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|  |
| --- |
| Attachment tables |
| Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this chapter by an ‘8A’ prefix (for example, table 8A.1). A full list of attachment tables is provided at the end of this chapter, and the attachment tables are available from the Review website at www.pc.gov.au/gsp. |
|  |
|  |

Corrective services aim to provide a safe, secure and humane custodial environment and an effective community corrections environment in which prisoners and offenders are effectively managed, commensurate with their needs and the risks they pose to the community. Additionally, corrective services aim to reduce the risk of re‑offending by providing services and program interventions that address the causes of offending, maximise the chances of successful reintegration into the community and encourage offenders to adopt a law-abiding way of life.

In this chapter, corrective services include prison custody, periodic detention, and a range of community corrections orders and programs for adult offenders (for example, parole and community work orders). Both public and privately operated

correctional facilities are included; however, the scope of this chapter generally does not extend to:

1. youth justice[[1]](#footnote-1) (reported on in chapter 16, Youth justice services)
2. prisoners or alleged offenders held in forensic mental health facilities to receive psychiatric care (who are usually the responsibility of health departments)
3. prisoners held in police custody (reported on in chapter 6, Police services)

* people held in facilities such as immigration or military detention centres.

Jurisdictional data reported in this chapter provided by State and Territory governments are based on the definitions and counting rules from the National Corrections Advisory Group (unpublished) *Corrective Services Data Collection Manual 2012‑13.*

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.1 Terms relating to corrective services |
| *Prisoners* in this chapter refers to people held in full time custody under the jurisdiction of an adult corrective services agency. This includes sentenced prisoners serving a term of imprisonment and unsentenced prisoners held on remand.  *Detainees* refers to people subject to a periodic detention order, under which they are held for two consecutive days within a one-week period in a proclaimed prison or detention centre under the responsibility of corrective services.  *Offenders* refers to people serving community corrections orders, which includes bail orders if these orders are subject to supervision by community corrections officers. |
|  |
|  |

Data quality information (DQI) has been progressively introduced for all indicators in the Report. The purpose of DQI is to provide structured and consistent information about quality aspects of data used to report on performance indicators. DQI in this Report cover the seven dimensions in the ABS’ data quality framework (institutional environment, relevance, timeliness, accuracy, coherence, accessibility and interpretability) in addition to dimensions that define and describe performance

indicators in a consistent manner, and note key data gaps and issues identified by the Steering Committee. All DQI for the 2014 Report can be found at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014 and as of this year is available for all indicators.

## 8.1 Profile of corrective services

### Service overview

The operation of corrective services is significantly influenced by, and in turn influences, other components of the criminal justice system such as police services and courts. The management of prisoners and offenders serving community corrections orders is the core business of all corrective services agencies. The scope of the responsibilities of these agencies, however, varies widely. Functions administered by corrective services in one jurisdiction may be administered by a different justice sector agency in another — for example, the management of prisoners held in court cells, the supervision of juvenile offenders on community corrections orders, juvenile detention, and responsibility for the prosecution of breaches of community corrections orders, vary across jurisdictions.

### Roles and responsibilities

Corrective services are the responsibility of State and Territory governments, which may deliver services directly, purchase them through contractual arrangements, or operate a combination of both arrangements. All jurisdictions maintained Government-operated prison facilities during the reporting period. Private prisons operated in five jurisdictions (NSW, Victoria, Queensland, WA and SA) in 2012‑13. One jurisdiction (the ACT) operated periodic detention for prisoners during the reporting period. Periodic detention was abolished as a sentencing option in NSW in 2010, but a small number of detainees who have not completed the order were managed under the non-residential stage of the program during the reporting period.

### Funding

Reported recurrent expenditure on prisons and periodic detention centres, net of operating revenues and excluding payroll tax and expenditure on transport/escort services[[2]](#footnote-2), totalled $2.4 billion nationally in 2012‑13. The equivalent figure for community corrections was $0.5 billion (table 8A.6).

Recurrent expenditure relates to the annual cost of delivering corrective services excluding payroll tax. For consistency with Sector Summary reporting, the annual expenditure on corrective services presented in figure 8.1 combines prisons and community corrections net operating expenditure plus depreciation, but excludes transport/escort services, payroll tax, and capital costs of debt servicing fees and user cost of capital. Net operating expenditure on corrective services including depreciation was $3.2 billion in 2012‑13 — an increase of 0.2 per cent over the previous year (table 8A.12).

National expenditure per person in the population, based on net operating expenditure on prisons and community corrections plus depreciation, increased in real terms over the last five years, from $138 in 2008‑09 to $139 in 2012‑13 (figure 8.1).

Figure 8.1 Real net operating expenditure on prisons and community corrections plus depreciation, per head of population per year (2012‑13 dollars)a, b, c

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.1 Real net operating expenditure on prisons and community corrections plus depreciation, per head of population per year 2012 -13 dollars.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Includes operating expenditure on prisons and community corrections (net of operating revenues) and depreciation; excludes payroll tax, transport/escort services costs where reported separately from prison expenditure, debt servicing fees, and user cost of capital.b Per person cost is calculated using total population (all ages). c Data are adjusted to 2012‑13 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012‑13 = 100) (table AA.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous Reports. See chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.13; table AA.2.

### Size and scope of sector

#### Prison custody

Corrective services operated 113 custodial facilities nationally at 30 June 2013 (table 8A.2). These comprised 85 government-operated prisons, nine privately‑operated prisons, four transitional centres, one periodic detention centre, and fourteen 24‑hour court-cell complexes (holding prisoners under the responsibility of corrective services in NSW) (table 8A.2).

