



# Engagement and Impact 2018

University of Technology Sydney

UTS12 (CAH) - Impact

## Overview

### Title

*(Title of the impact study)*

Designing Out Crime

### Unit of Assessment

12 - Built Environment and Design

### Additional FoR codes

*(Identify up to two additional two-digit FoRs that relate to the overall content of the impact study.)*

16 - Studies in Human Society

### Socio-Economic Objective (SEO) Codes

*(Choose from the list of two-digit SEO codes that are relevant to the impact study.)*

94 - Law, Politics and Community Services

### Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC) Codes

*(Choose from the list of two-digit ANZSIC codes that are relevant to the impact study.)*

77 - Public Order, Safety and Regulatory Services

### Keywords

*(List up to 10 keywords related to the impact described in Part A.)*

Crime

Design

Innovation

### Sensitivities

Commercially sensitive

No

Culturally sensitive

No

### Sensitivities description

*(Please describe any sensitivities in relation to the impact study that need to be considered, including any particular instructions for ARC staff or assessors, or for the impact study to be made publicly available after EI 2018.)*

### Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research flag

*(Is this impact study associated with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander content?*

*NOTE - institutions may identify impact studies where the impact, associated research and/or approach to impact relates to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, nations, communities, language, place, culture and knowledges and/or is undertaken with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, nations, and/or communities.)*

Yes

### Science and Research Priorities

*(Does this impact study fall within one or more of the Science and Research Priorities?)*

No

# Impact

## Summary of the impact

*(Briefly describe the specific impact in simple, clear English. This will enable the general community to understand the impact of the research.)*

UTS researchers developed a pioneering design methodology to reconceptualise and find innovative solutions to complex problems associated with crime and its prevention. Research impact included: adoption of the methodology by public sector agencies in Australia and overseas; policy and strategic interventions to improve public safety in popular night-time entertainment precincts in Sydney; and the construction and implementation of a prototype Intensive Learning Centre at a prison in Kempsey (NSW) to help rehabilitate inmates and improve learning outcomes and skills.

## Beneficiaries

*(List up to 10 beneficiaries related to the impact study)*

NSW Department of Justice

Corrective Services NSW

NSW Police Force

City of Sydney Council

Citizens of and visitors to Sydney

People incarcerated in NSW prisons

## Countries in which the impact occurred

*(Search the list of countries and add as many as relate to the location of the impact)*

Australia

Netherlands

Korea, Republic of (South)

United States of America

## Details of the impact

*(Provide a narrative that clearly outlines the research impact. The narrative should explain the relationship between the associated research and the impact. It should also identify the contribution the research has made beyond academia, including:*

*- who or what has benefitted from the results of the research (this should identify relevant research end-users, or*

beneficiaries from industry, the community, government, wider public etc.)

- the nature or type of impact and how the research made a social, economic, cultural, and/or environmental impact
- the extent of the impact (with specific references to appropriate evidence, such as cost-benefit-analysis, quantity of those affected, reported benefits etc.)
- the dates and time period in which the impact occurred.

NOTE - the narrative must describe only impact that has occurred within the reference period, and must not make aspirational claims.)

Crime is a complex social problem, and governments around the world struggle to develop strategies to understand and prevent it. The Designing Out Crime Research Centre (DOC) at UTS, a partnership with the NSW Department of Justice, researches complex and often intractable crime and associated social problems. Between 2006-16, researchers developed an innovative methodology – ‘frame creation’ – to research, recontextualise and reconceptualise these problems so as to develop novel solutions to them. The methodology has been applied, for example, to improve victim services, avert terrorism at railway stations, and counteract sexual violence in subways, and has been adopted by public sector agencies in Australia, the USA, Holland and Korea. This case study uses two examples to illustrate the spectrum of the methodology’s impact, from the design of interventions to improve public safety in Sydney’s entertainment precincts at night, to the design of a prison learning centre to improve inmates’ employability skills and qualifications.

