adults’ behaviour in relation to children may be wrong, resulting in programmes which may not meet their objectives’.
- **Values and principles** – ‘Many agencies are concerned with the lives, welfare and rights of children. This includes the right of children to participate in decisions that affect them’.

Key issues that emerged from the review were the rights of the juvenile and youth offenders, validity of responses from offenders, validity of data from a range of tools, the quality of the individual programme assessments, language and literacy levels, the time and limited resources available for the evaluation, and the range of factors being measured. These were taken into account in the planning and design of the IYOP review.

The framework on the following pages was used to ‘track’ the measurement process and indicators.

The methodology used a participative action-reflection approach for the pre and post evaluation. The benefits of this approach are:

- **Ownership** rests within the Correctional Centre community of staff, juvenile offenders, community structures and civil society;
- **Relevant findings** emerge based on experience and practice that are relevant for the specific context within which correctional services and youth offending occur;
- **Participation** in the research process is more likely and programmes are more likely to be sustainable in the longer term;
- **The needs of a diverse group** are reflected and their opinions and perceptions are taken into account in the future design and implementation of the programme; and
- **Both the immediate practical needs as well as the long-term interests of stakeholders and juveniles** are acknowledged in terms of respect for rights and responsibilities.
## INTEGRATED YOUTH OFFENDER PROGRAMME: FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRAMME OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IYOP OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>Protective and Resilience factor vs Risk factor</th>
<th>Expected outcomes and indicators</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>PROGRAMME FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Address individual’s attitudes and responses towards education, development and employment, and assist in opening up opportunities to access employment and other opportunities. | Education and schooling level and experience  
*Risk factors:*  
Poor cognitive skills and learning challenges. | Improvement in cognitive skills, and demonstrate open attitudes towards education and learning opportunities. | Demographic survey for educational experience.  
Pre and post cognitive development. | All programmes |
| Employment and vocational training, and financial support and debt management. | Acknowledgment that offender can access and create employment opportunities away from crime. | Achievement of outcomes of business skills training through BEntrepreneurING assessment. | BEntrepreneurING |
| Mental and physical health and behaviour; psychological resilience. | Understanding of how factors have impacted on their lives; Greater understanding and making sense of the world in which they live; Developed internal resilience to face up to difficulties. | Assessment by CSVR intervention. | All programmes Vuka S’Hambe |
| Attitudes, assertiveness and self-control, developing a sense of purpose and hope (spirituality), and understanding diversity in others and self.  
*Risk factors:*  
High impulsivity; Anti-social attitudes and feelings. | Shift away of criminal gang activity towards positive interactions with offender group. Improved assertiveness and self control. Develop a sense of purpose and hope for the future and an internal resilience to face up to life challenges. This will be gained through an increased | Pre and post evaluation of sense of purpose, role models, assertiveness and attitudes. | All programmes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Pre and post assessments</th>
<th>Alternatives to Violence</th>
<th>All programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop conflict management and problem solving skills to support successful interpersonal interactions.</td>
<td>- Understanding of how risk factors have impacted on their lives and a greater understanding of the world in which they live.</td>
<td>Pre and post approach to conflict and to see possibilities that problems can be solved. Demonstrate these skills in their life given the prison context.</td>
<td>Alternatives to Violence</td>
<td>NICRO Family reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-skills and developing coping skills. Risk factor: Lack of problem solving skills</td>
<td>The participant is open to opportunities to transform conflict and to see possibilities that problems can be solved. Demonstrate these skills in their life given the prison context.</td>
<td>Pre and post approach to conflict and to see possibilities that problems can be solved. Demonstrate these skills in their life given the prison context.</td>
<td>Alternatives to Violence</td>
<td>All programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration and rebuilding family relationships and networks with the offender while in prison and for after release.</td>
<td>- Improved relationships with the family while in prison and develop plans for post release housing and family acceptance.</td>
<td>Demographic survey family history. Pre and post views of family. NICRO reports and assessment.</td>
<td>NICRO Family reintegration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family networks and living arrangements (housing) post release. Risk factor: Family breakdowns and disrupted family relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to make informed decisions about healthy living in relation to drug and alcohol use, HIV/AIDS and sexual relationships.</td>
<td>- Increased knowledge and is able to engage in dialogue to inform attitudes and possible behaviour changes in relations to substance use and healthy living. Develop greater understanding of HIV/AIDS, sexuality and sexual relationships to make informed decisions in their own lives.</td>
<td>Demographic survey substance use history. Assessments from CADS and THEMBA. Pre and post attitude changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CADS THEMBA HIV/AIDS ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol misuse, healthy living. Risk factor: Participating in risk behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through restorative justice components participants will address the issues of taking personal responsibility and recognising the impact of their actions.</td>
<td>- Improved communication skills Relationship building with family. Understand the consequences of their actions on themselves, the victim, their family and community; and gain insights into restorative justice.</td>
<td>Pre and post survey restorative justice factors, relationships and communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive interaction with the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "A direct RJ intervention was not included in the programme."
Develop the social, behavioural and socio-economic skills to enable young person to resist risk factors and develop an internal resilience to face up to the difficulties that life throws in their way.

| Peer group and friends; communication and social skills; leisure, recreation and interests. Risk factors: Weak social ties Community disorganisation and crime Identification with anti-social or criminal role models | Develop the social, interpersonal and coping skills to enhance friendships and participate in meaningful self-development activities based on the strengths and skills of the individual. Demonstrate the growth by shifting away from criminal gang activity towards positive interaction with peers, and greater acceptance of others. | Demographic survey participation in gang activity. Pre and post future orientation. | All programmes |

possibilities and processes.


Participant consent and confidentiality

Given the nature of undertaking evaluation assessment with juvenile offenders as part of the selection process a briefing was given to the selected participants on the role of the review and purpose of the evaluation component of the programme. The evaluator then asked the offenders if they wished to participate voluntarily in the review process and explained the nature of the confidentiality of the information they would share during the course of the programme.

It was stressed that no incentives or benefits would be given to the offenders for their involvement in the programme, but the information would help the IYOP to strengthen its programme for other offenders and build our knowledge of reintegration, rehabilitation and preventing re-offending. Each participant was given the option to refrain from participating in the evaluation with no repercussions. Upon agreement each participant signed a consent form, which was also signed by the evaluator and each participant could take a copy of it (although none of them took it as they wanted it to be anonymous within their sections).

Instruments

Demographic surveys and baseline questionnaires were completed by the participants prior to the first programme intervention. This survey provided information on the life history and unchangeable risk factors that the young offenders had experienced. This included information about housing, schooling, bereavement, experience of substance use, criminal activity, family criminal associations, family relationships, poverty and economic support.

Mid-way through the programme one-on-one interviews were conducted by the CSVR lead facilitator with a sample of participants to gather feedback on the process, delivery and achievement to-date. These were conducted in the vernacular language. The week after the final sessions a post-intervention questionnaire (baseline revisited) was completed by 15 participants, and a post-intervention rating and feedback sheet was completed. In addition, one focus group was held with all the participants to gather qualitative and reflective data from the participants.

The assessments undertaken by each programme and implementation reports, as well as other documents of the process, were collated to provide evidence for the review. Upon completion of the programme, a review discussion was held with facilitators, team members and programme managers to reflect on the integrated process, selection and sequencing of programmes, and the integrated partnership approach. This provided valuable information on the process, implementation, challenges and achievements, and provided an opportunity for debriefing from the intensive programme.

The available resources for this review did not allow an intensive review process with the staff who underwent the training, nor those who were not included, to gain insights and evidence of the impact of the programme on the Centre functioning and culture. Limited interviews were conducted in February 2005 with five staff members to gain insights into these issues. This is noted as a limitation of the evaluation.

Limitations

The review was limited in two further ways. The instruments were only available in English and programme facilitators translated the tools while they were being implemented, as well as translation of participant responses from isiZulu to English.
Some variance in the actual and translated meaning may be evident. In addition, these instruments were being piloted for the integrated programme and further refinements will be made based on the emerging findings.

The second limitation is that the post-evaluation was conducted immediately after the final sessions before the graduation ceremony. Consequently no longitudinal study is incorporated to determine the impact of the programme of reducing recidivism – which is what the programme ultimately aims to achieve. This limitation was highlighted at the beginning of the programme and the intention is to undertake such a study, however additional funding is required.

C. INTEGRATED YOUTH OFFENDER PROGRAMME

C.1. Overview of the programme

The Integrated Youth Offender Programme (IYOP) was offered to 20 convicted young offenders at Boksburg Correctional Centre (prison) in Gauteng, South Africa by six non-government organisations (NGOs) over a period of eight months during 2004. A coordinated series of workshops were offered to the offenders by these organisations to reinforce the learning and build resilience. The Integrated Youth Offender Project built on the theory of risk and resilience, and focused on addressing the factors associated with re-offending. The aim was to deliver an integrated programme that tackled a critical range of issues by weaving these themes through all the interventions that were offered.

The IYOP recognised that the success of any Correctional Centre-based intervention depends on the attitudes of Correctional Centre staff and their treatment of offenders. Consequently the project offered a training programme to selected Department of Correctional Service (DCS) staff at the Boksburg Correctional Centre.

The Centre for the Study of Violence (CSVR) undertook the management of the programme. Monthly meetings were held to monitor delivery, report on progress, discuss hand over issues and ensure the delivery of the programme. The hand-over process was important as it allowed the next facilitator team (or individual) to understand the emerging and current group dynamics, successes to-date, issues and concerns about logistics and possible solutions found, and it acted as a debriefing process for the team exiting the programme.

The project acknowledged the importance of sustaining the outcomes of the programme with the participants as well as in the juvenile section of the Correctional Centre. The proposal stated that follow-up support on a monthly basis would be provided to the participants for at least a further one year, as well as peer-support programmes to facilitate the practical use of what the participants have learnt within the Correctional Centre community, and to run small interventions on their own. This will be supervised and monitored by the IYOP programme partners. Actual strategies and commitment to take the process forward with the participants in the Correctional Centre were discussed during the team meetings (and are reflected in the minutes) and the focus of the meetings in early 2005 began to clarify the process and financing of the longer term intervention of the programme as well as continued support for the graduates.

The juvenile and youth offenders who participated in the IYOP underwent a selection and assessment process prior to programme commencement. The process involved
the identification of approximately thirty potential participants by the Boksburg Correctional Centre staff. The identified offenders were then invited to undergo the assessment process conducted by the CSVR, as the lead organisation.

A team of psychologists undertook the assessment process and prepared a report on each of the areas assessed. Two hours were allocated to the assessment of each participant. Report-writing was estimated to be one hour per participant. The limitation is that this is an expensive process as it is done in individual rather than group format. The evaluation assessment could not afford to do a post-intervention assessment for this reason. However the information it yielded was a valuable diagnostic tool for decision making regarding selection of participants, programme content and individual case management throughout programme delivery.

The Senior South African Individual Scale - Revised (SSAIS-R) was used for assessment of the participants’ cognitive ability. This intelligence test standardised for South African pupils between ages of seven and sixteen years, measures two primary mental abilities, verbal and non-verbal factors. It was administered in the participants’ language of choice (isiZulu, isiSotho, English, and Afrikaans). It yielded valuable information about the participants’ learning potential and thus their suitability for the programme. Participants were further assessed on their emotional and personality makeup using a projective drawing analysis (Draw-A-Person); Incomplete Sentences and Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). Interpretation of these tools yielded information on each participants’ interpersonal relatedness and ability to communicate, sense of self, personality traits, mood and anxiety states. A decision was then taken whether the individual would be suitable for a group intervention.

The results from the above assessment process were used to select participants. Other selection criteria included the length of sentence (as those who were to be released prior to completion of the intervention were excluded), type of crime sentenced for (to ensure a range of offending behaviour), and those who were identified as having severe mental health problems were excluded as the programme did not set out to address these factors per se. This process identified fourteen potential participants. The social worker at the Correctional Centre assisted the assessment team to identify a further six participants. Those who were then selected were invited to participate on a voluntary basis as no remuneration or incentive (such as early release or parole) was given. In total, twenty participants were selected and who all agreed to participate in the programme.

One of the lessons from the selection process was to use the official age of the participants rather than ask participants their age – as sometimes this did not correspond with the official age on criminal records. It is necessary to use the official age, and not the age the participants gave, to avoid the possibility of transfer to adult sections – as happened with one of the participants although an arrangement was made for him to continue to attend the programme. A further criterion to add in future is to select participants who have not requested a transfer to other Correctional Centres - as happened half-way through the programme when three participants were transferred. After a written request to the Head of the Correctional Centre, they were recalled to ensure they could complete the programme.

