

Tender Proposal: Independent evaluation of *Strike force Parabell's* review of the identified 88 deaths during the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s



Why our team is well equipped to perform this evaluation

There are five key reasons why our team should be entrusted with the sensitive task of undertaking this review as will be elaborated upon below.

1. Research Expertise: an intimate three person team with diverse skills and knowledge

The project will be led by **Associate Professor Derek Dalton**. He has extensive experience conducting and publishing research in relation to the policing, homosexuality and public space. In particular, his research [published in leading national and International journals] has primarily focused on problematic ‘Beat’ spaces where men congregate to organise or engage in sex. In 2012 this research interest culminated in the publication of *‘Policing Sex’* by esteemed International publishing house *Routledge* [co-edited with Professor Paul Johnson]. Associate Professor’s Dalton’s grasp of the legal, social and cultural complexities of Beat spaces will be indispensable to this project given the manner in which they figure prominently in the review brief. Whilst Associate Professor’s Dalton is not an expert *per se* in ‘hate crime’, he nevertheless has an excellent grasp of this academic literature, particularly as it relates to the commission and indicators of homophobic violence.

In December 2004 Dr Dalton presented a one hour lecture entitled *"Hate Crime and homophobic violence: an overview"* to 22 senior police officers at the South Australia Police headquarters. In 2006 Dr Dalton gave a key note address as the invited guest speaker at the launch of the joint Federal Police and SAPOL *Gay and Lesbians Liaison Officer* training program. Entitled *"International perspectives on community building between police and the GLBTI community"*, the address was well received by the 35 officers in attendance. From 2004 until 2007, Dr Dalton attended monthly meetings of the *"GLBTIQ South Australian Police Focus Group"* at the Flinders Street Police Headquarters. Here his criminological knowledge helped inform South Australian Police policy and practice. Additionally, his participation contributed to nurturing cooperative relationships between members of the GLBTIQ community and police in a climate of wavering mutual mistrust that needed addressing. These experiences testify to the fact that Associate Professor Derek Dalton has extensive experience communicating with police officers and fostering mutual respect, trust and cooperation with a view to securing positive outcomes.

Before arriving at Flinders University, our second team member **Professor Willem de Lint** was Chair of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology at the University of Windsor,

**Tender Proposal: Independent evaluation of *Strike force Parabell's*
review of the identified 88 deaths during the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s**



Canada between 2007 and 2010. His areas of interest include security and policing, particularly public order policing, and how the governance of public safety and security is accomplished by a variety of service providers, actors, or agencies. Willem serves or has served on the editorial boards of the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *Policing and Society*, and *The Open Law Journal*. He has an esteemed International reputation in relation to his policing research and has managed many large projects to completion. Willem has extensive experience liaising with criminal justice agencies including a major project with the South Australian *Victims Support Service*. His expertise in policing culture and practices will be crucial to the thorough approach our team will take to this review.

Our third team member, **Dr Danielle Tyson**, is a senior lecturer in Criminology in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Deakin University and an adjunct senior research fellow in Criminology in the School of Social Sciences at Monash University. Dr Tyson has over 15 years' experience researching in the area of intimate partner violence, domestic homicide, filicide in the context of separation and divorce, and family violence and family law reform. She has accumulated a broad range of practical and legal research skills, including qualitative research methods, documentary and textual analyses of criminal trial transcripts and case files, as well as interviews and focus groups.

Her most recent research with the Domestic Violence Resource Centre Victoria (DVRCV) examined 64 prosecutions of men (n=51) and women (n=13) who have killed in the context of an intimate relationship since the implementation of key reforms to the law of homicide in Victoria in 2005. This research involved a systematic examination of case materials including transcripts of criminal trials, plea and sentencing hearings and media reports. The aim of the research was to retrospectively examine the case materials to identify risk factors for and depictions of family violence, defence and prosecution narratives, the use of evidence of family violence and the recognition of family violence at sentencing. The findings have been published in two co-authored discussion papers.

Additionally, it should be stressed that Associate Professor Dalton and Professor de Lint are members of the ***Centre for Crime Policy and Research*** at Flinders University. If the need arises, our team can draw on the expertise of a wide range of Centre academics and public policy experts including Professor Andrew Goldsmith, Professor Mark Halsey and Professor Adam Graycar.

**Tender Proposal: Independent evaluation of *Strike force Parabell's*
review of the identified 88 deaths during the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s**



2. Independence [a key to objectivity]

Being based in South Australia (with one team member located in Melbourne), our team has the benefit of being located outside the cultural, social and geographical sphere of New South Wales. This is advantageous because the period in which many of the deaths under review occurred was a somewhat fractious and divisive era in NSW police-GLBTI community relations. Much folklore and cultural memory exists about this period (some aligned with the truth, some perhaps based on supposition rather than facts). It could be argued that a concomitant amount of what one might term *baggage* might be associated with some of the key players [activists, academics, media commentators, former police etc.] who have so far contributed to public commentary. This makes perfect sense given that lives were lost and people feel impassioned about these deaths (murders) in the context of justice debates in NSW. This history [as captured by relevant academic literature and newspaper discourse] is a vitally important aspect of the review process and will inform the process.

