

Wednesday, 16 June 2010

Department of Corrective Services

Question No. A1: Hon Kate Doust asked –

(A1) Where do we find those parameter changes? To include details of the other small changes which is less than \$1 million.

Answer:

The increase in appropriation from the 2010/11 budget figure to the 2010/11 estimated actual figure is \$9.723 million. A number of items were detailed in the "Major Spending Changes" table of the budget papers however this table also includes components from other funding sources, such as Royalties for Regions or administered funds rather than appropriations.

Those components or portions of those components that are specifically appropriation related are as follows:

- Composite Allowance provisions - \$2.386 million
- Enhanced District Allowances - \$0.906 million
- Salary and Superannuation Increases - \$2.561 million
- Acacia Contract Wages Parity and Maintenance Escalation - \$3.200 million
- Transfer of Capital to Recurrent – Records Compliance Project - \$0.300 million
- Transfer of Capital to recurrent – Replacement Office Equipment - \$0.350 million
- Adjustment for part year impact of Voluntary Severance Savings (full saving harvest included in Salary and Superannuation figure above) - \$0.019 million and
- Salaries and Allowance Tribunal Pay increase - \$0.001 million.

Question No. A2: Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich asked –

(A2) Staffing numbers in each custodial facility for transport and G4S staffing? To include the actual numbers over the last 12 months, the approved staffing levels and how many were actually there?

Answer: See attached document. (Attachment 1)

(A3) Was there an investigation by the Department into any issues raised with the Department by Mr Geoff Barclay in relation to the Geraldton facility and the operations at the Geraldton facility?

Answer:

Mr Barkla has never made a complaint directly to the Department of Corrective Services regarding matters concerning G4S Custodial Services at Geraldton.

The Department understands that Mr Barkla had made complaints to WorkSafe about alleged unsafe work conditions and that Worksafe investigated the matter and dismissed the claim.

The Department also understands that Mr Barkla contacted the Minister for Corrective Services regarding alleged unsafe working conditions on several occasions.

The Department of Corrective Services contacted Worksafe which confirmed it had undertaken an investigation and shared its findings. Given the outcome of the WorkSafe investigation, the Department chose not to investigate the matter further and Mr Barkla was advised by the Minister's Office of the need to refer the matter back to WorkSafe if he did not agree with that outcome.

Mr Barkla made an application to Fair Work Australia ([2011] FWA967) in October 2010 alleging he had been unfairly dismissed by G4S Custodial Services. Mr Barkla claimed he was abused and humiliated by other employees and forced to take stress leave as G4S had not taken appropriate action. Fair Work Australia dismissed Mr Barkla's claim on 21 February 2011.

(A4) Can the committee be provided with an overview of those 12 cases where G4S Custodial Services failed to report and the three breaches of legislation? To include access to the ongoing operational reviews (March and September) during 2010?

Answer:

Failure to Report

- Nine occasions where G4S failed to report the late delivery of a person to court which caused a delay to court proceedings.
- One occasion where G4S failed to report a situation where after the determination of the court, G4S failed to comply with a judicial direction by allowing a person to leave the court without signing bail documents.
- One occasion where G4S failed to report a complaint they had received from Judge Fenbury in relation to the late delivery of a person in custody to the court.
- One occasion where G4S failed to report that an Officer had misplaced their Permit to provide High Level Security Work.

Breaches of Legislation

- One occasion where a G4S Officer diverted from a planned route to stop at their house and G4S failed to advise of any disciplinary action taken against the Officer. CSCS Act section 55 (2)(b).
- One occasion whilst transporting a prisoner from Newman to Roebourne, where G4S failed to provide a duty of care by not carrying a usable toilet on board the vehicle. Further, when stopping at a roadhouse to permit the person in custody to use a public toilet the officers failed to restrain the prisoner and as a result the prisoner attempted to escape. Failure to provide duty of care CSCS Act Section

16(2), Failure to follow CEO Direction CSCS Act section 22(3)(b) and CSCS Act Schedule 2 Clause 12 (2)(c).

