

From: Anthony_Crandell [REDACTED]/Staff/NSWPolice
To: [Craig N Middleton \[REDACTED\]/Staff/NSWPolice%NSWPolice](#); [Craig N Middleton \[REDACTED\]/Staff/NSWPolice%NSWPolice](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Delivery of final Academic report [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]
Date: Monday, 7 August 2017 14:55:42

Thanks Middo,

I agree with your view and that of Derek and I am comfortable releasing the synopsis only. I am weary of identification details however they were all in the public domain at some stage I presume. The only other thing is making sure we notify families prior to Parrabell release so that they have an opportunity to address me before release - could be a dangerous area here.

The only other thing that concerns me is the discoverable nature of the documents should a clever journo wish to obtain all documentation. In any event we can address that if such a situation presents itself. I will go through the document you left for me and will soon complete my executive summary.

Thanks for all your help.

Regards



Assistant Commissioner Anthony Crandell APM | Commander
 Education & Training Command
 Level 5, 20 Charles Street, Parramatta NSW 2150



▼ Craig N Middleton---07/08/2017 14:21:38---Boss Foe what it is worth I agree with Derek about not publishing the actual review forms. I have c

From: Craig N Middleton [REDACTED]/Staff/NSWPolice
To: Anthony Crandell [REDACTED]/Staff/NSWPolice@NSWPolice
Date: 07/08/2017 14:21
Subject: Fw: Delivery of final Academic report [DLM=For-Official-Use-Only]

Boss

Foe what it is worth I agree with Derek about not publishing the actual review forms. I have completed a draft synopsis of each matter which highlights both ours and Derek codings. I believe that this should be the document which is published by the NSWPF. I am on my 3rd reading of the synopsis and I think that Derek has a valid point about the review forms. A lot of the terminology in the review forms is reflective of the language of the era for which they are taken (70, 80's and 90's) and if not taken in that context could be construed as not 'politically correct' themselves. I agree with Derek, in that the review forms would, in my opinion, just be too raw to publish to the wider community and media for scrutiny. The review forms too me were and always remain an internal working document which *assisted* us in the process of coding the cases.

Additionally through my numerous proof readings, comparing the synopsis to the review forms and ultimately checking each matter (synopsis) against the original case files, I have noticed certain anomalies and errors within the review forms. Whilst these errors do not change our codings on each matter, they are never the less errors that if not corrected before being published could be used to highlight inaccuracies. The errors, inconsistencies and omissions I am talking about e involve the following:

* Incorrect dates/spelling: Some of the forms have listed the incorrect date of death. This is mainly due to the victim initially being assaulted and then dying some days later in hospital. Some of the review forms list the day of assault as the date of death. I have systematically gone through each matter and double checked all the dates of death against the original case files (coroners reports, fact sheets etc). Likewise with some spelling of victims/witnesses/offenders/places etc, ages DOB etc. They are not deliberate errors just more typos etc

* I have also noticed that there is differing writing styles to completing the original review forms. I put this down to the individual investigator. Hence some of the narratives (summaries) are written in a certain style which may not always truly reflect the actual timeline of events or are written to highlight a certain perspective. Ive also noticed that some of the backgrd information has been omitted. Essentially we asked young investigators to sort through a wealth

of material and cherry pick out certain aspects of each matter as per our indicator forms. They did this to the best of their ability and they did very well. What we didnt do, and perhaps we should of is, explain to them how to write a comprehensive narrative with accurate timelines and pertinent backgrd information on the accused/victim. You must remember that this is not one of the categories they were taught to look for. However when I have gone back and reread the review forms summary narrative (thats the narrative at the end of the review form) against original casefiles for the synopsis I have discovered some omissions and/or explanations which in my opinion I would have included in the review forms summary narrative at the end to help explain certain aspects or clarify certain statements.

I know what your thinking but please dont panic !!! - I havent found any glaring mistakes that would, in my opinion, totally change a coding on a matter, more just subtle interpretations of the case files. There is nothing major that would change our codings, but to me important enough that it should be included in the synopsis document for accuracy and may assist in explaining a certain word used or action by either the accused or victim.

In other words, the final synopsis when completed, will be the most accurate and correct document that I can produce for you. It should give you a brief but succinct overview of each matter. Importantly it will be accurate as far as the timeline and descriptor of each case. I am presently cross checking every matter against the case files on e@glei. I stand 100% behind everyone of our codings and the process we used, of which the review forms should be viewed as part of the process.