One participant from the original selection only attended a few sessions and then ‘disappeared’ from the programme. By then it was too late to add a new participant to the programme. Towards the end of the programme three participants were released from the centre and consequently did not attend the graduation ceremony. Two were transferred to KwaZulu-Natal and Leeuwkop Correctional Centres in September at their request to be nearer their family members.
Consequently fifteen offenders graduated from the IYOP on 25 November 2005 at a ceremony held at Boksburg Correctional Centre. Families of the participants were invited to attend, and the programme included the reading of poems written by the participants and a dance from the Themba HIV/AIDS Organisation workshops.

By January 2005, seven graduates remained in the juvenile centre. One had been transferred to the adult section, three had been transferred to other Centres, and four had been released.

The project was funded through a Development Cooperation Ireland (DCI) grant to the Criminal Justice Programme of the CSVR. Although the project did not form part of the initial proposal, the DCI was kind enough to support the IYOP.

C.2. Sequencing of programmes

The programmes were offered in a phased approach. The sequence of the programmes intended to build on the core protective factors known to prevent re-offending and to reinforce core messages and values to meet the programme outcomes as discussed previously. The programmes complemented each other for the range of targeted factors and links between the programmes were made as issues arose. The content or sections of some of the programmes was reviewed to ensure the compatibility of the programmes and to reduce replication where it was believed to be unnecessary. Actual delivery is illustrated in the Appendix 1.

The programmes for training DCS personnel as well as the offenders are included, and the dates of the key project team meetings are included.

C.3. Offender-based Programme Profiles

The intervention profiles for each of the six programmes, which comprised the integrated approach, are provided below. An overview of the staff training is provided later in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of organisation</td>
<td>Phaphama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) is a series of workshops presenting pre-emptive conflict management skills enabling individuals to build successful interpersonal interactions, gain insights into themselves and find new and positive approaches to their lives. It provides experiences of respect for all, community building, co-operation and trust. Three workshop levels are offered:

- **AVP Basic**
  This workshop deals with affirmation, communication methods, developing cooperative attitudes, developing a sense of community, and creative conflict resolution.

- **AVP Advanced**
  The group selects a topic of concern for further exploration and to develop skills to transform conflicts non-violently. Typical themes include dealing with anger, fear, resentment, forgiveness, stereotyping, relationships between man and women and negative peer pressure.

AVP Training for Facilitators
Participants who wish to become AVP facilitators after completing the basic and advanced workshops are trained in group process skills, leadership skills and methods, and developing team building.

The methodology is an experiential learning process based on various activities which are used to illustrate and explore individual and group behaviour, engage participants in dialogue, and seek alternative acceptable behaviour. Each AVP programme was run over four hours over four consecutive days. The AVP basic was run at the beginning of the IYOP (as the first intervention), the AVP advanced two months later, and the AVP Training for Facilitators (T4F) towards the end of the programme.

Assessment and evaluation processes are integrated into the workshops and participants reflect on their growth and challenges they faced since the last workshop at the beginning of the next one.

Participants trained as facilitators are able to join the AVP Facilitator team to undertake workshops while in prison and post-release.

A number of key achievements were made during the AVP Basic workshop with the participants. These included:

- A shift from macho bravado to humility, co-operation and cohesion.
- Participants getting in tune with themselves.
- Relationships formed between participants and between participants and facilitators.
- From non-communicative to communicative.
- Building self-esteem, self awareness and self empowerment.
- Understanding of power issues.

‘Ngifunde ukumamela umuntu’ (I learnt to listen to people)
Participant

From the AVP Advanced workshops the following insights were gained by participants:

- Learning the importance of introspection.
- Raising consciousness of goal setting, especially own goals and group goals
- Possibilities of behaviour change.
- General commitment to continue with the process of finding alternatives to violence and to the IYOP.
- Exploring how fear leads to anger.
- Talking about their offences.

The AVP Training for Facilitators allowed participants to:

- Experience being facilitators including role-playing and debriefing.
- Learn skills of facilitation of giving and receiving feedback.
- Learning from one another.
- Understanding the concept of conflict transformation.
- Understanding the elements of leadership.

---

15 The spelling was corrected in the quotes used in this report and otherwise is directly as written by participants. In some instances the original was in the vernacular language and the translation is provided.
During the Training for Facilitators a visiting observer documented the process (with the permission of AVP and the participants). This provided valuable insights into how the AVP process impacts on the group and individuals within the prison context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Business Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Organisation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>BEntrepreneurING</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme aimed to develop participants’ self-knowledge and self management skills, help them re-frame their current context and the skills they have acquired in the business of crime so they are empowered and motivated to change, and to develop a future vision of themselves and a sense of purpose. In addition, the programme aimed to teach practical skills to start up and sustain a business that reinforced and developed their unique package of skills.

The programme was offered as four modules:

**Module 1** Investigating myself, my present, past and future.
Expected outcomes were to strengthen self image, increase awareness of own skills and talents, draw out positive aspect of self and their past, and create a sense of possibility and hope in their future.

**Module 2** Feasibility study.
In group discussion they brainstormed business ideas based on the skills and resources available in the group. They were then taught to undertake a feasibility study. The outcomes were to look at the world with an entrepreneurial ‘eye’, develop a sense of various business opportunities outside, and to learn skills for testing business ideas.

**Module 3** Basic business plans, cash flow margin and profit.
This module provided an understanding and basic business vocabulary, and developed an understanding of, and practice, of price costing, selling price and profit margins. A cartoon story book was used as a learning tool.

**Module 4** Marketing myself and my business, managing myself as an entrepreneur.
An understanding about marketing and types of marketing and promotional period was provided, and how this can be applied. In addition, participants explored how to sell themselves as a personal brand.

The modelling of one of the course facilitators was powerful as being self-employed and an entrepreneur made it appear possible. Key outcomes included the recognition and valuing of existing experience and skills of the offenders, the exposure to the option of legal self-employment (the offenders were excited to know that they could make money legally), enhanced self-esteem, the gaining of practical skills and knowledge, and the exploration of a vision for themselves and their community.

The participants were given the contact number of the organisation for them to contact for support in being self-employed after release.
In addition to the business skills programme, BEntrepreneurING offered a writing programme to the participants as the IYOP drew to a close. This was both an identified need to encourage creative skills as a result of the business skills course, as well as a method to ‘capture’ more qualitative feedback for the evaluation.

Successes of the writing programme include:
- Showing them the use of writing as a tool for exploring personal growth and building emotional resilience.
- Sharing our passion for and respect of writing.
- Developed a compilation of groups writing as content for the IYOP evaluation.
- Gave the participants the time and space to reflect on their growth journeys.
- Validated existing writers in the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Substance Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme involved a prevention and awareness programme that dealt with addiction, information on drugs and alcohol, the impact of addiction on the physical, spiritual and psychological functioning, dealing with peer pressure, coping with relapse and high risk situations, and the links between drugs, HIV and STDs. The focus of the programme was to engage offenders in positive behaviour change through promoting healthy living and habits, and encouraging individuals to take responsibility for meaningful interpersonal relationships. Six sessions were held.

The methodology incorporated providing information through the use of videos, brochures, guest speakers (for example a recovering alcoholic), handouts and activities, followed by discussion, feedback, group presentations, role plays and opportunities for questions and answers. The role-plays provided opportunities for offenders to experience being in different situations and to face the challenges of ‘saying no’ and changing their behaviour. Offenders were given opportunities to be honest about their drug-related behaviour and the consequences of it. Individual high-risk situations were identified and participants developed original and realistic ideas and plans on how to overcome personal addictions.

During one session the relationship between crime and drugs was raised. Offenders “spoke passionately about their involvement in criminal activities” (CADS report). One offender revealed he was a gang leader and provided insights into the relationship between drug use, drug trafficking and crime. He revealed how important drugs were in him feeling powerful and strong in order for the gang to achieve its goals, and that peer pressure played an important part in ‘safety in numbers’. Of interest is that during the session there was an ‘awakening or realisation that friends are not here to rescue one from negative situations or necessarily visit one at Correctional Centre. Family usually play an important role in this regard’ (CADS Report).

The facilitators were concerned that the offenders gave model answers, indicating their level of awareness of issues and ‘correct attitudes’, but that it was not possible.
to detect their honesty especially as what was often written about did not correspond to the verbal response or experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>VUKA S’HAMBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation:</td>
<td>Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vuka S’Hambe programme is a psychotherapeutic approach to life skills that promotes the development of self-knowledge, psychological well-being, and promotes an authentic self-esteem. Expected outcomes included assisting young offenders with anger, stress management, developing emotional relationships with others, developing decision making skills and included a restorative justice approach to encourage taking personal responsibility for one’s actions as well as creating awareness of the impact of actions on the victim.

The methodology is based on an experiential process intended to engage participants in creative ways to reflect upon themselves and learn new ways of thinking, feeling and behaving. Games and puzzles were used to promote thinking skills, managing emotions, problem solving, sharing, decision making, managing conflict and self awareness. Each session began with the lighting of a candle and placing it in the centre of the circle to provide continuity and safety. To promote self-knowledge, facilitators gave participants the opportunity to self-monitor changes in their behaviours, thought (attitudes) and feelings. They were encouraged to share their reactions to the experiences in the group and encouraged to give and receive feedback.

The length of the intervention was scheduled for 26 sessions, and the programme was run throughout the IYOP. The Vuka S’Hambe programme served as a weaving thread throughout the IYOP. Even though other programmes came and went, the Vuka S’Hambe facilitators remained constant and gave a sense of continuity, assisting participants with emotional difficulties as they emerged, providing debriefing opportunities when incidents arose such as fights in the sections and the sexual offender intervention.

Only two sessions were given to the restorative justice component of the programme because four sessions were lost due to Correctional Centre operational factors. The two sessions provided an overview of restorative justice and “set the scene for them to take responsibility for their crimes and to recognise how their actions impacted on the victims” (Vuka S’Hambe report). The programme recognised that this topic was not addressed adequately, and there is a need to take it forward.

Key changes that the Vuka S’Hambe programme brought about in the young people included the following:

- Ability to reflect on emotions, make sense of their lives.
- Develop trust as group, safety, supportiveness to each other.
- Develop empathetic understanding.
- Managing anger, sense of control.
- Positive attitude.
- Positive self worth and confidence.
- Taking responsibility for crime, behaviour and lives.
- Optimism and realistic sense of hope for future.
- Challenges to think about right and wrong.
- Making peace with past negative experiences.
- Experiencing positive peer relations and role modelling of facilitators.

Of interest was the month-long break in the Vuka S’Hambe programme during July as this impacted on the group. The report highlights the necessity of then having to take two sessions to ‘warm up to the group again’ and the need for participants to share their growth.

The challenges in taking this programme forward include the need for follow-up after release and within the Correctional Centre to sustain and deepen the change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Family Reintegration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of intervention:</td>
<td>National Institute for Crime Prevention and Reintegration of Offenders (NICRO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NICRO intervention focused on family relationships between the offender and the family. The objectives were to enhance family involvement and contact with the offender, increase awareness of the rights and responsibilities of families during imprisonment and after release, and involve families in the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders. The programme involved group discussions, contact with family members (by telephone or a personal visit), and one-on-one counselling with the offender. The intervention aimed to provide continuity between what happens inside the Correctional Centre and outside. Where necessary, action plans or further referral were made.

Three group sessions were held with the inmate participants for about 2-hours each. The first session explored the family as an institution in terms of who and what is a family, the role of a family and different roles within a family structure. Activities allowed participants to explore the differences between functional and dysfunctional families. The second session unpacked the participants’ relationship with their family. This session was difficult for some participants as they shared personal details with the group. This was very touching and brought out many emotions and issues in family relationships.

The third session focused on identifying any issues or needs the participant might want to restore in their family relationships. This was based on the drawing the participants had done of their families between the second and third sessions. This provided insights into the nature and state of the relationships for the facilitator, and possible areas for intervention.

NICRO received positive responses in the evaluations of the sessions from the offenders who participated, and indicated that they felt there was group respect and adherence to the agree group rules. However three participants did not participate in the group sessions. Reasons cited were one transfer of an inmate, ill-health, and loss of interest.

The group sessions were followed by one-on-one sessions with each participant. The graph below illustrates the number of one-on-one sessions (contacts) held with programme participants by the NICRO social worker to facilitate family reintegration.
The majority of participants (49 percent), as illustrated in the graph below, had three individualised sessions with the social worker. The number of sessions depended on the needs and counselling required.

**GRAPH 1: Frequency of One-On-One Contact by NICRO Social Worker with Inmate**

In addition, the facilitator held fourteen telephonic conversations with family members to mediate relationships, convey concerns of participants, and restore family communication. Two home visits were undertaken towards the end of the programme. The social worker experienced difficulty in trying to contact family members and to re-establish connections with three of the participants. Many family members did not have telephones, worked long hours or had moved and were difficult to trace. In one instance, the family members did not want to have anything to do with the offender.