- One occasion where G4S Custodial Services released a person in custody to freedom when that person had a Warrant of Commitment requiring that G4S take that person to prison. CSCS Act section 27 (1).

See the Schedule of Reviews and Operational Reviews for Geraldton attached. (Attachments 2, 3, 4)

Question No. A5: The Chair asked –

(A5) Can the Department notify the committee when the contract for the Court Security and Custodial Services became available and was tabled?

Answer:

The Contract for the Court Security and Custodial Services was tabled in Parliament on 22 June 2011.

Question No. A6: Hon Liz Behjat asked –

(A6) Recidivism rates for prisoners accessing external activities particularly the Prisoner Employment Program. To include statistics for the last two years?

Answer:

OFFSITE EMP PEP	108	Females:	20	Indigenous:	15
		Males:	88	Non-indigenous:	93
Free	96	Females:	19	Indigenous:	13
		Males:	77	Non-indigenous:	83
Reimprisoned	12	Females:	1	Indigenous:	2
		Males:	11	Non-indigenous:	10

Reimprisonment rate for OFFSITE EMP PEP assistance: 11%

Of the 108 placed into employment after release 12 have returned to prison. This equates to an 11% reimprisonment rate.

- Statistics for the last two years.

PEP Stats	2009/2010	2010/2011
Applications	277	344
Approvals	92	201
Paid Employment	27	47

Work Experience	19	21
Seeking Employment	40	114
Education & Training	6	19

Question No. A7: The Chair asked –

(A7) In regards to Aboriginal offending, what has been the trend and what continues to be the trend in terms of recidivism? Is there any difference between five years ago, what it is projected to be in five years and what it is now?

Answer:

Whilst the Department of Corrective Services does not have access to data relating to all offending (Police and Courts), it does however analyse rates of return to prison and community corrections.

The table below outlines the trend and the overall decrease in Aboriginal rates of return over the past 5 years:

Reporting Period	Rate of Return to Prison (%)	Rate of Return to Corrections (%)
2005/06	56.92	66.15
2006/07	51.28	61.37
2007/08	51.66	60.66
2008/09	51.1	63.31
2009/10	49.43	64.3
2010/11 (to 31 May 2011)	43.13	58.65

The Department does not forecast recidivism rates.

(A8) Percentages of increased service provision (ie. programs)? What percentages of people leave the prison system without having completed the programs? (to include a comparison from the last couple of years and where is it at now?)

Answer:

The following information highlights the percentages of increased service provision. There are a number of reasons as to why an offender may not complete a treatment program. Sometimes there is insufficient time for offenders to complete a treatment program prior to their release, especially if the prisoner's sentence is short and the program is longer than their time in custody.

For example, an Intensive Sex Offender Program can take up to 10 months to run. Also, an offender may deny their offence and be ineligible to participate, they may refuse to participate in a program for a variety of reasons, be removed from a program as their behaviour is disruptive to the group or have a mental health problem or intellectual disability that excludes them. In the community, there are other complicating factors such as lifestyle issues (homelessness or chaotic lifestyle) that impact on a person's capacity to complete programs.

Prison Program Delivery

- The Department increased prison program delivery by 68% during 2009/10. The total number of offenders participating in prison programs increased from 1237 in 2008/09 to 2083 for 2009/10 (68%).
- Program activity increased in 2008/09 by 45% and during 2009/10 by 68% and continued growth albeit less significant is expected, in 2010/11.
- The total number of Aboriginal offenders participating in Aboriginal programs increased from 652 in 2008/09 to 935 in 2009/10 – an increase of 43%.
- The total number of female offenders participating in programs increased from 116 in 2008/09 to 211 2009/10 – an increase of 81%.