#### RE-IMAGINING NIGHT-TIME SYDNEY

From 2009-14, DOC partnered with the City of Sydney Council to research factors contributing to crime and antisocial behaviour in the city’s night-spots. The context was Kings Cross. This small, densely populated suburb is the city’s most popular entertainment precinct, with 30,000-strong crowds on weekends. At the time, it was also a major crime hotspot, with high levels of alcohol consumption and anti-social behaviour including assault occurring on Friday and Saturday nights. Efforts to address these problems had previously focused on introducing stricter conditions for businesses and a greater police presence, provoking a public outcry.

Through an intensive research process using its frame creation methodology (see Associated Research), DOC reconceptualised the precinct as a ‘music festival’ and proposed introducing the kind of event-management infrastructure used to manage large, festival-like crowds. This included Precinct Ambassadors, a first aid tent, free water, more (portable) public toilets, night-rider buses and managed taxi ranks, light projections to encourage people away from congested areas, and a smartphone app to provide real-time information on transport, food options, club queues and so on.

DOC’s reframing of the Kings Cross problem was foundational to the Council’s plans to improve the ambience, safety and economy of night-time Sydney more broadly through their OPEN Sydney Strategy and Action Plan 2013-30, and led to its establishing an internal think-tank that uses the frame creation methodology. Suzie Matthews (Manager Late Night Economy, City of Sydney) encapsulated the Council’s adoption of this new approach in her presentation ‘Rethinking alcohol in the night time economy’ (2012): ‘Before – We asked how do we fix alcohol-related violence? Now – We ask how can we transform our city at night?’

In busy entertainment districts across Sydney the Council introduced initiatives first proposed from the Kings Cross research. In Feb 2014 the NSW Government introduced lock-out laws, but the Council continued to put in place many of DOC’s proposals. For example, the Safe Space and Take Kare Ambassador program was introduced in Dec 2014 at Town Hall, Kings Cross and Darling Harbour.

#### IMPROVING LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR PRISON INMATES

DOC partnered with Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) in 2012 to research factors contributing to low educational engagement and attainment amongst prisoners. Quality education is fundamental to supporting inmates’ re-integration into society and reducing the risk of re-offending. However, existing educational facilities in prisons were found to conform to the outdated model of upfront teacher instruction, often in small classrooms with out-of-date resources. These facilities failed to engage inmates or cater to their learning needs. The outcome of the research was the design and construction of an Intensive Learning Centre (ILC) for prison inmates at the Mid-North Coast Correctional Centre at Kempsey, NSW. Working closely with inmates, teachers, prison management and CSNSW senior managers, DOC reframed the enclosed prison classroom model as an open-plan, collaborative, technology-enabled and therapeutic learning environment. The plan also included landscaped gardens and outdoor learning spaces, including a yarning circle to support Aboriginal learning.

The buildings were designed as pre-fabricated modules so they could be constructed at St Heliers Correctional Centre by Aboriginal inmates engaged in the Gundi employment pathway program. Furniture was also designed for inmate manufacture. According to Dr Anne Marie Martin (Assistant Commissioner, Offender Management & Programs, CSNSW), prior to this ILC project ‘there were no buildings within correctional centres designed with

recognition of the learning needs of inmates, nor were they built by inmates'.

The ILC opened in Apr 2014, and the first cohort of 13 learners graduated with certificate qualifications later that year. A formal post-occupancy evaluation undertaken in 2015 found that 72% of inmate learners agreed "In comparison to other places where I have attended education, the design of this ILC makes it easier for me to learn in class". One inmate said: "Well this place is improving my life heaps and it makes me feel like I'm...at TAFE". Further, 80% of teachers agreed "the ILC makes them more effective teachers" and "the ILC makes engaging with inmates easier". As one teacher explained: "Teaching out there [in the prison wing] you'd get 3 or 4 certificate completions per semester, in here we got 7 or 8 (per class of 10 students)"

CSNSW determined to use the highly collaborative and inclusive nature of the design process as a benchmark for future projects, and nominated the ILC for an International Corrections and Prisons Association Award. The ILC was also rated 'exemplary' by the OECD Centre for Effective Learning Environments.