The original proposal indicated that family group conferences would be held after the one-on-one sessions. However this was dependent on the needs of the participants and only one conference was held. This is discussed later in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Relationships and Sexual Health (HIV/AIDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td>Themba HIV/AIDS Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The organisation has developed the ‘Interactive Themba Theatre’ (ITT) methodology to help individuals explore ways of transforming their lives and giving them techniques to practice behaviour to keep themselves safe within the context of HIV/AIDS. The ITT methodology was developed specifically in South Africa, and includes aspects of drama therapy, psychodrama, theatre games, improvisation, formal teaching methods, forum theatre, play devising, play directing and performance.

The initial performance-workshop aims to:
- Provide up-to-date accurate information about HIV/AIDS and related issues.
- Provide an opportunity for the audience to practice strategies for safe/safer sex.
Promote and affirm ‘staying safe’ through the role modelling of the actor-educators and the performance characters.

Challenge stereotypes, discrimination, stigma and prejudice and address the South African context of HIV/AIDS.

The initial performance-workshop (given to a larger group of inmates at the prison) was followed by fourteen action based workshop sessions with the young people. These workshops developed participants’ practical skills, such as using a condom properly, participating in a public performance, sharing information with other offenders, articulating changes in attitudes towards HIV positive people, related health and social skills, redefining relationships to others in terms of ‘there’s more to loving someone than just having sex’, and developing the ability to talk about intimate activities openly and to ask questions. 93 percent of the participants indicated that the training ‘made me think about how people who are HIV positive are treated by others’, and all participants agreed that it made them think about their life. Only one participant indicated that it was not relevant to his life.

Through these participants engaging with the other young people in custody in open discussions and sharing information, it has raised the ‘consciousness’ of the entire cell. As one respondent in the post training evaluation wrote in response to the question ‘As a result of this training I am going to … talk about HIV/AIDS’.

The sessions raised a number of issues about sexuality, sexual relationships, sexual development and masturbation. There is a need to provide further workshops on issues such as pregnancy, birth, and the biological aspects of being human and ‘being alive’.

One of the challenges the programme faced is gaining the support of the DCS health department regarding HIV testing procedures within the custodial setting and gaining the support of healthcare staff in relation to communicating safer sexual practices.

D. BOKSBURG CORRECTIONAL CENTRE IYOP PARTICIPANT OFFENDER DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographic survey was completed by 16 of the 20 participants. The figures below are based on this. The exception is for the offending behaviour where offences of all 20 participants were included.

*Age of the participants at beginning of programme*

Of the twelve participants the programme had the (official) ages for, two of the participants were 18 years of age at the beginning of the programme, four were 19 years and six were 20 years. One participant was transferred to the adult section during the programme as he turned 21 years of age, and continued to participate in the programme as Centre management arranged for him to be escorted to the juvenile centre for sessions. It was noted during the programme that there was a discrepancy between the ‘actual age’ of some participants and the ‘prison age’. Given that more services are offered to children and juveniles through the criminal justice system, many young people will give their age younger than they actually are in order to benefit from the juvenile criminal justice process and services. Consequently there is often a discrepancy between the official age and the actual age of the participant.
Offending behaviour: Conviction and sentences

The table below indicated the convicted offences committed by the selected group of 20 participants. Seven participants had two or more convictions. All participants were convicted of serious crimes. The highest category of offences is for economic crimes.

TABLE 1: Frequency of Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery and theft</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of stolen property</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpable homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to property</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive robbery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selection criteria specifically excluded rape convictions, as the integrated approach did not include a specific intervention to address and prevent this type of crime. Of interest is the finding that seven participants self-reported previous criminal activity prior to this sentence: one of whom was placed in a place of safety previously.

As indicated in the following table, the majority of the selected participants were serving a two to five year sentence. Eight of the participants had only served their sentence in Boksburg Correctional Centre, four had served part of the sentence in one other juvenile centre, two participants in two other centres, and one had been in the Awaiting Trial centre. Five participants did not answer this question.

TABLE 2: Sentence duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years or less</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to three years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five year sentence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years reduced to nine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of interest are the sentence scenarios that this group of participants fall into. These are highlighted below:

- No participants in the selected group were convicted as child and released as child (14-17 years);
- Four participants were convicted as child and will be released as juveniles (18-21);
- One inmate was convicted as child and released as young adult (21-25);
- Four participants were convicted as juveniles and will be released as juveniles (18 – 21);
- Six participants were convicted as juveniles and will be released as young adults (22-25);
- Three participants were convicted as juveniles and will be released as adults (25-30).
As discussed previously, the age at sentence, duration of imprisonment and age of release is likely to impact on the developmental stages of the young person and their experience while incarcerated, as well as the reintegration experience after release. Unfortunately an in-depth analysis of these scenarios was not possible within the financial and time constraints of this review.

Criminal family associations and ties to anti-social behaviour

There was a high level of criminal association within the family structures for these participants indicating ties to criminal networks. Thirteen participants indicated that close family members had been convicted of a criminal offence. Two participants had more than one family member convicted. Family members convicted included mothers (6), uncles (3), fathers (3), step-brothers (2 both for rape) and brother (3). Mothers were convicted for economic crimes (shoplifting 2), interpersonal violence (assault 2), attempted murder (1) and murder (1). In one family the mother and a brother had been convicted of murder.

Three participants indicated that they had been involved in anti-social behaviour - gangsterism - prior to prison. Two of whom were still involved in gang activity while in prison at the start of the programme. Of interest is one participant who responded ‘yes’ and stated it was with the IYOP group.

Family structures and bereavement

The participants’ family structures differed. However, most offenders indicated that they had moved between family members’ homes while growing up. Only one inmate did not indicate that his home was within the East Rand of Johannesburg. Of interest were two participants who wrote that their home was the ‘public phone prison’ indicating a lack of connection with family members and a lack of belonging to a community outside of prison.

The table below (Table 3) indicates the roles family members played in the lives of the participants prior to incarceration. The roles focused on economic support (breadwinner), setting family boundaries for behaviour (disciplinarian), taking care of one (carer) and who the inmate could confide in and share hopes, challenges and go to for emotional support (confidante). Mother’s by far take on the majority of these roles, while very few fathers appear actively to be involved in parenting the child. Only one inmate indicated that both parents were the ‘carers’ in his family. Of interest is the high number of siblings (brothers and sisters) who are the breadwinners and support family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Breadwinner</th>
<th>Disciplinarian</th>
<th>Carer</th>
<th>Confidante</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girlfriend / lover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3: Who played the following roles in your life?
Graph 2: Family Bereavement experience

Every participant surveyed indicated that they had lost a close family member and experienced bereavement. The graph below (Graph 2) indicates the frequency of family members deceased.

Substance use and abuse

Graph 3 below indicated the frequency of use of substances. Alcohol and dagga are the substances that are used the most within the ‘sometimes’ category, indicating that some participants are not dependent (addicted) on them. However, Dagga and Mandrax were reported to be used ‘always’ indicating greater addictive use. Two participants indicated that they had never used drugs, while four respondents did not complete this section of the survey.

Graph 3: Frequency of self-reported substance use

Of concern is the early age at which some of the participants began to use illegal substances. At the age of eight and nine years, two participants began using inhalants (such as glue) and dagga respectively, three started to use drugs and alcohol by ten years of age, and 40 percent began to use alcohol during their early adolescence (13-16 years). Alcohol and dagga are the most common substances used, followed by mandrax. Only one inmate self reported the use of ‘Rock’ at the age of nineteen.

Educational experience and cognitive skills

55 percent of the participants had an educational level above Grade 9, with no participants with educational levels above a Grade 11. Four participants had Grade 6 and Grade 7 educational levels. The Grade levels attained are presented in the table below. None of the participants were involved in formal education or further study.
prior to the IYOP programme. In terms of the intellectual scores, three were below average, five were average and six were above average.

**TABLE 4: Highest Grade Achieved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post matric diploma, certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of the participants had repeated grades or had failed to continue with education. Seven participants indicated that arrest or prison had stopped them from continuing. One indicated that he had to repeat a Grade because of his involvement in crime and another participant indicated that he had to repeat Grade 3 because of being truant from school. One learner repeated both Grade 5 and Grade 7 because of drugs.

In three instances lack of money hindered the schooling process: two participants had to stop at Grade 7 and Grade 10 due to lack of money, and one participant repeated Grade 4 only to have to stop at Grade 7 as their was no money for further schooling. Other reasons for repeating grades are the movement during the school year to different locations to stay with other family members who could provide for the child. Only one inmate indicated that he repeated due to not being ready for the next grade. Five respondents did not complete this section of the survey.

**E. FINDINGS: JUVENILE OFFENDERS**

**E1. THE MORNING STARS**

The participating offenders were asked to come up with a name for their group during the Vuka S'Hambe programme. The name they chose was ‘Morning Stars’: ‘ikhwezi lomso’ (Xhosa), ‘Inkanyezi yentathakusa’ (Zulu). This gave them the sense of identity and meaning. This was a reflection of the impact of the candle used at the beginning of each Vuka S’Hambe session, and light, as both a literal experience and a means to describe figuratively the journey they undertook as part of the IYOP. The group indicated that the name meant they were moving from darkness to light, they had been lost and felt they were moving from ignorance to being informed. This idea was then translated graphically into the murals they painted on the walls in the room which was being used for the programme: an offender holding a candle and walks towards the future. The motto they chose was: ‘on the right track’.

‘This candle is a symbol of our hope for our future. It shines in our hearts and in our minds in times of darkness. It reminds us that we are alive. It became for us like a magnet bringing us close, And allowed us to learn to trust again’

Morning Star offender, graduation ceremony 2004

Being part of this ‘gang’, as one member indicated in the demographic survey when responding to gang participation, and feedback from the morning stars about what made it easy to attend the programme, suggests that the group provided a sense of belonging, acceptance, affirmation and community.

‘We shared each other the things that we did not know’
The following reasons were noted in terms of why participants continued to be part of the group:
- Belonging to a family (1);\(^{16}\)
- A need to change their life (1);
- Being positive about learning (5) and learning together (1);
- Developing a sense of wisdom, understanding and building knowledge (1), as well as trust (1);
- Being listened to (1) and able to talk about oneself (1);
- Knowing when the programme was and what the session was about (2).

‘Encourage one another and give each other support’

(Participant 12)

Members were very positive about each other and expressed positive feelings about one another as members of the morning star group: 72 percent indicated that the group made them happy, 53 percent found it friendly and special and 33 percent found the group caring. As one participant wrote:

‘I felt like I am their child’

(Participant 8)

E2. CHOOSING A NON-CRIMINAL LIFE:
Building Resilience and Addressing Risk Factors Associated With Re-Offending

As stated previously, the IYOP aimed to build resilience among young offenders to enable them to choose a non-criminal life, and to address the factors associated with re-offending. The programme objectives, the range of protective factors targeted and the expected outcomes are highlighted in the framework in Section 2 of this report. The purpose of this section is to highlight the findings based on the evidence from the evaluation process of the extent to which the young participants have achieved the expected outcomes and altered their attitudes and behaviour.

Although the aim of the IYOP is to prevent recidivism, this review is limited in that it determined the impact on the targeted outcomes immediately after the programme. A longitudinal study to track offending behaviour post-programme would provide further insight into the effectiveness of the IYOP to reach this goal.

**Expected outcome 1:**
*Improvement in cognitive skills, and demonstrate open attitudes towards education and learning opportunities.*

The assessment process undertaken for the selection of participants determined cognitive skills of the participants and their potential to learn from the intervention. Unfortunately the programme budget could not cover a post-assessment to determine growth in cognitive skills.

It is noted in the pre- and post-surveys to determine changes in the attitudes and understanding of the protective factors on their lives and the enhancement of life skills, that the reasons and motivation for participant answers to questions has changed. In the post-survey they tend to be more articulate and demonstrate a

\(^{16}\) The number in brackets indicates the frequency of the response by the fifteen participants.
greater understanding of the issue, and depth of insight into internal responses and how they can apply what they have learnt in their lives.

The writing presented by the participants from the writing workshop demonstrates a growth in writing skills as the writing becomes more expressive and there is an improvement in language structure. These workshops encouraged writing in English with the expectation that the writing skills could be applied across languages. Of interest was the confidence of many participants to share their depth of understanding through reading poems, writing extracts or reflecting verbally on the programme at the graduation ceremony.

Given that 55 percent of the participants of this group had attained educational levels between Grade 9 and Grade 11, there is scope for further educational and learning opportunities. Despite disrupted schooling for many, five participants indicated that they wished to continue to study. One participant indicated he wanted to become a psychologist prior to the intervention and afterwards was more realistic about becoming a facilitator and was proud of his achievements.