Community Program Delivery

- The total number of offenders who participated in community programs delivered by the Department and external agencies increased to 730 in 2009/10. This includes participants in externally delivered Domestic Violence (DV) programs.
- The number of offenders that participated in community programs that were delivered by the Department increased by 56% - 205 in 2008/09 to 321 in 2009/10.
- 409 offenders participated in programs delivered by external agencies under contract for the provision of family and domestic violence (DV) perpetrator programs.
- Referrals to community programs from Adult Community Corrections increased by 33% - 1268 in 2008/09 to 1693 in 2009/10.
- Community Programs provided treatment to 43% (730 program places) of the referrals from Adult Community Corrections.
- During 2009/10 125 Aboriginal offenders participated in a community program compared to 58 in 2008/09. This is an increase of 115%.

- Aboriginal program completions increased by 140% (20 in 2008/09 to 48 in 2009/10) from figures achieved in 2008/09, although only by 41% from figures achieved in 2007/08 (34 completions).
- In 2009/10 730 program places were offered in the community to adult offenders.
- Overall 359 (49%) offenders who were enrolled in a Community Program during 2009/10 completed the program.

The attached table highlights the percentages of people leave the prison system without having completed the programs and comparisons. (Attachment 5)

Question No. A9: Hon Alison Xamon asked –

(A9) A breakdown of every prison, including juvenile facilities, of exactly what FTE's are available in relation to psychiatric support, mental health nurses, counsellors and any other mental health professionals and what they may be, for the coming year? To include 2010/11 and 2011/12.

Answer:

CO-MORBIDITY SERVICES STAFF ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION AT PUBLIC PRISONS 2010/2011

Total of 28.5 full time equivalent (fte) Co-morbidity staff offer a range of interventions to patients experiencing mental health problems, including those with alcohol and drug problems at state prisons. The staffing includes:

Central Management:

- 1 fte Manager Co-Morbidity.
- 1 fte Co-Morbidity Services Coordinator.

Administrative support:

- 0.8 fte Administrative Assistant.

Medical Officers:¹

- 1.2 fte Psychiatrists.
- 2 fte Senior Medical Officers (Psychiatry).
- 0.8 fte Senior Medical Officer (Addictions).
- Service Level Agreement with North West Mental Health Service to provide in-reach service to Broome Regional Prison.
- Fee per service agreement with private psychiatrist at Bunbury to provide in-reach service to the prison. (1 session per fortnight).

¹ Note: Specialist Medical Officers offer regular clinics at all metropolitan prisons and a fly in – fly out service to regional prisons as required

- Contract with Child Psychiatrist to provide in-reach service to the Juvenile Detention Centres (1 session per week).

Co-morbidity Clinicians

Regional Prisons

Prison	Staffing
Broome Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Roebourne Regional Prison	0.64 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Greenough Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison	No dedicated position, Service covered by Nurse Manager, who is Mental Health Trained
Bunbury Regional Prison	0.5 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Albany Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity

Metropolitan Prisons²

Hakea Prison ³	1 fte Clinical Consultant Co-morbidity 7 Fte Co-morbidity Clinicians
Casuarina Prison, also provides services to Karnet Prison	1 fte Clinical Consultant Co-morbidity 3.5 Fte Co-morbidity Clinicians
Bandyup, also provides services to Wooroloo and Boronia Prisons	1 fte Clinical Consultant Co-morbidity 4 Fte Co-morbidity Clinicians

CO-MORBIDITY SERVICES STAFF ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION AT PUBLIC PRISONS 2011/2012

Total of 28.5 full time equivalent Co-morbidity staff offer a range of interventions to patients experiencing mental health problems, including those with alcohol and drug problems at state prisons. The staffing includes:

Central Management:

- 1 fte Manager Co Morbidity.
- 1 fte Co-Morbidity Services Coordinator.

Administrative support:

- 0.8 fte Administrative Assistant.

Medical Officers:⁴

- 1.2 fte Psychiatrists.
- 2 fte Senior Medical Officers (Psychiatry).