Indeed, any team that undertakes this task must show deference to the endeavours that provided the impetus for the establishment of Strike force Parabell. However, our team has the requisite objectivity (afforded by physical distance and lack of involvement in the events under review) to offer an **unbiased review**. Such a position is neutrality (which other proposals may not offer) is a **guarantee of impartiality to the NSW Police and the citizens of NSW**. It will act as a **type of insurance against accusations** that NSW-based teams are not wholly divested of pre-existing bias (either pro GLBTI community *or* pro-NSW police).

3. Dedication to ensuring clear lines of communication are maintained

Any project that deals with death requires a great deal of sensitivity and respect for the material under consideration. Clear lines of communication are thus vital to the success of this review. A team that both assists with the production of an *initial* review report document and subsequently evaluates the quality of a *finalised* report is in a slightly invidious position. There is room for tension and disagreements to arise. The key thing to do here is not pretend that such issues won't arise, but to implement a plan to minimise tension in this process. Clearly documenting and communicating unambiguous feedback with ensure the detectives authoring both the draft and subsequent version of the review report are given ample opportunities to craft a product [report] that will be likely to meet with a more favourable review. **Fostering transparency and genuine cooperation between all parties** will foster a collaborative spirit that should provide clarity of purpose.

Tender Proposal: Independent evaluation of *Strike force Parabell's* review of the identified 88 deaths during the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s



4. A meticulously well thought out approach to the brief provided

The manner in which this project should methodically proceed has been clearly outlined in the Gantt Chart below. Of course, this approach is **open to negotiation** to ensure it fits the needs (and time frames) of the NSW police. The process (as our team currently envisages it) can be summarised by the bullet points below:

1. Request NSW to provide preliminary Strike force Parabell Report [hereafter SPR] based on 88 Case files report
2. Focus group discussion (fact finding exercise) Derek informally interviews detectives and parties intimately connected with the Strike force in NSW¹
3. Analysis of preliminary findings arising from focus group discussions
4. Derek to provide feedback on SPR to allow client to improve review and hone quality and scope of SPR
5. Meet with Client to share and discuss Derek initial review comments on SPR
6. Client revises SPR based on Derek comments and submits revised (final) SPR for review
7. If necessary, Derek to review original source material in consultation with guidance from experienced detectives [about standard operating procedures]
8. Derek to prepare independent evaluation of Strike force Parabel Review (SPR), including: Introductory section, provision of historical context (prevailing social and cultural factors), and recommendations for future policing, community engagement, training and development of bias crime indicators / processes [This involves accessing and reviewing relevant academic literature]
9. Produce draft report
10. Meet to present draft report
11. Finalise report
5. Determine recommendations for future directions of the GLLO arising from the report
6. Meetings (3) across the duration of the project with Corporate Sponsor Sexuality & Gender Diversity and the Senior Programs Officer
7. Produce research article for submission to appropriate quality journal

¹ NOTE: Officers will not be quoted in the report. These discussions are merely fact finding processes to aid in understanding what has taken place.

Tender Proposal: Independent evaluation of *Strike force Parabell's* review of the identified 88 deaths during the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s



Note: As specified in the Gantt chart below, Associate Professor Dalton will do most of the face-to-face liaising and Professor de Lint and Dr Tyson will assist me with the analysis and preparation of written documents.

8. Value for money

The requested funding for the project is \$54,000. Details are provided below.

Item	Cost (\$)
Personnel	
Project leader - Derek Dalton	31,000
Willem De Lint	4,000
Danielle Tyson	3,200
Travel and Accommodation	
Sydney trip 1, 2 days, flights, accommodation, incidentals	1,350
Sydney trip 2, 4 days, flights, accommodation, incidentals	2,300
Sydney trip 3, 2 days, flights, accommodation, incidentals	1,350
Other	
Flinders University Infrastructure Levy (25%)	10,800
TOTAL, excluding GST	54,000

The budget offers a **realistic and fair appraisal** of the costs involved in delivering a quality review and is itemised down to the last dollar. It includes costing of 39 days of time for the project team as detailed in the Gantt Chart below. For the three proposed 'field trips' to Sydney (as indicated by burgundy colour in the Gantt chart), standard travel rates have been used and the expertise charge rates (per day dollar charges) are 36% of the standard consultancy rates as advised by Flinders University. We offer this **discount (64%)** because we are enthusiastic about the research topic and are keen to secure the work. The infrastructure levy is a standard charge for University consultancies and research.

The Gantt chart and associated information on the following page details the methodology, timeframe and responsibilities for each task associated with the project. Please treat this project detail as confidential. Time frames are estimated, and subject to your approval, and delivery of required input.

