

Appendix C:

Audit scope and method

Scope of this audit

Who we examined	We examined the following agencies:				
	Agency	Their key responsibilities			
	Department of Justice and Community Safety (including Corrections Victoria)	Responsible for overseeing Ravenhall and the state's other public and private prisons.			
	GEO Group Australia	The company that operates Ravenhall.			
	ASGIP III Ravenhall Project Pty Ltd (Project Co)	The consortium which holds the contract with the state and engages the prison's operator, GEO.			
Our audit objective	Is Ravenhall Correctional Centre rehabilitating and reintegrating prisoners as intended?				
What we examined	We examined: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ravenhall's rehabilitation and reintegration programs• post-release services offered at GEO's Bridge Centre.				
Aspects of performance examined	Our mandate for performance audits and reviews includes the assessment of economy, effectiveness, efficiency and compliance (often referred to as the '3Es + C'). In this audit we focused on the following aspect:				
	Economy	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Compliance	
					
	Key:  Primary focus  Secondary focus  Not assessed				

Conducting this audit

Assessing performance To form a conclusion against our objective we used the following lines of inquiry and associated evaluation criteria.

Line of inquiry	Criteria
1. Is Ravenhall delivering its rehabilitation and reintegration programs as required?	<p>1.1 Ravenhall's rehabilitation programs have high completion rates and address needs (for example, programs targeting alcohol and drug issues and offending behaviour).</p> <p>1.2 Released Ravenhall prisoners receive all reintegration services that they need, including for housing, employment, mental health and alcohol/drug issues.</p>
2. Is Ravenhall's rehabilitation and reintegration model contributing to reducing reoffending?	<p>2.1 DJCS and GEO regularly monitor, evaluate, report and act on Ravenhall and the Bridge Centre's performance data.</p> <p>2.2 Ravenhall's programs (including the Bridge Centre) support positive rehabilitation and reintegration outcomes, including reducing reoffending.</p>

Our methods As part of the audit we independently analysed Ravenhall's reoffending rates compared with other prisons. We excluded the state's female prisons from the comparison group. This differs from DJCS's official method for assessing Ravenhall's performance against KPI 16.

We made this change because as Ravenhall is an adult male prison, its reoffending rates are most comparable to other adult male prisons. Female prisoners may have different offending profiles and rehabilitation needs.

For data triangulation purposes, we also measured Ravenhall's performance using 2 different approaches:

- We defined the rehabilitation and reintegration treatment group (Ravenhall prisoners) as those who were released from Ravenhall. This approach is relevant because only those who are released from Ravenhall are eligible for the Bridge Centre's post-release services. It also matches DJCS's definition. However, it may include prisoners who spent more time at, and were more influenced by, rehabilitation programs at other Victorian prisons.
- We defined the treatment group (Ravenhall prisoners) as those who spent at least 90 days and/or at least 50 per cent of their time at Ravenhall. We did this because the 'prison of release' does not necessarily reflect the prison where the person spent the most time. This approach is relevant for identifying prisoners who had more exposure to Ravenhall's rehabilitation programs. However, they would not have access to the Bridge Centre if they were released from a different prison. This definition is different to DJCS's current KPI calculation method. DJCS discusses this option of identifying Ravenhall prisoners by 'dosage' in its draft evaluation strategy.

Level of assurance

In an assurance review, we primarily rely on the agency's representations and internally generated information to form our conclusions. By contrast, in a performance audit, we typically gather evidence from an array of internal and external sources, which we analyse and substantiate using various methods. Therefore, an assurance review obtains a lower level of assurance than a performance audit (meaning we have slightly less confidence in the accuracy of our conclusion).

Compliance We conducted our audit in accordance with the *Audit Act 1994* and ASAE 3500 *Performance Engagements* to obtain reasonable assurance to provide a basis for our conclusion. We complied with the independence and other relevant ethical requirements related to assurance engagements. We also provided a copy of the report to the Department of Premier and Cabinet and the Department of Treasury and Finance.

Cost and time The full cost of the audit and preparation of this report was \$549,000. The duration of the audit was 8 months from initiation to tabling.