‘I want to (go) back to school and complete my matric and when completed my studies, I want to be psychologist, soccer star’

Participants’ ability to reflect on themselves and the processes in the group improved significantly over the course of the intervention. The reflections during the Vuka S’Hambe sessions shifted from being merely about events in their lives, towards a greater depth of introspection. They started to reflect on their reactions to situations in their lives; and they grew to identify and express their feelings to these situations with ease. Some of the participants’ ability to comprehend was evidenced by their ability to summarise and make links to what was learnt in previous sessions or other programmes, and their meaningful engagement was also shown in their ability to ask relevant questions.

**Expected outcome 2:**
*Demonstrate improved communication skills, assertiveness and self control.*

Participants were asked to rate themselves on how often they liked themselves. 71 percent of the participants (10) marked the same response prior to and after the programme. Of interest are the reasons they gave for these ratings as there is a shift from external aspects such as being good at soccer, taking care of oneself, liking oneself because one can ask for help or trust oneself; to a greater awareness of knowing who one is and expressing internal strengths and needs.

28 percent (4) marked an improvement in self esteem. The most noticeable was one participant who marked ‘never’ in the pre-questionnaire and wrote: ‘I want to change my life. I want to be a normal person in our community, to be proud about me’. In the post-questionnaire he marked ‘always’ with the reasoning: ‘I must accept the way I am. And I am proud …’ Their was also a marked shift in recognising his own strengths and a greater commitment to living a positive life.

One participant (7 percent) rated that he liked himself most of the time in the post-survey whereas in the pre-survey he rated ‘always’. The reason in the pre-survey focused on him being good at external aspects such as soccer and education, whereas in the post-questionnaire it is about knowing himself and other people’s perception of him:

‘I know who I am and where I come from. Most the time people they like me that is why I like who I am’.
In terms of participants' ability to handle their emotions prior to the intervention and post-intervention, 36 percent felt that they could handle their emotions the same as before, 36 percent felt they had improved skills to handle their emotions, while 28 percent (4) indicated a lower rating in being able to handle their emotions but a greater understanding of their emotions and their reactions to their emotions. As one participant wrote in the post-questionnaire:

‘If you are unable to recognise what you feel it is your own problem. If you are a person you need to recognise the feelings’.

In the pre-survey he had given no explanation for indicating that he always could handle his emotions.

Initially it was difficult for participants to identify feelings that they found difficult to manage. Two participants identified the difficulty of being in prison, one their difficulty in dealing with sexual feelings (desires) and others were broad issues of poverty, smoking, being released and ‘feeling coming from my heart’. Other participants indicated happiness (1), patience (1), violence (1), fear (1) and anger (1). After the intervention the majority of participants (5) identified the feeling of anger as being difficult to deal with, one still indicated smoking, another, loneliness. One participant indicated that he could deal with all emotions now, and one indicated the difficulty he had in dealing with his emotions when somebody was beating him.

A facilitator of the Vuku S'Hambe programme noted a positive change in the participants’ ability to communicate and how this was transferred into positive body language, improved self esteem and confidence in interacting with other people. The observable changes included making appropriate eye contact during sessions; displaying an open rather than closed posture during sessions; and engaging with interest in the activities. It was also observed that these changes were more evident in the participants whose assessments suggested evidence of low self-esteem and depression at the beginning of the intervention. The therapeutic approach of the Vuka S'Hambe programme, which facilitated exploration and healing or resolution of emotional concerns, and secondly the group approach utilised by all the programmes which offered a sense of community and a shift from isolation, allowed some of these participants to experience acceptance, optimism and positive esteem.

By the end of the Themba HIV/AIDS sessions more of the young people were sharing openly about intimate personal experiences and asking detailed questions with regard to relationships and sexual health. This indicated both increased individual confidence and the creation of a supportive environment where people were respected and listened to. An increase in self control, assertiveness and confidence was also evident during the preparation and performance of their plays to other prisoners, staff and members of the public. The young people spoke about controlling their anxiety and nerves and the role of ‘self talk’ in doing this: one telling himself, when he wanted to hide, ‘I can do it’. This experience of overcoming disabling emotions contributed to their ability to perform their final presentation.

In addition, participants noted the improvement in their verbal and listening skills. As two participants said at the end of the programme:

‘Learn how to communicate with other people’; “I messages” and try to understand others not the same’

The programme ‘really change(d) my life in many things because now (I) respect people; when somebody talking must listen before, then speak …’
Expected outcome 3:
The participant is open to opportunities to transform conflict and to see possibilities that problems can be solved. Demonstrate these skills in their life given the prison context.

During the final focus group almost all the participants recalled an aspect of the Alternative to Violence ‘mandala’ for transforming conflicts. Many indicated the skills they had learnt – such as ‘thinking before reacting’, ‘I messages’ and looking for a non-violent path to solve conflicts and problems.

‘Before I come to programme thought if solve problems must fight, know violence not way to solve problem: if someone want to fight must find another way’
Participant, final evaluation focus group

The advanced AVP workshop focused, as chosen by the participants, on ‘fear and anger’. As per the report: ‘As the sessions progressed more and more participants wanted to talk about their criminal offences; they felt this was helping them to understand how anger had led them to commit these offences. Their understanding went even deeper (than) this; to see that their anger was based on immense fear of being hurt had they not acted violently in certain situations. This led them to understand that it is not just anger they need to deal with, but their deep-seated fears ... All in all, this was a very sensitive situation because whilst their openness led to a greater understanding of their past, it also opened up new fears about their victims, particularly when they get released.’

The evaluation process which is integrated into the AVP workshops highlighted the honest and genuine desire the participants had for searching for alternative ways to live their lives. Feedback from the participants after the AVP workshops indicated the difficulties they have experienced in applying the skills within the prison context because of the lack of skills of other offenders. Despite this challenge, many indicated how they are applying the skills in their daily lives.

Expected outcome 4:
Increased knowledge and ability to engage in dialogue to inform attitudes and possible behaviour changes in relations to substance use and healthy living.

There was a 21 percent increase in recognition of the importance of living a healthy life after the IYOP programme. The understanding of what it means to live a healthy life varied for each participant. This ranged from healthy eating, exercise, looking after one’s body, not being violent and abstaining from drugs, to having a house, wife and one’s own children. One participant highlighted (in the pre-survey) the fact that prison itself contributes towards an unhealthy lifestyle:

‘I am not healthy by living in prison. Instead I become aggressive … prison is a very dirty place the(y) do not contribute with such thing with healthy lifestyle’

All participants highlighted the core messages of abstinence and the impact of illegal substances on ones body and life. Two participants indicated that they had stopped using drugs or smoking (dagga or tobacco). One participant indicated that he still has difficulty in not smoking but he was thinking about stopping, and one was considering stopping ‘liquor’. Of interest was the acknowledgement of how drugs had led them to be in prison and how it met certain needs of theirs prior to prison: it gave them a sense of belonging as ‘I was not alone’; for a sense of powerfulness and purpose ‘to see them self bigger than other’ and so that others feared them; to go and do crime as it gave them confidence; to enjoy themselves; to overcome problems; to make money by dealing and using drugs; and to hide fear. Furthermore a participant
indicated that he avoids fellow inmates who ‘do bad things’ although he did not elaborate on what this is.

‘My body must be healthy all the time, body cells must work well.’

Initially most participants starting the Themba HIV/AIDS workshops believed that if you found out you were HIV positive death soon followed. This perception had changed by the end of the programme with the young people able to discuss how to live a healthy lifestyle whether HIV negative or HIV positive. Healthy eating, exercise, safe(r) sexual practises and the impact of drugs and alcohol on the immune and reproductive systems were all explored. They were also able to state the signs of other sexually transmitted diseases, including skin to skin infections along with how to keep safe from these. The young people shared their own experiences of STIs and their concerns about the impact of substance use on their sexual health. The participants recognised the benefits of the physical activities contained in the Themba sessions.

**Expected outcome 5:**

*Develop greater understanding of HIV/AIDS, sexuality and sexual relationships to make informed decisions in their own lives.*

The post-IYOP programme evaluation indicated an increase in knowledge about HIV and AIDS, sexual intercourse, sexuality and sexual relationships, and a shift in attitude towards taking care of oneself and others. There was an openness to raise issues and to talk about health concerns, such as masturbation and using a condom. This confirms the findings from the Themba HIV/AIDS Organisation’s pre and post intervention surveys conducted with the participants. The following results are taken from eight participants who completed both the pre and post surveys (16 in total). This number is lower than expected due to participants missing sessions, or being transferred or released (see discussion further in report regarding programme participation and intensity).

No participants answered all the knowledge questions correctly in the Themba HIV/AIDS survey prior to the intervention. 25 percent answered all the questions correctly in the post survey; 37.5 percent scored 90 percent in the post-survey. This indicates that 62.5 percent of the participants gained a significant amount of knowledge during the intervention. In all but two of the questions participants scored higher correct responses in the post surveys.

The surveys indicate an increase in awareness of previous sexual behaviour that may have put themselves or their partners at risk of getting pregnant. 37.5 percent indicated they ‘may have’ in the pre survey, whereas 62.5 percent indicated this in the post survey. Of interest is that 50 percent of the respondents indicated that they ‘do sexual things that put me at risk of getting HIV’ in the pre survey, whereas 37.5 percent indicated this in the post survey. However, 25 percent in the post survey indicated they were ‘unsure’ about this compared to 12.5 percent; suggesting that participants were more aware of their previous behaviour and engaging in the process of contemplating behaviour changes.

In terms of previous condom use behaviour, one participant changed their answer from saying they had not used a condom last time they had sex to ‘yes’. This suggests that one participant is having sex while in prison and using a condom. As part of the programme all participants practised putting a male condom on a wooden condom demonstrator and were able to ask questions while doing this.
The pre survey indicated that 62.5 percent of the participants believed that a woman did not have the right to refuse sex if her partner or husband had an STI: in the post survey this had dropped to 37.5 percent. In the pre-survey all participants indicated that a woman had a right to ask her husband or long term partner to use a condom if he had an STI, whereas in the post survey 87.5 percent agreed with this and one participant indicated ‘no’. The ‘no’ response may be due to one participant expressing anger towards the IYOP in the last week as the programme was drawing to an end and he expressed concern and anxiety about being ‘abandoned’ by the facilitators. Consequently he was aggressive and negative towards the programme and this is reflected in the survey he completed.

In the post survey, all participants indicated they knew where to go for an HIV test compared to 75 percent in the pre-survey. Two participants had gone for an HIV test prior to the intervention, and this increased by one during the intervention.

Of interest is a shift in thinking that the participants knew someone who is HIV positive. In the pre-survey 37.5 percent indicated that they knew someone who was HIV positive, which dropped to 12.5 percent in the post survey. This suggests a shift in making judgements about people not based on stigma or perceptions, rather on open communication and trust. 37.5 percent in the pre-survey indicated they would be friends with someone who has HIV, and the same percentage indicated that they ‘maybe’ friends. In the post survey, 75 percent said yes, 25 percent ‘maybe’. During the Themba sessions one participant shared that his girlfriend contracted HIV after being raped while he had a gun to his head. Participants had different reactions to continuing the sexual relationship or not, and the issue of remaining friends or not. Of interest was the level of discussion this evoked, the level of engagement by all participants in facing the reality of sexual relationships and friendships, and the group support offered to this participant to explore his emotions, attitudes and consequences of actions. The consensus at the end of the discussion was that one had a choice about continuing a healthy sexual relationship, and that it was important to remain friends with the girl and not abandon her because of her being HIV positive or her past experience.

Empathy with HIV positive people increased by 25 percent in terms of understanding how difficult it might be for a person who is HIV to tell someone.

‘I want to help people and those people who are sick because of HIV’ (post)

In the pre-survey, 37.5 percent thought that talking about safer sex may scare off a boyfriend(s) or girlfriend(s). In the post survey this had dropped to 12.5 percent. The pre and post survey results remained the same for participants’ ability to ask a partner about their past sexual experience: 62.5 percent indicated that they would find this difficult. 62.5 percent indicated in the pre survey that it would be difficult to tell their partner about their past sexual experiences compared to 50 percent in the post survey.

When it came to being able to talk about and negotiate safer sex with someone they wanted to have sex with, all indicated in the pre and post survey that they would be able to. However findings from confidence levels in responding to specific situations suggest a different ability. 25 percent of the participants indicated they were very confident to be able to start a conversation about past sexual behaviour in the pre and post surveys. 37.5 percent indicated they were not at all confident to talk about this in the post survey, an increase from 12.5 percent in the pre survey. This suggests a far greater awareness of the issues and consequences of talking about past sexual behaviour and the difficulty of opening spaces in relationships to do so.
Similarly, in relation to confidence levels in being able to refuse to have sex and still be friends, once again there was a decrease from being very confident (50 percent to 25 percent) towards being ‘a bit confident’ (25 percent to 37.5 percent).

Confidence levels in relation to refusing to have sex without a condom (for an existing partner where no condom is currently being used) increased by 25 percent, with one participant acknowledging in the post survey that he would not be at all confident to refuse. 25 percent of the respondents in the pre survey indicated that they were very confident to use a condom properly, whereas in the post survey this had risen to 62.5 percent.