I will of course send the final synopsis to Derek, but I doubt very much that he will even be aware of the changes Ive made in the synopsis compared to the review forms. Essentially date of deaths etc are not part of his academic review product. The other changes are more subtle changes to the narrative - they done and wont change the codings for either us or the academics.

I hope you can understand what I am trying to explain. In my opinion, I would be far more comfortable with the synopsis being published as opposed to each individual review form.

However as always I will leave the final decision to yourself.

(PS: I slipped a draft of the synopsis into one of your boxes - bear in mind it is a draft only !!! so dont take it as gospel as the final product)

Regards

Middo

(PS: I may want to come and see you and have that lobotomy sometime soon !)



Craig Middleton | Detective Chief Inspector
Crime Manager | Surry Hills Local Area Command



----- Forwarded by Craig N Middleton/24962/Staff/NSWPolice on 07/08/2017 13:18 -----

From: Derek Dalton <derek.dalton@flinders.edu.au>
 To: Anthony Crandell
 Cc: "Jacqueline Braw" [redacted] Craig N Middleton
 Date: 04/08/2017 16:59
 Subject: Delivery of final Academic report

Dear Assistant Commissioner Crandell,

I note that under the terms of the 'Deed of Variation', we are meant to deliver the final report to NSWPF on Monday 7th August.

Willem has sent me his final changes and I am still dealing with lots of missing references [much more time consuming than I ever envisaged they would be]. 99% are Willem's, but it makes sense if just one of us attends to this tedious task.

Realistically, with proof reading and niggling formatting issues, I hope to send you the final report in the next 2 weeks [hopefully sooner, but I am working on 2 weeks to allow me some breathing space]

We made a few (5 or 6) last minute classification changes to our numbers [this was a result of my rigorous quality control checking process]. We found that we could not “live” with a few classifications. Some – when we stared them down – were best changed. [e.g. we CHANGED Walsh (case 47) from Anti-paed back to Anti-gay].

I am sure you would rather me spend a few extra days polishing than rush the process.

I hope this is acceptable to you. Indeed, I apologise for the lateness. With semester in full swing (I am teaching *Crime, Law and Trauma*) I have lots of competing tasks.

In light of some email correspondence, Craig has convinced me that publishing some sort of table with the academic and police coding/classifications is probably going to be a good idea in terms of full transparency. At first I was reluctant to do so, but Craig is right to assert that we don’t want any party to make some sort of claim along the lines of ‘*We waited so long for this report and it occludes the sort of details we have long anticipated*’.

It will, of course, be your “call” Assistant Commissioner. I am happy to discuss this with you if we want me to elaborate on the ‘pros’ and ‘cons’. Craig (as always) has a well-informed view. He may offer you wise counsel and is in a good position to summarise our deliberations. He managed to persuade me that the benefits outweigh the drawbacks.

For what it is worth, I still think that publishing the case reports (even if redacted) is very unwise. They are full of what I would term the “legacy language” of the times in which they were written. Lots of cringe worthy turns of phrase that have pathological connotations (this is not a criticism of *Parrabell* detectives, they were just harnessing sentiment from the archive). They are – in a sense – products of the 1980s and 1990s. No amount of careful and painstaking editing will divest them of this quality. They are just too clinical and raw as reading for the lay public. Dr Tyson agrees. She said “Publishing them would be a really bad idea”. I rest my case.

Jackie mentioned redacting some names from the report? This too is somewhat problematic. I think it is best to keep the case surnames in place because the specificity seems important and warranted.

Once again, we might need to discuss this at some stage.

Sincerely

Derek

Dr Derek Dalton
Associate Professor
College of Business, Government & Law
Flinders University

Sturt Road, Bedford Park South Australia 5042
GPO Box 2100 Adelaide SA 5001

E: derek.dalton@flinders.edu.au

Office Consultation Hours: Monday 10-11am and Tues 12-1pm [3.32 in LAW Building]

All mail is subject to content scanning for possible violation of NSW Police Force policy, including the Email and Internet Policy and Guidelines. All NSW Police Force employees are required to familiarise themselves with these policies, available on the NSW Police Force Intranet.