² Note: Staff resource allocation to individual metropolitan prisons is based on identified need and hence allocation to individual prisons as reflected above may vary at times.

³ Two of the Co-morbidity clinicians based at Hakea provide group based education programmes to all metro sites except juvenile prisons.

⁴ Note: Specialist Medical Officers offer regular clinics at all metropolitan prisons and a fly in – fly out service to regional prisons as required

- 0.8 fte Senior Medical Officer (Addictions).
- Service Level Agreement with North West Mental Health Service to provide in-reach service to Broome Regional Prison.
- Fee per service agreement with private psychiatrist at Bunbury to provide in-reach service to the prison. (1 session per fortnight).
- Contract with Child Psychiatrist to provide in-reach service to the Juvenile Detention Centres (1 session per week).

Co-morbidity Clinicians

Regional Prisons

Prison	Staffing
Broome Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Roebourne Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Greenough Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison	0.6 fte Clinical Manager (co-morbidity portfolio holder)
Bunbury Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity
Albany Regional Prison	1 fte Clinical Specialist Co-morbidity

Metropolitan Prisons⁵

Hakea Prison ⁶	1 fte Clinical Consultant Co-morbidity 6.6 Fte Co-morbidity Clinicians
Casuarina Prison, also provides services to Karnet Prison	1 fte Clinical Consultant Co-morbidity 3.4 Fte Co-morbidity Clinicians
Bandyup, also provides services to Wooroloo and Boronia Prisons	1 fte Clinical Consultant Co-morbidity 2.4 Fte Co-morbidity Clinicians

(A10) Has any money been put aside in this budget to continue with the pilot program for inside parenting?

Answer:

No, the initial funding was for \$500,000 from Federal Government over a three year period commencing in 2007. Uniting Care West was the lead agency in this venture. The funding provided for research and development of two pilot programs at Acacia Prison. At the end of the pilot period "Inside Parents" was judged to be the most effective based on the evaluation from Edith Cowan University. There then followed a period of program delivery by Serco at Acacia Prison. Continuation of the program has not been funded by State Government.

⁵ Note: Staff resource allocation to individual metropolitan prisons is based on identified need and hence allocation to individual prisons as reflected above may vary at times.

⁶ Two of the Co-morbidity clinicians based at Hakea provide group based education programmes to all metro sites except juvenile prisons.

(A11) Page 799 of the Budget statements under the heading of “Youth Justice Services” cost per day of keeping a juvenile in detention. Estimated actual is \$599, estimated that it was meant to be \$641. The budget target for the coming year is \$645. Why was it so much lower?

Answer:

The estimated actual cost of \$599 per day for the detention of a juvenile has decreased from the original budget forecast due to the substantial increase in total juvenile detainees. Accordingly overhead and fixed costs have been distributed over a larger number of detainees thereby reducing the cost per day.

The increase in target cost in 2011/12 is mainly due to a lower offender population forecast for the coming year and increases in staffing costs.

Question No. A12: Hon Ken Travers asked –

(A12) In regards to electricity and water costs, how much have they gone up by in the last financial year compared to the previous financial year? Have you been compensated for that within your budget?

Answer:

Electricity and Water charges have risen from \$6.3 million in 2009/10 to an estimated \$7.2 million in 2010/11, an increase of 15.7%. Cost escalation funding, based on CPI, is provided by government to meet increasing costs of goods and services.

Question A2 – Attachment 1

STAFFING ACROSS FACILITIES 2010-11

	Approved Jul-10	2010/2011 Average
Albany	184	188
Bandyup	155	168
Boronia	45	40
Broome	83	83
Bunbury	176	175
Casuarina	361	374
EGRP	76	78
Greenough	164	155
Hakea	405	437
Karnet	124	129
Pardelup	43	44
Roebourne	92	89
Wooroloo	152	143
ESG	84	63
Gate	32	29
DDU	15	14
Total	2191	2209

Facility includes relevant work camps

The approved staffing is based on the forecast DAP at the start of the financial year 2010-11.