There appears to be a need for an understanding of basic health care and an understanding of how the body functions. The Themba HIV/AIDS Organisation facilitators were constantly asked questions not only about HIV and sexual relationships, but also about pregnancy, childbirth and general health. There was great interest in masturbation as a safe form of expressing sexual desires while in prison.

Of concern was the lack of knowledge and practical support from the correctional centre’s health services. The sustainability of the outcomes achieved from this intervention need to be reinforced by management and health officials: core messages and positive behaviour changes must be based on accurate information irrespective of personal beliefs. For example, the young people were open about masturbation as an alternative to penetrative sex within the prison setting; however a health official undermined these positive behaviour changes by stating that ‘masturbation causes acne’. The staff must be aware of the issues that the young people are grappling with in terms of healthy living and sexual relationships as they will then be able to provide support for them to make informed decisions both in and out of prison.

A further concern was the set-up within the centre for HIV testing and Voluntary Counselling and Testing. One of the participants shared with the group, initially in the CSVR Vuka S’Hambe session, which was followed through in the Themba sessions, his negative experiences of sodomy while in prison. He was supported by the group in dealing with this trauma. He had been to the clinic for an HIV test and was given medication; however the clinic indicated that they did not do a further HIV test and consequently the participant does not know whether he is HIV positive or if the treatment was effective. Because the system was not functional, even though they expressed concern about their situation, the young people that wished to find out if they were HIV positive or HIV- did not do so while in prison as it lacked the support, care and follow-through. In addition, as many were nearing the end of their sentence it was deemed more appropriate that they go to a clinic based in their community where they would be able to receive pre and post-test counselling and support.

Expected outcome 6:
The offender acknowledges they can access and create employment opportunities away from crime.

The participants were eager to learn and share their knowledge and experiences with the group in the BEntrepreneurING training. The course content ‘was quite refreshing for them as it helped to remove them from their own realities as they learnt about cash flow projections and marketing techniques’. The realisation by participants that they had valuable skills from crime and individual capacities motivated them to participate and to start working on their business plans while still incarcerated. The
intention is that after release they will have a concrete action plan to immediately begin implementing. It was acknowledged that family members may be more willing to support them if they see a concrete road ahead. The sharing of past business experiences, such as selling fruit and vegetables, confirmed the possibility of ‘how it is genuinely possible to make an honest living’.

‘We must not rush to have a job we must plan first’  
Feedback from a Morning Star participant

Post-release, six participants plan to start their own small business, four want to find employment, one wished to become an actor, and two were looking at facilitating or teaching on programmes within the IYOP.

‘I plan that I will open a fruit corner shop’.

Feedback from the participants during the final evaluation focus group indicated the scope of options for legal economic participation which participants are considering. There was a strong commitment by participants not to return to a life of crime, and they did see opportunities for themselves as entrepreneurs or to be employed. Participants were motivated by the realisation that they could start their own business with very little, and that it could start small and grow and that they could still be successful.

‘In business (I will) use my crime skills to open business’  
‘I must learn and finish school so that I can get a job and live well and help other people and those that are poor’

Expected outcome 7:  
Improved relationships with the family while in prison and to develop plans for post release housing and family acceptance.

There were no clear trends emerging regarding the impact that the offender felt his actions had had on his family. This suggests that their personal development through participating in the IYOP as well as the process of family reintegration undertaken by NICRO was specific to individual needs and journeys they were undertaking.

The NICRO social worker indicated that each case is specific to the offenders’ family structure, and the relationship they had with the offender. In addition, the criminal behaviour and pre-sentence lifestyle of the offender impacted on the family – although the offender was not aware of this prior to the one-on-one sessions held with the social worker. Many of the families indicated the hurt and anger they felt towards their child as a result of the crime they had committed and the stigma this had placed on them. In some instances, the family member ‘punished’ their child for this by not visiting them. Another reason given for not visiting the child was due to lack of finance for transport and work commitments.

It was difficult for the social worker to establish connections with family members and mediate the specific issues between family members and the child. As stated previously, family members had moved, did not have telephones, worked shifts or long hours or were not open to the mediation.

Of concern was one participant who was due for parole however his parents had passed away and no family member would house him as per the parole conditions. The social worker made efforts to find a ‘shelter’ that would accept him, with the result that he was accommodated at the Salvation Army.
One Family Group Conference (FGC) was held between family members and the offender. Although both maintained that they had a good relationship and family members regularly visited the child, the participant wanted to apologise to his family for his actions and the hurt he had caused them. The social worker mediated the conference and indicated that it benefited both the family members and the participant.

Three of the participants indicated that they grew up in families that were abusive (alcoholic fathers and mother), and one indicated he grew up in a family without love. One of the offenders is a father and his plan after release is to be good father to his child – not like his own father. Another participant has lost contact with his surviving aunt and his younger brother, who is a ‘thug’ in Vosloorus.

One member indicated that after his release, he would have to look after his younger siblings when his old and sickly grandmother passed away. The social worker undertook a home visit to the family and met with family members who reassured her that the participant’s siblings would be taken care of, and that he would be welcomed home after his release. This was conveyed to the participant. The family members indicated that they would reassure him on the next visit.

A ‘good life’ for you means:
‘It means success. To have a happy relationship with my family and have my own properties …’

Although family members were invited to the Graduation ceremony, very few confirmed or indicated a willingness to attend. However, on the day most of the participants had a family member present and there was pride on both sides of the achievements made. The social worker highlighted that a number of parents have thanked her for the efforts she has made, and indicated that they are appreciative of the improved relationship and that greater communication is underway.

The post-programme surveys suggest that the participants have a deeper insight into what it means to be part of a family and in understanding the roles, relationships and importance of caring, guidance, communication and accountability within the family network. For all participants, they indicated a clear post-prison plan for where they would stay and how they would engage in earning an income, and what support they could expect from their family.

**Expected outcome 8:**
*Understand the consequences of their actions on themselves, the victim, their family and community; and gain insights into restorative justice possibilities and processes.*

57 percent indicated that they felt they deserved to be in prison because they had committed crime and were being punished, or that they had to correct the mistake they had made. 14 percent (2) participants stated that they had not done the crime for which they were convicted. Interestingly one of these participants admits in the post-survey that he did commit the crime and holds himself accountable for his actions.

‘Because I commit crime and the time while here I correct my mistakes …’
Only two sessions were held on restorative justice by the Vuka S’Hambe programme and consequently participants did not have the opportunity to explore possible healing processes for themselves, or the victims or their family. However, at least two participants indicated in the general comments about the programme a desire to follow such processes with their victims. For example, prior to the programme, one participant indicated that he ‘don’t trust the family of my victim’ and afterwards said: I plan to go to my victim and tell him that I am sorry for doing bad things.’

In three instances the participants had taken steps to ask for forgiveness and to begin the healing process for themselves. The participant who denied committing the crime had written a letter to the victim apologising for his actions and explaining why he had committed the crime. He received a letter back and felt he had been forgiven. Three participants in the post intervention surveys acknowledged that their victims would feel something toward them, whereas they had indicated that their victim probably felt nothing towards them in the pre-survey. Post intervention 50 percent of the participants thought their victims would be angry towards them, and 50 percent felt they would be forgiving toward them. Those who felt they were forgiven had either made efforts to ask for forgiveness, or felt that they were being punished and that ‘she (is) happy with this sentence’. Those who felt the victim was angry at them tended to have inflicted physical harm (two had shot the victim), or that they had done wrong and their actions had had a big impact on the persons wellbeing or lifestyle.

71 percent indicated that they felt sorry for the victim after the intervention compared to 41 percent prior, suggesting an increased empathy towards others and accountability for their actions.

‘Cause I see that I was wrong by robbing his money, cell phone and his jewellry and shot him in the stomach’ (post-survey)

**Expected outcome 9:**
**Develop a sense of purpose and hope for the future and an internal resilience to face up to life challenges. This will be gained through an increased understanding of how risk factors have impacted on their lives and a greater understanding of the world in which they live.**

There was a 21 percent increase in feeling of hopefulness about their future. 14 percent indicated they were ‘mostly hopeful’ about their future, as they had learnt new things through the programme, and one participant indicated this was due to family expectations of opening a successful small business.

‘Because I got to fulfil (my) dream and I belief in myself that I will do this’
‘I still have hope that I can make it in life. I can achieved my plans or goals’

In general there was a greater acceptance of who they were and how their past life had impacted on them. There was also recognition that the past will not stop them from achieving their goals of living a normal, good life. Through talking about past experiences and opening of potential avenues for business, the healing process has begun within themselves and in their relationships:
‘My past life not stop me to reach my future, but all the same in heart and mind and talking about past heal us.’

The challenge will be how the participants put into practice skills they have learnt in the challenges that they face in prison and after release. This is beyond the scope of
this review. However, indications based on the ongoing support sessions held with
the participants in the centre in early 2005, indicates that they are applying what they
have learnt, sharing it with fellow inmates, and demonstrating a commitment towards
a new life. The difficulty of implementing the skills within the prison context is noted,
as highlighted by the AVP feedback.

‘By doing this programme I achieve a lot, to know myself and I am important and to
take care of myself. Lot of things think I cannot do it but through programme wake up
my mind and life, talent in my life I can do it. Seek help from others ... to achieve my
goals. No shortcut’.

**Expected outcome 10:**
**Develop the social, interpersonal and coping skills to enhance friendships and
participate in meaningful self-development activities based on the strengths
and skills of the individual. Demonstrate the growth by shifting away from
criminal gang activity towards positive interaction with peers, and greater
acceptance of others.**

The enhancement of life skills and protective factors as illustrated above, contributed
towards the self development and social skills of the young people towards their
families, each other and the programme staff. In some instances, the Correctional
Centre staff have noted a marked difference in the young people’s ability to
communicate with them. Participants have noted the change in themselves. Not only
are they more aware of themselves, have coping skills, have knowledge and realise
the consequences of their actions, but they are more aware of their strengths and
how they can use these both in and out of prison.

‘... and help me to change my behaviour. I control myself... have life in community.
(In) Cell teach other people about life.’
(Participant 14)

‘I want to start creating good things about my life, to make a future plan and make
positive thinking.’
Morning Star writing exercise

The shift away from anti-social associations towards a ‘positive life’ meant that some
of the participants began reflecting on their friendships prior to prison and what their
new lifestyle would mean to these friends after release. Prior to the intervention one
participant indicated that his many friends had a bad influence because they would
‘talk about drug, have money, nice clothes and crime’. However, after the
intervention, he indicated that they had a bad influence because ‘you do not share
about life or do nice thing you just think drugs and crime and when you get arrested
is no longer your friends’. Another participant indicated in the post-survey that they
were a bad influence ‘Because they have led me to darkness and they lied to me and
I now see what I have done’. This suggests a greater awareness of the influence of
peers.

Of interest is that at least three participants wanted to share what they have learnt
with their peers both in and out prison. In addition, a strong bond was formed
between the participants of the Morning Star group. The comments in the final
evaluation indicated how important these positive friendships had become in showing
each other a positive life style and in modelling a new kind of friendship:

‘Cause if I do what is wrong they show me that now what I am doing is wrong and
they always encourage me and give support’
Facilitators noted the change in attitude and level of engagement by the young people as the programme unfolded, and observed the growth of the individuals during the intervention time and over the course of the programmes. In particular the AVP and Vuka S’Hambe facilitators noted this change as they engaged with the participants at various points throughout the programme.

‘Through the IYOP I believe that genuine change can happen in this timeframe because it’s very intensive and see the change they gone through, know it because was part of it’
Facilitator

F. EFFECTIVENESS OF IYOP APPROACH

F1 IYOP Approach and Methodology

One senior DCS official indicated the importance of the integrated approach as the core range of coping skills are given within each programme and enhanced throughout the programme. If only one programme is offered, this limits the relationship between skills and issues and the effectiveness of interventions to meet the needs of participants and strengthen new behaviours and attitudes are not reinforced in all the programmes. The influence of the programme was noted on the participants, and concern raised as two or three participants who have demonstrated less change. The official highlighted that these participants did not necessarily meet the initial criteria of educational background and length of Correctional Centre sentence.

No concerns were raised by the participants regarding the methodology of each of the programmes, despite asking for comments. The ratings for each programme in terms of ‘How I liked the way the lessons and activities were given’ all scored high, indicating support for the methodological approaches used.

Each programme ran as an ‘independent’ programme and consequently used the method which over time and with experience programme evaluations have deemed appropriate for the purpose and content being taught. The initial conceptualisation meeting of all the partners in the IYOP discussed general principles behind the programme implementation. This included a commitment towards outcomes-based educative approaches and participative action-orientated methodologies to engage participants on a practical, physical, emotional, psychological and cognitive level.