## Associated research

*(Briefly describe the research that led to the impact presented for the UoA. The research must meet the definition of research in Section 1.9 of the EI 2018 Submission Guidelines. The description should include details of:*

- *what was researched*
- *when the research occurred*
- *who conducted the research and what is the association with the institution)*

The research was undertaken by UTS academics between 2006-2016. Foundational research was initially conducted by Dorst into how designers solve complex problems. This research initiated a new methodology called 'frame creation'. This is an iterative process for re-examining and reconceptualising a complex problem by considering it from novel perspectives and broadening the context in which it is understood, thereby 'reframing' it to point towards innovative solutions.

DOC researchers applied this methodology to complex criminological problems, creating a new transdisciplinary approach in the process. This brought together the criminologist's knowledge of elements in environments, buildings and products that can attract crime or deter it, with the designer's expertise in creating and adapting physical, environmental and programmatic elements for new designed solutions.

Key to the frame creation methodology is its testing and refinement through the applied research projects undertaken by DOC researchers. As founding director of DOC, Dorst was part of collaborations between researchers including Camacho Duarte, Kaldor, Klippan, Lulham, Tomkin and Watson from DOC's establishment in 2008 through to 2016. These researchers also published these refinements to the methodology with reference to DOC research (see references below). This iterative process of application and refinement is central to the frame creation methodology itself.

## FoR of associated research

*(Up to three two-digit FoRs that best describe the associated research)*

12 - Built Environment and Design

## References (up to 10 references, 350 characters per reference)

*(This section should include a list of up to 10 of the most relevant research outputs associated with the impact)*

1.Dorst, K. (2006). 'Design problems and design paradoxes'. Design Issues, 22(3), 4-17. DOI: 10.1162/desi.2006.22.3.4

2.Dorst, K. (2008). 'Design research: a revolution-waiting-to-happen'. Design Studies, 29(1), 4-11. DOI: 10.1016/j.destud.2007.12.001

3.Dorst, K. (2011). 'The core of "design thinking" and its application'. Design Studies, 32(6), 521-532. DOI: 10.1016/j.destud.2011.07.006

4.Camacho Duarte, O., Lulham, R., and Kaldor, L. (2011). 'Co-designing out crime', CoDesign, 7(3-4), 155-168 DOI: 10.1080/15710882.2011.630476

5.Dorst, K., and Tomkin, D. (2011). 'Themes as bridges between problem and solution'. in Proceedings of the 4th World Conference on Design Research, IASDR 2011, n.p

6.Tomkin, D. and Watson, R. (2013). 'A new visual aid for designing'. Proceedings of the 5th International Congress of the International Association of Societies of Design Research, IASDR 2013, 3558-3567.

7.Camacho Duarte, O. (2013), 'Can design support community safety and crime prevention programmes in areas of socio-economic disadvantage?', Crime Prevention and Community Safety, 15(3), 223-239 DOI: 10.1057/cpcs.2013.3

8.Dorst, K. (2015). Frame Innovation: Create new thinking by design. MIT Press.

9.Lulham, R., Tomkin, D., Grant, L., and Jewkes, Y. (2016). 'The risk of "a cold conservatism" in correctional facility design: the case for design innovation'. Advancing Corrections, 1(1), 1-12.

10.Dorst, K., Kaldor, L., Klippan, L., Watson, R. (2016). Designing for the Common Good. BIS Publishers.

## Additional impact indicator information

### Additional impact indicator information

*(Provide information about any indicators not captured above that are relevant to the impact study, for example return on investment, jobs created, improvements in quality of life years (QALYs). Additional indicators should be quantitative in nature and include:*

- name of indicator (100 characters)*
- data for indicator (200 characters)*
- brief description of indicator and how it is calculated (300 characters).)*