The staffing includes all staff employed by adult custodial, both PSA and POA.

ESG was maintained at lower levels due to structuring considerations.

	Approved Jul-10	2010/2011 Average
Banksia Hill	130	140
Rangeview	111	114
Total	241	254

Question A2 – Attachment 1

G4S STAFFING BY LOCATION

Location	Agreed Staffing	April 2010	October 2010	January 2011	April 2011
Armadale Court	9	9	8	9	8
Perth Children's Court	8	6	6	6	7
Fremantle Court	11	10	10	10	9
Joondalup Court	11	9	9	8	11
Midland Court	10	8	9	7	9
Rockingham Court	9	8	8	8	5
Supreme Court Security	10	12	12	9	9
Supreme Court Custody	7	7	7	7	6
State Administration Tribunal	4	4	4	4	4
Mandurah Court	7	8	8	7	5
Royal Perth Hospital	6	5	6	7	6
Albany Court	13	11	11	11	10
Broome Court	15	11	12	10	11
Bunbury Court	16	14	16	13	14
Carnarvon Court	7	7	7	5	5
Geraldton Court	12	4	9	5	5
Kalgoorlie Court	15	10	7	10	10
Kununurra Court	5	1	2	3	2
Roebourne Court	5	0	0	0	0
Sth Hedland Court	4	1	1	2	2
Pool *	70	113	114	91	105
Transport Operations	49	42	35	41	40
Total	303	300	301	273	283

*The agreed pool staffing was for the purpose of unexpected demand in transport related to funeral escorts, medicals and hospital escorts and was predominately made up of part time and casual staff. In September 2009, G4S commenced employing permanent full time staff to the pool and utilised the excess numbers to fill vacancies in regional areas on a 2 week fly in basis.

OPERATIONAL REVIEW

**G4S OPERATIONS AT
Geraldton Court House.
15th to 17th March 2010.**

Geraldton Court House.

REVIEW OF SERVICES PROVIDED BY G4S CUSTODIAL SERVICES (G4S) AT THE GERALDTON COURT

15TH - 17TH MARCH 2010.

CONTEXT

Court Security & Custodial Services (CS&CS) Contract Monitor John Wadkins attended the G4S Geraldton Court site from Monday the 15th March 2010 to Wednesday 17th March 2010, to undertake compliance and audit checks against services provided by G4S Custodial Services in accordance with the CS&CS Contract.

Reviews and compliance testing was conducted on the following services:

- Prison-Court-Prison transfers, including the loading and unloading of prisoners;
- Vehicle Standards;
- Medical Escorts;
- Court Services;

Consultation was also conducted with the following stakeholders;

- Acting Registrar, Geraldton Court;
- Geraldton Court staff;
- Western Australian Police;
- G4S staff;
- Greenough Regional Prison staff;

METHODOLOGY

The audit and compliance check involved the observation of the Contractor performing the functions, noting procedural issues against a checklist and interviews with key stakeholders and participants.

OVERVIEW OF SITE

Accommodation is in the Court Custody Office in the Police Lockup in the Geraldton Court building. The courthouse comprises of three courtrooms, a court custody/Police Lockup area, Control office and general administration. G4S Staff are responsible for staffing the custody suite on scheduled court sitting days Monday to Friday each week.

They are also required to perform transfers of all Persons In Custody (PIC) from Greenough Prison for Court appearances, medical appointments and Interprison transfers.

The staff at the Geraldton site is also responsible for custodial transfers from Carnarvon and Meekatharra Police Stations to Greenough Prison as a result of Magistrate Courts held at those locations.

Observation:

At the time of monitoring the staff was also servicing the court on Saturdays for the Justice of the Peace courts for a total of sixteen hours.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The evidence gathered from stakeholders, compliance tests and general observations indicate that the services being provided do not fully meet stakeholder needs, (see below).