The methodologies used were essential to ensure that all members could participate to meet their cognitive, creative and expressive needs. For example, drawing pictures provided opportunities for those who cannot process at an abstract level, but through guidance and discussion they could understand what they had put down on paper, often unconsciously. Greater assistance was provided by facilitators to those who were more reserved, and individual growth was managed by the team. Concerns and successes were discussed at the team meetings, during handover sessions between programmes, and as aspects emerged during the programme.

A case management approach towards each individual was integrated within the delivery of the programmes. Individual participants were mentored and coached through the programme and necessary individual guidance was provided by facilitators in terms of their particular programme.
F.2  Sequencing of programmes

Of interest is that 80 percent of the participants indicated that they knew which programme was coming next, whilst only one participant (7 percent) indicated he never knew which programme was next. 67 percent of the participants thought that the programmes carried on from the one before, whilst 20 percent (3) thought they sometimes did. Two participants indicated that they did not see a sequence to the programme. It is hypothesised (as the post-survey was anonymous) that these two participants had lower cognitive skills of the group and therefore were unable to make the cognitive connections between the programmes. Reflection by Correctional Centre management suggested that they have observed fewer changes in the participants who had the lower schooling and cognitive levels.

The final surveys asked participants if they found it difficult to have different facilitators for each programme. 47 percent indicated that it was ‘never’ difficult and 20 percent found it ‘sometimes’ difficult. However, 27 percent (4) did find it difficult. There was an overwhelming sense by the majority of the participants that they felt guided across all the programmes (87 percent). However, two participants (13 percent) did not feel guided. One of these participants had also indicated that that he never knew which programme was coming next, nor did he think that each programme carried on from the next.

DCS staff interviewed indicated that the range of programmes was appropriate and had no comments regarding the sequencing of the programmes. They did however note the need for a restorative justice component as a number of the participants have requested assistance in further mediation with victims. This was viewed by two staff members as an essential element in the reintegration process post-release and one of the factors that contributed towards ex-offenders returning to prison. They agreed with the proposal that this be a second phase of the programme as they believed the IYOP had raised the level of consciousness and maturity for participants to be able to participate in restorative processes.

Reflection by the organisations and facilitators at the end of the implementation phase of the IYOP suggests that the programme sequencing was appropriate and had built on the core protective factors it set out to achieve.

One of the cornerstones of effective programmes is building trust between the offenders and facilitators. All programme facilitators indicated that this was established during the AVP Basic workshop, which provided a foundation for behaviour, communication, and working relationships. Consequently the other facilitators did not have to spend as much time building this trust and group community as in other interventions in the prison context.

It was suggested that the writing and creative input begin earlier in the programme to open opportunities for participants to write a journal if they wished to about the experience (and this would require clarification on issues of confidentiality).

‘The business skills training came at exactly the right time, as it was clear that all participants were dedicated to living a crime-free life and were eager to learn the practical steps as to how to make a living for themselves’
BEntrepreneurING report

The findings emerging from the evaluation indicate that refinement is required more on the logistical and process level of the entire programme. One of the participants
suggested that the programme begins earlier in the year in order for more sessions to be held.

For example, the following observations were made by the BEntrepreneuriNG team, which require restructuring of how they implement the programme in the Centre:

- There was insufficient time for integration of learning at the beginning of the next session as the content needed lots of repetition, explanation and examples for participants to apply the knowledge across different business settings;
- The week long time between sessions meant some participants forgot the content from the previous week and there was insufficient time for detailed recapping;
- It is necessary to find ways of helping the participants to practice business skills in prison – this will remain challenging given the incarceration scenario;
- Four hours is too long to concentrate on a content-based course: it was therefore suggested it be eight sessions, twice a week for two hours.

The Themba HIV/AIDS Organisation indicated that they need to find ways to support the Morning Starts to spread the message in the Correctional Centre.

F.3 IYOP participant review of programmes

There was overwhelmingly positive support for the IYOP from the fifteen participants who undertook the evaluation at the end of the programme.

The following findings are noted from their rating of the entire programme:

- All the participants enjoyed the IYOP programme, with 93 percent strongly agreeing to the statement;
- 93 percent indicated that the IYOP had helped them to be more positive about life in prison;
- 80 percent indicated that they ‘strongly agreed’ with the statement that the IYOP had helped them to cope in prison, while 20 percent ‘agreed’ with the statement;
- 100 percent indicated that they get on better with other people in prison now because of being part of the Morning Stars;
- All the participants agreed with the statements that they felt more confident and were able to handle their emotions (feelings) better because of what they learnt from the IYOP.

When asked if they thought that any of the programmes were not important to them, 73 percent indicated that they were all important, while two participants (13 percent) responded with positive attributes about the programme. The following statement epitomises the importance of the integrated programmes:

‘because my life (was) a big hell I was think(ing) to kill my self, but this programme help a lot, to express emotions, to care, to think before reacting’ (participant 12)

The individual rating of each programme was high and positive feedback received from all participants. This suggests that each programme was of value and benefited the participants in some way.

Two thirds (63 percent) of the participants indicated that the programme should remain the same if it was implemented again. Suggestions for what the IYOP could

---

17 Three participants did not answer this question.
do differently next time, or how it could be strengthened, included: giving more advice (1), give more courage (1), start the programme earlier in the year so that more can be covered (1), give staff new ideas (1), and that to run the programme for more offenders and out of the prison to prevent youth from committing crime (3).

The positive feedback could also reflect the participants’ ability to provide critical reflection or an inhibition to be upfront about the overall programme. This is deemed unlikely as the participants were open during the individual sessions about their individual and group concerns on issues of content, process and implementation of the IYOP.

F.4 Programme participation and intensity

The level of participation of most members grew during the delivery of the various programmes. Initially, four of the more confident offenders, who also had the higher levels of education, tended to break the ice with most activities. This was an important part of the participation process as they demonstrated and role-modelled the necessity of taking risks and being initiators. The facilitator in the Vuka S’Hambe programme was conscious of this and reflected the observation back to the entire group to place the responsibility with the group members to increase levels of participation by all members. With time there were shifts with other members as levels of confidence, trust and willingness to share grew.

One of the indications of the increased level of trust and support of the group was the sharing by one of the offenders that he had been sodomised. He was traumatised by the experience and this had to be managed by the facilitator, the team, and by the Morning Stars themselves. The Morning Stars were very supportive and maintained (as far as we are aware) the confidence of the disclosure.

Concerns were expressed by the facilitators about the level of sincerity of some members towards the group and the process. One offender for example demonstrated inappropriate behaviour during one session and although remorseful afterwards, could not give reasons for such behaviour.

Not all participants attended all the programmes or sessions. Reasons for non-attendance were mainly due to being transferred to another Correctional Centre (and then being transferred back to continue with the programme), kitchen or learning obligations, and being in court facing further charges. DCS officials found dagga in the possession of one of the participants during July and the participant was placed in single cells. Consequently he could not participate in the Vuka S’Hambe programme during this time, and he was unable to attend the CADS substance abuse programme. Another participant missed three weeks in June because of having fought with another participant who was not part of the group and consequently was placed in isolation cells.

The graph below indicates the attendance figures across the IYOP programme and the individual programmes. The NICRO social worker expressed concern in the group reports about two participants who did not want to attend the programme, and one inmate who was excluded because he kept reporting being ‘sick’. It was difficult to understand the reasons behind their non-attendance.
Reasons given by participants for missing the Thembra HIV/AIDS Organisation relationship and sexual health sessions included being ill (1), Correctional Centre members not escorting them to sessions (1) and that the cells were dirty so they were not permitted to leave them (1). Missing sessions did impact on the group and personal learning and growth, as time was limited so it was difficult to do ‘catch up’ sessions or input with those who missed sessions. A few of the participants also did not do their homework between the BEntrepreneurING sessions, making it difficult to keep the group on track and individuals to achieve what the session set out to.

Two participants attended less than half the Vuka S’Hambe sessions. Of interest is that one of these participants completed the post-programme evaluation and the findings indicate a limited change in knowledge, attitude and achievement of the expected outcomes, suggesting the importance of the “dosage” of the programme.

The table below illustrates the number of sessions held by each programme, and the duration in hours. This illustrates the intensity of the programme delivery and the intensity of contact with the core group of participants (those that attended all sessions).

The Vuka S’Hambe programme was scheduled for 26 sessions, however four sessions were lost due to a soccer game; a performance which all inmates had to attend; a meeting held by a senior staff member to address the section after a fight had erupted the previous day; and when all staff had to attend a meeting and consequently there were no available staff members to supervise the offenders.

In total, the participants who attended all the sessions had 262 hours of contact with the programme facilitators, excluding the one-on-one sessions with the NICRO social worker, on average a further three hours.
53 percent indicated that it was not difficult to attend the sessions. At times participants were challenged to attend and had to resist negative inmate peer pressure not to attend, as these writings indicated:

‘When I go to Med A it was not easy but I tell myself that I want to change and I want to get all the skills about my life; I want to be somebody and today I am somebody. I can tell you good thing(s) about life, I am positive person.’ (Participant 13)

‘… wanted to learn more about life, and other person they were joke(ing) about this programme’ (Participant 12)

‘in prison there (are) many thing(s) which can make you to give up about the programme and I think that is difficult to attend the project …’ (Participant 15)

Offenders who were not part of the group constantly asked to be part of it and wanted to know more about the programme. This highlights the potential impact of the programme within the broader context of influencing the culture and behaviour within the prison setting, and the importance of belonging to a ‘positive group’ as highlighted previously.

Initially DCS staff found it difficult to get juvenile offenders to volunteer and come forward to be part of the IYOP programme. This was a new programme and no-one knew what it would be like so offenders were hesitant to come forward. However, the staff now cite how they are constantly being asked by offenders when the next IYOP will begin and asking to be part of it. Consequently, the Morning Stars were encouraged to tell fellow inmates about the programme and to share the content. The sharing of the business skills course for example reinforced what they were learning in the sessions.
F.5 Challenges of working in prison context

As external service providers to the Correctional Centre, the programmes and facilitators faced a number of challenges in working within the centre context. Initially there was difficulty in finding a dedicated space where the Morning Stars could meet and the programme could be delivered away from the rest of the offenders. The eventual allocation of the space was an important step in the process of building a team identity, although the space was not ideal as there were still interruptions and visits by other offenders and staff.

During the substance abuse programme the venue was changed as the first one was too cold (because it was mid-winter) and the noise levels were not conducive to levels of concentration and participation. DCS staff agreed that the prison design and infrastructure is not conducive to programme interventions and are concerned that this will limit the actual delivery of the programmes as no venue is now available.

The issue of the participants’ chairs disrupted the second session of the BEntrepreneurING training. The chairs had been sourced from various sections so that the participants and facilitators had something to sit on during the programmes. However, they had been removed and this impacted on the group mood. However, the facilitators were able to address the problem and the session did continue in a positive manner.

Initially the logistics were a problem to get the inmate participants from the various sections to the programme. It helped to have undertaken the briefing to the centre management; however it took a while for it to be communicated down to discipline officials. The process was greatly facilitated by Division Head: Care Services, Boksburg Correctional Centre, who was committed to the programme and often went out of his way to ensure actual programme delivery.

Punctuality was a problem because of Correctional Centre system and staff did not know about the programme. DCS officials agreed with this: initially they did not know what the programme was about, who was involved, when it was held and where participants needed to go and at what time. However, they indicated that after a few sessions the logistics were sorted out. They suggested that they be given a programme (and not only management) with names of those participating at the beginning of the programme so that they can facilitate the movement of participants. After a few sessions the facilitators would arrive early to give sufficient time for participants to be gathered.

On arrival by NICRO to the Centre on 25 July 2004, they were informed that it would not be possible to have the session as there had been a fight in one of the sections and no Correctional Centre official could therefore ensure the facilitators safety. However the social worker did manage to talk to some of the participants through the cell gates in Section J4.

The programmes indicated that it was a challenge to fit the agenda into the Correctional Centre hours: AVP is usually run for two consecutive full-days however in the Correctional Centre setting it was run over four consecutive days as only the morning sessions could be used. Even so this was challenging as sessions started late due to punctuality issues and often had to end early for participants to go to meals as if they were late there was no food for them.
The team meetings meant that the challenges of working in the Correctional Centre environment could be shared, possible solutions and approaches discussed, and ways to work through or around them found.

**F.6 Integrated Partnership Approach**

The team acknowledged that the team process had taken time to build: it started two years prior to the actual work with the juvenile offenders. Many meetings were held and discussions about how to proceed, financial resources and negotiation with the Department of Correctional Services for permission to implement the IYOP. The process appears, on reflection, to have been seamless despite the time taken. The time and meetings allowed organisations, team members and facilitators to implicitly develop a common mission and similar values – including sincerity, commitment towards the process, a drive to succeed, sharing the responsibility, and defining delivery of services and methodologies within the common values. As one member said:

‘It was easy to leave but eager for achievement so drove along’

The time taken also ensured that protocols were established, the evaluation was integrated into the programme, and that previous experience of individuals and programmes could be shared. This provided a quality service for the young men on the programme.