Observation:

Greenough Regional Prison staff felt that the service provided for Hospital Sits was insufficient due to lack of G4S staff and transport availability.

The Geraldton site currently has only one vehicle at its disposal, therefore they cannot meet the demands that are placed upon them to do transfers from Greenough Regional Prison for court appearances, medical appointments, hospital sits and lock up clearances from Meekatharra and Carnarvon if they are required on the same day. The site requires a second vehicle to facilitate the operational requirements, also as back up for the present vehicle in case of failure or service requirements.

Recommendation 1:

A second vehicle should be sourced for this site as a matter of priority.

Another area of concern is the custodial area which is managed by WAPS. Court Custody does not have any cells allocated, therefore a transfer procedure has to be undertaken every time a PIC is moved from the WAPS-controlled Lockup cells to G4S custody, for court appearances, lawyer interviews etc.

There are three cells adjacent to the custody centre office that could be proscribed as a Court Custody Suite for the exclusive use of the Contractor.

Recommendation 2:

The three Police Lockup cells adjacent to the Custody Office should be proscribed as a Court Custody Centre.

COMPLIANCE OUTCOMES**Unloading and searching**

Searches of persons in custody (PIC), being unloaded from vehicles at the Geraldton site was observed. PIC's from GRP were unloaded individually from the vehicle in the secure sally port. The transport vehicle was identified prior to entry to the sally port. The identity of the PIC was established by G4S staff in the sally port where they were both pat searched and wanded prior to being taken through to the custody suite and secured in a WAPs holding cell. The searches observed were found to be against policy and procedure in certain cases (see below). However all searches were conducted in line with requirements for the correct gender requirements.

Observation:

The G4S staff searching was thorough as shown in the evidence supplied of a weapon found on a transferred PIC from WAPS to G4S.

However one search of a male PIC from GRP was done without removal of socks and the frontal wand was done in an inappropriate manner, which placed the G4S officer at risk.

Recommendation 3:

Staff requires further training in the methodology of searching and wand use to ensure that they do not place themselves at risk during the search, and to ensure compliance with policy and procedure.

“G4S Policy document 2.135 Searches – Persons in Custody, 2.2 Conduct the Pat Search, 3.2.2 clearly states that the “removing and examining of footwear and socks” must take place.”

Permits:

The permits of all G4S Custodial Officers were checked. The Permits double as identification cards for the officers with co-badging between the contractor and the State. All were observed to be up to date and were displayed as required by G4S staff.

Resources:

The current supervisor, Geoff Barkla, is employed in an acting role due to the recent transfer of the previous supervisor, there are a further eleven staff employed on a permanent part time basis. Five of those staff members were on secondment from Perth, the other six live in Geraldton.

Recommendation 4:

A permanent supervisor should be appointed as soon as practicable and every effort made to fill other staff vacancies locally.

There is an interview room and three holding cells; two are located at the top of the stairs to the rear of the courtroom to accommodate PIC prior to being escorted into the dock. The third holding cell is located to the rear of the third court room on the ground floor. All holding cells are air conditioned and were observed to be in a clean and tidy state.

The custody suite has the CCTV monitoring service, which comprises of four images. These images are, two of the sally port area, and two images of the WAPS controlled cell No 3.

There are a total of eight duress alarm points in the custodial centre and sally port. There are two duress alarms in the sally port and six other duress alarm points in the corridor from the cells to the access door to the stairwell to courts one and two. Regular testing is conducted and documented accordingly. There is a strip search room located within the WAPS cell area.

The Geraldton Court sally port is fit for purpose to accommodate the present fleet of transport vehicles from G4S, Greenough Prison and WAPs. A security wall encompasses the rear perimeter with an electrical security gate, monitored and controlled by the WAPs.

Observation:

There are no duress alarms in the stairwell, which gives access to courts one and two.