Review of the minutes indicates a shift from the early days where meetings focused on programme sequencing and delivery issues (April and June minutes) within the Correctional Centre context, to a greater concern and case management approach for the individuals who participated in the programme (July minutes).

Of interest is how organisations went beyond the scope of only delivering the programmes in Correctional Centre to supporting the participants individually by, for example, collecting clothes for one inmate who was about to be released, finding a placement for him in a shelter, and the need to bring more creative activities into the Correctional Centre for the participants and other offenders (August minutes). Furthermore, the minutes began to share more of the content of issues being debated and knowledge being shared amongst the team indicating the increased depth of understanding and knowledge about delivering an integrated approach.

However there were times when the partnerships had to be managed and individual activities impacted on the programme.

At one point one of the facilitators of a programme went to visit the family of an inmate to try and mediate a family breakdown between the offender and the aunt and uncle as his parents are deceased. This was done with the best intention however the intervention was not communicated to the NICRO social worker, with the result that there was confusion and frustration on all sides. NICRO was also in a slightly different position to the other organisations as their involvement was based on the individual social worker’s contribution, based at the Correctional Centre, rather than a team approach as used by the other programmes. The NICRO social worker attended the team meetings whenever possible given her work load and is to be commended for her commitment to the process.

The issue of photographs was another point of contention which required debate and consensus on the principle behind the use of them. There are huge implications of taking and using photographs of participants and the question to ask is whose needs are being met: the organisation, programme or the boys at that time. It was
recognised that anything can be done with an image and there is lack of control of
the use of it. Furthermore, the young offender may be caught up in the moment and
want the photograph and publicity now, but after release and once gained financial
sustainability, he may not want the image to appear in public. As a result, the group
photographs are not being used and the individual photographs were given to each
inmate for their own use.

Unfortunately one of the programmes was not as integrated into the programme as
the others. CADS were not always able to attend the IYOP meetings and participated
more as an ‘ad hoc’ service provider. This was regrettable as not only did the
facilitators learn less about the programme, they were unable to integrate learning’s
and reinforce the core messages in their facilitation. Consequently the juvenile
participants provided less feedback on this programme and continued to raise
questions indicating a need for greater understanding and dialoguing in order to form
clearer attitudes, perceptions and possible behaviour change given that no drugs,
including cigarettes, are permitted in the correctional centre.

The team did not find it easy to challenge each other at times as criticism is always
difficult to receive and there was sensitivity towards maintaining group equilibrium.
This is probably the area for greatest learning in the future – how to manage and
communicate the gaps and differences, as well as to ask the challenging questions.
One organisation was given feedback about an approach to an issue and this was
discussed between the project manager and the facilitator and resolved amicably to
the benefit of the programme.

A further area for future growth is internal team communication between the team
meetings. Email was used, however the responses were not always forthcoming and
greater effort is required to communicate and integrate to a greater extent CADS and
NICRO management into the programme. There was a change in the team leader
and facilitators from CADS and consequently the same buy-in and commitment was
not present – and the team felt that they could have done more to facilitate this when
the change occurred.

The team meetings relied on individuals communicating effectively within their
organisations, particularly to facilitators who were not present at the meeting about
the issues arising and directions to be taken. This appears to have been done
effectively as there were no reports of internal miscommunication.

It was felt that each facilitator was expressing the same values and reinforced this by
not only talking about them, but living them. The diversity of the facilitators also made
a difference as despite languages, cultures, races, personalities, ages, and skills
(from professors and professionals to students, trainers and the unemployed), they
worked together demonstrating an integrated, inclusive and friendly approach across
what are often seen as perceived barriers between people. This was seen by the
team as a powerful role-modelling experience for offenders. The closeness and
support shared by all facilitators from the range of programmes provided a “good
vibe” which was felt to have filtered to the Morning Stars and was echoed in there
group cohesion. There was no sense of competition or competing of egos by the
partners as the relationships was based on trust, honesty and commitment. This
demonstrated a new way of working together and appears to have been valued by
the participants as a demonstration of a different, possible future.

The importance of meeting regularly and giving feedback on the process, challenges
and individual participant coaching resulted in facilitators knowing where to go with
the overall programme, facilitating individual growth and being able to incorporate this into their programme delivery.

Contracts provided by the CSVR to the partner organisations sounded punitive at the beginning of the process, but the way the integrated approach worked was collaborative and not dictatorial. Over time individual programme leaders and facilitators skills complimented one another, as did the programmes, and the method evolved by making the connections between the risk and resilience, and protective factors. The clear focus of why each programme was part of the integrated approach kept the direction and held the overall programme together. The programme co-ordinator from the CSVR played an important role in holding the programme together and providing the strategic management and containment of the programme.

G. FINDINGS: IMPACT ON STAFF AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

The programme included a focus on supporting DCS staff at Boksburg Correctional Centre. The purpose was two-fold: facilitating the support and buy-in of the staff for the implementation of the programme, and training to meet identified needs for the professional development of DCS staff.

The expected outcomes of the training were for officials to gain knowledge and skills in trauma management, stress management, enhanced skills in dealing with juvenile offenders, conflict management and transformation, personal and professional development.

G.1 Overview of staff training programmes

Below is an outline of each of the four training programmes including feedback received as part of the assessment and evaluation components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training session 1: Alternatives to Violence Project – Basic workshop (29/30 July 2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The two day Alternatives to Violence workshop covered the core principles of the programme: communication, affirmation, cooperation, community building and transforming power and conflict. The aim was to enable staff to know and experience the same non-violent team-building, leadership training and conflict resolution that the participants had undergone; to strengthen the team-spirit and support staff networks; and to empower staff with non-violent conflict resolution skills that would enable them to find alternative ways of working with offenders, thus also supporting the newly learnt people skills that the offenders were attempting in their own interactions.

It challenged participants to find creative non-violent responses to conflict and gave them an opportunity to re-think paradigms about conflict. The role-play explored staff-management interactions as well as staff-inmate interactions. The focus was on challenging traditional power relations within the Correctional Centre environment.

‘It came at the right time because I was feeling negative towards my job – but I was motivated’

DCS official, written response AVP Evaluation form
The training enabled participants to realise the need to deal with their own conflicts so that they could be of support to each other and transform the power dynamics in their working environment.

### Training session 2: CSVR Trauma Management (4 and 18 August 2004)

The Trauma Management training aimed to increase awareness about the impact of trauma on offenders and staff, and to enhance the skills of DCS members to deal effectively with trauma.

The first day of training focused on developing an understanding about trauma and allowed participants to be aware of their own trauma and the impact of this on their lives. The phases and symptoms of trauma were explored to enable staff to identify stages in the offenders they work with. The second day explored the impact of trauma on staff and their work. By using offenders case studies participants further explored offenders’ behaviours, attitudes and feelings as result of offenders' life experiences. This included discussions about the challenges of working with offenders and how this impacts on staff.

The evaluation report of this training indicated a depth of insight and understanding of staff members own trauma and that of the offenders and how it has manifested in their actions and behaviour. Furthermore it ‘built awareness of the impact of our work on own physical and mental well-being’. As one member indicated: ‘Have always taken suicidal / self-mutilating offenders as seeing attention – never took it seriously but now I have gained understanding into these issues’. A need was expressed for further training in counselling skills.

### Training session 3: P Sadie – Effective use of discipline and authority (10 August 2004)

This training session comprised three modules. The first module allowed participants to reflect on the discipline experience of correctional officials which led into discussions on why corporal punishment was banned. The debate centred around the current use which was seen to be effective (so why change it) and a shift towards the necessity of teaching youth the consequences of actions to enable self-discipline and using discipline techniques to enhance reintegration.

The second module introduced ‘Erickson’s stages of development’ and focused on adolescent needs. Participants explored ‘whether correctional offices or the gangs were better able to respond to these in developing a sense of authority’. The third module explored alternative methods of instilling discipline as apposed to punitive measures. This utilised the ‘Life Space Crisis Intervention’ method as a therapeutic intervention.

> ‘Now I know more about punishment, alternative way of dealing with inmates’
> DCS Official, Boksburg Correctional Centre
> Juvenile Section

The challenge staff face is the need to work with gangs and how this can be undertaken with in the Correctional Centre environment.
Training session 4: CSVR – Role of Correctional Officials as Rehabilitators (25 August 2004)

This one-day training session explored the role of correctional officials as rehabilitators as stated in the draft DCS White Paper (2003). The first session focused on the purpose of imprisonment and explored the four main theories of punishment. These were discussed in terms of their usefulness, fulfilment of society expectations, and their contribution to reducing recidivism. The second session focused on providing an overview of the legislation and policies governing and directing offender management, rehabilitation and reintegration in South Africa. The final session focused on the role of different functional correctional officials in contributing to rehabilitation. Concerns raised included insufficient staff and resources at the centre, lack of team work, and poor management support. At the end of the training participants were provided with additional information regarding rehabilitation and their role as highlighted in the White Paper.

This training programme raised the need for staff to work together and to understand the different roles members play in the rehabilitation process. However the training was not sustained in practice because of the lack of management support for further training, lack of a framework to train within, and that those staff who could really have benefited from this course did not participate.

G.2 Facilitating support and buy-in for implementation

The IYOP co-ordinator undertook a briefing to the juvenile centre staff about the programme prior to implementing the programme. The purpose was to inform them about the programme, encourage their engagement with the process and to facilitate their support for the movement of the selected offenders to the programme, and to allow the facilitators entry to the section and offenders. Prior to this a meeting was held at the District Management Office and the head social worker to brief them on actual implementation (as they had approved the proposal) and to confirm the core areas of intervention.

A meeting with DCS mid-way through programme and staff interviews indicated mixed understanding about what the programme was about, and perceptions about the impact. Some staff did not know about the programme despite briefings by the project team to management, while others knew what it was about and were hopeful about the possible impact. Expected benefits of the programme included: cooperation between offenders, being positive about life, less fighting as they are better able to handle their differences.

Of concern were the references made to offenders as ‘rocks’ and ‘animals’ by some DCS staff. This indicates the necessity for working with staff and centre management to support the policy shift articulated in the White Paper towards rehabilitation. Members interviewed believed that the programme would help them in their job and in building relationships with offenders. For example, members indicated that ‘they become more positive about the future’ and consequently ‘they can start to see us as approachable rather than as a threat’ and as role models.

The key person for the facilitators in terms of support from Centre management and staff was the Divisional Head of Care Services. He played an invaluable role in the co-ordination between IYOP and Correctional Centre, sections, and staff; ensuring the time set aside for the programme was used; and organising a room and chairs for

the participants. The month he was away team members and participants indicated it was ‘very complex’ to hold programme: if he was present people knew what to do and it was done.

The attitude of staff discouraged some participants from deepening their learning and commitment towards a new vision, illustrating the need for sustained support to staff.

G.3 Development of DCS staff and correctional centre

The Department of Correctional Services recognises the need for the culture of the institution to change and to change the old approaches to meet the new policy direction. This is articulated in the White Paper and by Correctional Centre management and staff. There appears to be a willingness by all staff to change the way things happen – however there is lack of knowledge on how to change it and a sense that even with the training, staff are going against the daily institutional workings and function. The department faces many staff challenges included a shortage of staff, high staff turnover, low self-esteem and lack of motivated staff, and staff capacity building.

‘It is important to train staff and impart skills – we feel deprived of knowledge – DCS has not focused on this area and we are just rotting’

DCS Official, Boksburg Correctional Centre Juvenile Section

The challenge of the training is in the ability of the participants to apply what they have learnt in practice post-training. Clearly the assessment during the programme and post-training evaluation indicates that staff enjoyed the training and value the knowledge and skills they gained. In terms of applying it in practice, it appears to have had mixed views on the effectiveness. Staff interviewed indicated how it has changed the way they perceive offenders (attitudes) and increased their ability to understand what is happening in the sections in terms of behaviour and shifting towards a rehabilitative focus. One staff member indicated that she was ignorant of what it meant to be a rehabilitator but after the training understood how she could include it in her core function.

‘We are now more observant now on what is happening in the section/’

Staff Interview Report July 2004

Two staff members interviewed in the final evaluation review process who underwent the training confirmed this, but indicated the difficulty in taking it further because not all staff have the same new view, and that the daily operations and system in the Correctional Centre make it difficult to take up a greater rehabilitation role. One staff member who did not participate in the training indicated that she had noted a difference in those who had and regretted she had not been able to attend due to work pressure despite being selected. The discipline member interviewed indicated that he had seen no difference in how offenders were treated by staff who had or had not attended the training. This may however be more of a statement of his own level of understanding and interaction with offenders and less so on the programme.