Equipment:

An inspection of restraint equipment was conducted. All appeared to be in an acceptable condition.

An inspection of two way radios was conducted. There were eight radios present which is insufficient to meet requirements in accordance with approved staffing levels. There is also a shortage of earpieces for use within the site.

Staff conducted radio checks at the time of signing out allocated radios for the day. All appeared to be in good functioning order.

The First Aid cabinet and hospital sit bag were present in the custody control room. Both were inspected and found to be appropriately equipped.

Recommendation 5:

The staff at the Geraldton site requires more radios and earpieces to perform their duties.

Documentation:

Documentation including the occurrence log, key and equipment Register, search register, vehicle and security equipment registers, restraints register, first aid register, tasking sheets, and warrants and movement authority were checked and all found to be uniform and to have been maintained to a high standard. It was noted that all warrants, authorisations and property were correctly identified by G4S staff on receipt, and where applicable, on the release of PIC from G4S custody.

Training:

All staff stated they were kept up to date with changes to procedures and held current Senior First Aid, CPR and restraint training certificates. It was apparent through observation that staff, were familiar with policy. A high standard of professionalism was maintained at all times.

The staff worked well whether under direct supervision or individually.

Stakeholder Issues:

The various stakeholders of the Geraldton Court stated that they were satisfied with the service provided by G4S. The acting registrar stated that he had no issues what so ever with the G4S staff on site. The Magistrate stated that the staff on site performed their functions well. The G4S staff were polite and visible. WAPS stated that they had a good rapport with G4S staff.

Transport:

The Geraldton site has one vehicle available, L3 - 1QBM 396, the vehicle was found to be in very good condition both externally and internally.

The vehicle is used for transport of PIC's both to and from GRP for court appearances, medicals and funerals.

The vehicle is also required to do WAPS clearances due to Magistrate courts at Meekatharra and Carnarvon.

Observation:

The site requires another vehicle (see Recommendation 1) to enable staff to fulfil the requirements of the site.

At the time of monitoring there were several demands made for transport which could not be met due to the availability of only one vehicle. A second vehicle would also ensure that the site could function should the L3 vehicle become unserviceable.

It was also noted that G4S were sending a vehicle from Perth to meet the Corrective Services Air Wing (CSAW) flight at Geraldton airport to do the PIC transfer from the airport to GRP. This would not be required with the placement of a second vehicle.

Also due to the medical and court appearance requirement from GRP a PIC from Carnarvon who had been in WAPS custody since his court appearance in Carnarvon on 15th March 2010 was flown to Geraldton by Shine Aviation on 17th March 2010, as the vehicle was unavailable.

COURT OPERATIONS:

Overall observations by the attending reviewer deemed the Geraldton site to be a professional and well run operation. PIC were received and processed into the custody suite in an efficient and effective manner. A good rapport with Western Australian Police was observed.

Court Orderlies conducted their duties in a professional manner, court room order and security was maintained throughout all court sessions observed.

Dock Guards were observed to maintain security and surveillance of PIC at all times. Staffing was seen to be appropriate and PIC's were presented in the dock in a timely manner.

Perimeter security was observed to be conducted in a professional manner. A regular and vigilant security presence was noted both externally and in all internal public areas. Order was maintained. Searching of corridors, waiting areas, interview rooms and toilets were observed. The provision of assistance to the public was provided as required.

Court Custody Officers were observed by the attending reviewer to adhere to procedural requirements whilst conducting their duties. Upon receipt of PIC, a custody booklet was initiated and subsequent risk assessment conducted. Any personal property was checked and securely stored until the time of release or transfer. Security of the custodial centre was maintained and all movement of PIC was conducted in accordance with policy and procedure. Custody staff displayed a duty of care toward PIC whilst supervising and managing their time in custody.

When a PIC had been assigned to prison, the said prison was contacted by both phone and email, and given the full details concerning the transfer from Geraldton court house to the prison in good time, with an estimated time of arrival.

Evacuation procedures and exits were displayed in a prominent location for the viewing of the public.

Custody evacuation procedures were located in the custody control room in a prominent location for the viewing of staff, which the supervisor and staff advised the reviewer they were aware of.

On questioning the staff could all correctly identify the assembly point designated.

SUMMARY

Operations at the Geraldton site run efficiently and the staff has good awareness of their powers and accountability. The acting supervisor was observed to obtain a sound knowledge of policy and procedure which has been imparted and was seen to be adhered to by staff. From all accounts a good rapport has been developed between the acting supervisor with both G4S staff and stakeholders. The staff members worked well both under supervision and individually.

In order to remove some of the misconceptions between the service required by GRP and the service delivered by G4S, the reviewer initiated a meeting between the reception staff at GRP and the acting supervisor at G4S.

The meeting has already taken place and a greater understanding of each others roles, and concerns, have now been relayed and understood by both parties.

The site would also work more effectively if the three cells adjacent to the custody centre control room / office could be proscribed to G4S use. This would eliminate the lengthy procedure that is in place of the temporary transfers to and from WAPS to G4S, and vice versa, each time a PIC is required by court or lawyers or returned to custody.

Observation:

On a medical visit to the St John of God Hospital Geraldton, it was noted by the reviewer that the PIC was allowed to wear jewellery items and sunglasses prior to the appointment, the PIC was strip searched by a GRP officer and assisted by a G4S officer, these items were removed from the PIC during the appointment by the G4S staff attending. The G4S staff member apologised for the oversight.

It was also noted that the PIC was not wanded or pat searched prior to placement in vehicle for return to GRP (See Recommendation 3).

RECOMMENDATION	ACTION	DUE BY	COMPLETED
<i>1: A second vehicle is required by the site to fulfil its contractual obligations.</i>			
<i>2. Proscribing of the three cells adjacent to the custody centre control room to Court Custody Centre under G4S control.</i>			
<i>3 Staff awareness of their contractual requirements regarding searches to be reviewed</i>			
<i>4 Additional two way radios and earpieces as required on site asap</i>			
<i>5: Requirement for a full time supervisor on site.and additional local staff instead of secondments from Perth</i>			
<i>∴</i>			

SCHEDULE OF REGIONAL OPERATIONAL REVIEWS 2010												
	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
ALBANY												
BROOME												
BUNBURY												
CARNARVON												
GERALDTON												
KALGOORLIE												
KUNUNURRA												
ROEBOURNE												
SOUTH HEDLAND												

TO BE REVIEWED
COMPLETED
REVIEW FOLLOWUP
POSTPONED DUE TO BUDGET CONSTRAINTS
RE-SCHEDULED

SCHEDULE OF PROCESS AUDITS 2010																								
	JAN			FEB			MAR			APR			MAY			JUN			JUL			AUG		
ARMADALE CRT																								
FREMANTLE CRT																								
JOONDALUP CRT																								
MANDURAH CRT																								
MIDLAND CRT																								
PCC																								
ROCKINGHAM CRT																								
Supreme Court																								

TO BE REVIEWED
COMPLETED
FOLLOW UP

The above schedules are accurate as of 3 December 2010.

Question A8 - Attachment

All Offenders Released from Prison – assessed as suitable for program participation and were willing & able to participate						
Program Category	2008/09		2009/10		2010/11 (end Q3 only)	
	% of prisoners with Interventions met	% of prisoners with Interventions not met	% of prisoners with Interventions met	% of prisoners with Interventions not met	% of prisoners with Interventions met	% of prisoners with Interventions not met
All categories	29%	71%	35%	65%	51%	49%
Addictions	28%	72%	43%	57%	59%	41%
Cognitive Skills	32%	68%	31%	69%	55%	45%
Sex	54%	46%	54%	46%	47%	53%
Offending Violence	19%	81%	23%	77%	34%	66%