It was noted by staff that there has been a big change in Section J5 where one of the staff members has been very proactive in changing how staff and offenders interact and has begun to shift the section towards a stronger rehabilitation approach. It appears that the rehabilitative understanding is being incorporated into the unit management approach.
Staff indicated that the programme had helped them in their job: both from the training they had received as well as the growth in the offenders. In particular the improved communication skills have resulted in better relationships between them which have resulted in less stress for the staff.

G.4 Perceptions of changes in participants

Staff interviewed indicated that a few of the participants are demonstrating different, more positive behaviour. In particular they note the ability of participants to control themselves in trying situations, they are less aggressive towards staff, and how they all carry themselves now. In addition they noted that they are more optimistic about their future.

The initial number of participants was small in comparison to the entire juvenile Correctional Centre population and consequently the impact they have on other offenders is limited. DCS staff indicated during the mid-way interviews that they have observed fewer fights in the sections since the programme begun, and that participants are more respectful to female visitors. The programme was viewed as important and that there was a need to reach other offenders.

However they noted that a few participants have ‘not changed that much’: they still participate in negative behaviour. Reasons cited included the negative influence of peer offenders, the difficulty in altering behaviour while incarcerated, and that the level of schooling influences the extent to which participants gained knowledge and skills from the programme and their ability to translate it into practice.

Staff highlighted the need for continuous support to be given to inmate participants both during the programme and afterwards – whether in Correctional Centre or after release. The social worker indicated that participants spoke to her about the programme and she supported them by helping to debrief and process what was happening to individuals during the entire programme roll-out. She noted that participants benefited from different parts of the programme according to their needs and identification with the programme content in relations to their lives. Two staff members indicated that they can support the graduates by involving them in the Correctional Centre programmes as facilitators and mentors.

The involvement of gangsterism was noted by staff to have decreased across all sections and the IYOP is acknowledged to have contributed towards this as ‘it kept members busy’ and they shared some of the learning with peers. Discipline staff called for more offenders to participate in the programme as it has stopped ‘some of the funning(sic) things’. One staff member indicated that the influence these graduates had on other peers was limited due to the small number.

H. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS: STRENGTHENING THE IYOP

The Integrated Youth Offender Programme piloted in Boksburg Juvenile Correctional Centre with twenty male offenders specifically aimed to address the risk factors and build resilience within the participants to facilitate a shift away from crime. The findings clearly indicate the impact of the programme on the participants in meeting the expected outcomes. The participants articulated how the programme has impacted on their lives: on their own personal growth emotionally, psychologically, physically, socially and cognitively. The knowledge gained and process of engaging
in dialogue in a safe, open and supportive environment contributed towards a change in attitude towards the key factors the programme aimed to address: education, employment, healthy living, a sense of purpose, conflict resolution, building family networks, taking personal responsibility for their lives, improved life skills for coping and developing an internal resilience to face the difficulties that they may face. The participants are positive about their lives after prison and their ability to engage in non-criminal income generation.

The development of the Morning Star group was an important and critical part of the process of building positive peer relationships, role modelling of alternative forms of behaviour and creating a sense of acceptance and belonging. The process was not easy and a few of the participants are still struggling to make the shifts in the daily interactions with peers and DCS officials, as observed by the facilitators and one of the DCS members interviewed. The changing of behaviour does not occur immediately and the process of building healthy habits away from crime takes time.

Recommendation 1: Mainstream behaviour change
There is a need to mainstream changing behaviour and actual behaviour change into the programme to a greater extent. The participants are facing the reality of sustaining the changes they have made without the daily or weekly interaction with the IYOP facilitators. In addition, they face a number of situations both in and out of prison where they are challenged to use the knowledge and skills they have gained. It is therefore recommended that sessions are set aside for participants to talk about the challenges they faced and how they addressed it (positively or negatively) using their new skills during the year-long intervention. This would allow facilitators to guide participants and engage with participants in how to keep healthy habits.

In addition, the IYOP and Correctional Centre management suggested that the graduates be housed in the same cell in order for them to support each other in reinforcing positive behaviour. This limits opportunities for the participants to role-model positive behaviour and share knowledge (such as about sexuality, substance use, transforming conflicts and entrepreneurship), but, given the small number of participants remaining in the centre, it currently would provide a supportive environment.

Recommendation 2: Post programme support
Given the limited resources, the IYOP aims to support the graduates as far as possible after the intervention. In the two months after the graduation ceremony and over the December holiday period, each organisation undertook a session with the graduates remaining in the Correctional Centre to assist them in processing the intervention, the changes in the group as participants left, and as they adjusted to a new life in the same environment. In the next year, AVP intends to undertake further workshops with offenders (with centre management approval) whereby the graduates are co-facilitators, and the DCS social worker intends working with the graduates to help facilitate her programmes. Where possible, the other programmes will include the graduates into the second programme cycle. The possibility of implementing a crafts programme for the graduates is being considered to provide a meaningful and positive self-expression intervention.

Recommendation 3: Longitudinal study
One of the limitations of this review is the impact of the intervention on how the graduates cope and adjust to life after being released. The actual impact of the IYOP will only be determined if the participants of the Morning Star group do not return to crime. This is beyond the scope of this review given the time-frame of the review (immediately post intervention). However, key to the sustainability of the outcomes in
the participants is ongoing support while incarcerated, and after release, as discussed above.

It is therefore recommended that an investigation into the effectiveness of the IYOP six months to two years after release be undertaken to inform the necessity of post release support and determine whether the programme met reintegration requirements and impacted on reducing re-offending. Post release is a crucial time and the programme may need to strengthen the intervention in term of housing and financial sustainability post-release, given the feedback and experience of a few of the graduates who have been released. One participant contacted AVP after release and is one of their facilitators.

Furthermore, there is a need to undertake a longitudinal survey to determine if the integrated approach has contributed towards preventing re-offending behaviour in this group of participants. The study would also provide insights into the challenges these participants have faced after release to determine the appropriateness of the range of interventions, level of skills attained, and the transferability of the outcomes into daily living out of prison.

The findings from the review suggest that the integrated approach is an appropriate intervention to encourage young male offenders convicted of serious economic crimes to understand the implication of and be accountable for the harm caused, to shift away from a life of crime to promote the reintegration of the young person after release from imprisonment into the family and community. The integrated approach allowed the threading together of the complex intersection of the risk, resilience and protective factors and facilitators were able to focus on their core training programmes as the range of issues were addressed across the entire programme.

Participants enjoyed the programme and found the methodology stimulating and appropriate to their needs and intellectual levels. Only two participants did not make the connections between the programmes, and 87 percent of the participants felt they were guided across the programmes despite having different facilitators. The continuity of the Vuka S’Hambe psychotherapeutic programme was important as it provided constancy and direction to the participants. All six programmes were seen as important and appropriate by the participants and DCS staff. One of the most challenging programmes to deliver on was the family reintegration programme because it involved engaging and mediating with family members. The BENtrepreneurING programme and the AVP programme highlighted the challenges of adapting the programme to meet the centres daily routine, and to find ways to help the participants to practice their skills. The findings indicate the necessity of incorporating a restorative justice component into the ongoing support for the graduates.

**Recommendation 4: Restorative Justice**

It is recommended, as identified by the IYOP members and DCS centre management, that the approach includes a greater restorative justice element. This will require bringing in a further expert partner to offer these services with the offenders who wish to take the journey further by engaging in the victim-offender mediation. It was suggested, and this is supported, that this part of the programme is offered as ‘phase two’ of the programme as it is necessary for the offender to hold themselves accountable for their actions and be willing to engage in the emotional intensity of the process.
Recommendation 5: Continued delivery of IYOP
The participants made a strong call for the programme to continue in the Centre: both for themselves as well as for fellow offenders. The Centre staff indicated that there are a large number of offenders who wish to participate in the programme. The offenders further indicated that there is a need for this type of programme to be on offer outside of prison to prevent young people from engaging in crime and violence.

It is therefore recommended that the programme is offered on an annual basis and that more than one group is reached. This would increase the number of offenders with the skills and knowledge and it is likely, based on the experience of other interventions in juvenile centres, that this will have an impact on the section culture.

Recommendation 6: Assessment and Review
There is a need to restructure the evaluation and review tools as these were being piloted for the integrated approach. The instruments need to be made available in vernacular languages and the design requires simplification in order for them to be completed without facilitation by the participants. In addition, it is recommended that the programme develops a standardised register for ease of tracking participation over the programme. Ideally the IYOP needs to undertake the assessment process at the end of the intervention to determine the cognitive, emotional and psychological impact of the programme on the participants.

Recommendation 7: Staff training and support
Part of the IYOP provided training for twenty DCS officials from the Boksburg Correctional Centre. It is recommended, as suggested by the IYOP team, that the staff training needs to begin earlier in the programme so that there are greater opportunities to work with the staff as part of the programme with offenders. Staff indicated the need for further training and the inclusion of more elements. They felt the training was too short as they wanted to know more about the issues.

From the training emerged the recommendation for a support structure for staff within the Correctional Centre to deal with the emotional impact of their work, their own feelings evoked by their work such as anger and helplessness, and the emotional impact inmates have on them due to their own issues. It was suggested that this be in the form of debriefings or supervision. It further raised the need for counselling skills and greater skills to be able to effectively address issues such as depression, suicidal threats, self-mutilation, sodomy and HIV and AIDS. In addition, it was suggested that the programme find ways for staff to provide feedback on the growth of individuals in a more structured manner as this will provide greater opportunities to engage with staff on individual case rehabilitation and build rehabilitative skills and knowledge of all concerned. This would address the difficulty staff have in intervening as rehabilitators and encourage staff shifts towards greater morale and direction.

Staff indicated that they feel they have been left behind in training and development in corrections and juvenile rehabilitation. There appears to be a gap in translating the Department of Correctional Services White Paper into practice and consequently there is a lack of strategic direction and practical application as to what it means to be a ‘rehabilitator’.

The selection of internal management and operational staff as participants to the training is important as the rehabilitation role impacts on present management and daily operating systems. It is therefore necessary to reach all staff and management within the juvenile centre. In addition it is recommended that the training needed to include health care personnel and area level management officials as the programme impacts on their services and support. Furthermore, particular training components
the offenders received are of benefit to the staff who could then transfer, or reinforce, the knowledge and skills to offenders in their daily interactions. This is particularly relevant in terms of healthy lifestyles (HIV/AIDS, sexual relationships and substance use), developing lifestyles away from crime (entrepreneurial skills), transforming conflict and in the psycho-therapeutic interventions to facilitate behaviour change.

The management and team process and role-modelling was a further lever for the successful implementation of the programme and establishing a democratic, human rights based ‘culture’ in the programme. Issues pertaining to the participants and programme delivery were discussed and challenges overcome, such as the logistical arrangements and the concern about photographs. Working together as six independent organisations in an integrated manner was a new experience and good working relationships were established. The partners need to continuously build their relationships particularly when facilitators or managers change to ensure that the team dynamics, and communication, is inclusive. The challenge is to provide constructive feedback and reflection during programme delivery.

The findings suggest that some refinement is required in terms of logistical arrangements with the Correctional Centre to find a more appropriate venue and to inform all centre staff of the programme, delivery schedule and who the participants are to facilitate the movement of offenders between cells and sections. This would address a number of the challenges the organisation faces in working in the Correctional Centre setting.

The findings of the immediate post-programme review indicate that the integrated approach was successful and appropriate and made a positive contribution towards enabling male youth offenders to build resilience, shift their ability to cope with factors associated with re-offending, and to choose a non-criminal life. The IYOP was designed to target specific characteristics and problems identified through the assessment process and has achieved this. The ‘dosage’, treatment integrity, multi-modal approach, and the methodologies used in the range of interventions were appropriate to the intellectual and emotional levels of the participants, and challenged them to undertake a mentored journey of introspection towards opening up possibilities of a new way of life – one of hope and a sense of playing ‘socially constructive and productive roles in society’.

MARGARET ROPER

---

19 Margaret Roper was contracted by the CSVR to undertake this review. She is a facilitator of AVP and during the year became a Director of the Themba HIV/AIDS Organisation.
## APPENDIX 1: PROGRAMME SEQUENCING AND IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW

### OFFENDER INTERVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews mid-way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vuka S'Hambe</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Sessions 1-7</td>
<td>Sessions 8-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICRO Family Programme</td>
<td>3 sessions</td>
<td>4 sessions</td>
<td>7 sessions</td>
<td>6 sessions</td>
<td>5 sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADS</td>
<td>6 sessions</td>
<td>8 sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themba HIV/AIDS Org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEentrepreneurING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing workshop (BE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-Jul</td>
<td>27-Aug</td>
<td>30-Sep</td>
<td>28-Oct</td>
<td>17-Nov</td>
<td>3-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing to management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Management meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAFF TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29/30 July</td>
<td>4/18 August</td>
<td>10-Aug</td>
<td>25-Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSVr Trauma Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Correctional Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>