On average, 30 082 people per day (excluding periodic detainees) were held in Australian prisons during 2012‑13 — an increase of 3.0 per cent over the average daily number reported in the previous year (table 8A.1). In addition, on average, 68 people per day were serving periodic detention orders in NSW and the ACT in 2012‑13 — a decrease of 41.9 per cent from the 2011‑12 average, reflecting the continuing impact of the abolition of periodic detention as a sentencing option in NSW in 2010.

Excluding periodic detainees, 22.1 per cent of prisoners were held in open prisons and 77.9 per cent were held in secure facilities in 2012‑13. A daily average of 5632 prisoners (18.7 per cent of the total Australian prisoner population, excluding periodic detainees) were held in privately operated facilities during the year (table 8A.1).

Nationally, the daily average number of prisoners (excluding periodic detainees) in 2012‑13 comprised 27 821 males and 2260 females — 92.5 per cent and 7.5 per cent of the prison population respectively. The daily average number of Indigenous prisoners was 8259 — 27.5 per cent of prisoners nationally (table 8A.1).

The rate of imprisonment represents the number of prisoners (excluding periodic detainees) per 100 000 people in the corresponding adult population. The adult population refers to people at or over the minimum age at which offenders are generally sentenced as adults in each jurisdiction (17 years in Queensland and 18 years in all other jurisdictions for the reporting period).

The national (crude) imprisonment rate for all prisoners was 172.4 per 100 000 Australian adults in 2012‑13, compared to 167.4 in 2011‑12 (figure 8.2). On a gender basis, the national imprisonment rate was 323.7 per 100 000 adult males and 25.5 per 100 000 adult females in 2012‑13 (table 8A.4).

Figure 8.2 Imprisonment rates, total prisoners, five-year trendsa, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.2  Imprisonment rates, total prisoners, five-year trends.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Non-age standardised rates, based on the daily average prisoner population numbers supplied by State and Territory governments, calculated against adult population estimates. Rates as of 2011‑12 use population estimates based on the 2011 Census while those for prior years are based on estimates using the 2006 Census. **b** The ACT rate in 2008‑09 includes prisoners held in the ACT and ACT prisoners held in NSW prisons and NSW rates exclude ACT prisoners held in NSW prisons. As of 2009‑10 all ACT prisoners were held in ACT facilities.

*Source*: ABS (unpublished) *Australian Demographic Statistics*, as at December of each year, Cat. no. 3101.0; State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.5.

The national (crude) imprisonment rate per 100 000 Indigenous adults in 2012‑13 was 2391.7 compared with a corresponding rate of 125.7 for non‑Indigenous prisoners (figure 8.3).

Imprisonment rate comparisons need to be interpreted with care, especially for states and territories with relatively small Indigenous populations. This is because small changes in prisoner numbers can cause variations in rates that do not accurately represent either real trends over time or consistent differences from other jurisdictions.

Figure 8.3 Indigenous and non-Indigenous crude imprisonment rates, 2012‑13a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.3 Indigenous and non-Indigenous crude imprisonment rates, 2012- 13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Non-age standardised rates based on the daily average prisoner population numbers supplied by State and Territory governments, calculated against adult Indigenous and non-Indigenous population estimates. b Excludes prisoners whose Indigenous status was reported as unknown.

*Source*: ABS (unpublished) *Australian Demographic Statistics*, Cat. no. 3101.0; ABS (unpublished) *Experimental Estimates and Projections, Indigenous Australians* (series B), Cat. no. 3238.0; State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.4.

The Indigenous population has a younger age profile compared with the non‑Indigenous population, and that factor will contribute to higher rates when the overall (crude) imprisonment rate is compared between the Indigenous and non‑Indigenous populations. Age standardisation is a statistical method that takes into account differences in the age structures of populations, allowing a more valid comparison to be made between populations.

The national age standardised imprisonment rate per 100 000 Indigenous adults in 2012‑13 was 1861.9 compared with a corresponding rate of 155.9 for non‑Indigenous prisoners (figure 8.4). This represents a ratio of 11.9, compared with a ratio of 19.0 for the crude imprisonment rate.

Figure 8.4 Indigenous and non-Indigenous age standardised imprisonment rates, 2012‑13asubtitle

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.4  Indigenous and non-Indigenous age standardised imprisonment rates, 2012-13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Rates are based on the indirect standardisation method, applying age-group imprisonment rates derived from Prison Census data.

*Source*: ABS (unpublished) *Australian Demographic Statistics*, Cat. no. 3101.0; ABS (unpublished) *Experimental Estimates and Projections, Indigenous Australians* (series B), Cat. no. 3238.0; ABS (unpublished) *Prisoners in Australia,* Cat. no 4517.0; State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.4.

While imprisonment rates for Indigenous people, whether calculated on a crude or age standardised basis, are far higher than those for non‑Indigenous people, the majority of prisoners are non-Indigenous. Nationally, 71.5 per cent of all prisoners were non-Indigenous in 2012‑13 (table 8A.1).

Statistical information on the profile of prisoners additional to that provided in the *Report on Government Services* is available through Australian Bureau of Statistics publications. For example, *Prisoners in Australia* (Cat. no. 4517.0) provides data on the offence types and length of sentences served by prisoners in each jurisdiction and nationally.

#### Community corrections

All jurisdictions provide community corrections services. Community corrections are responsible for a range of non-custodial sanctions and also deliver post-custodial interventions, under which prisoners released into the community continue to be subject to corrective services supervision. In some jurisdictions, community corrections responsibility includes managing offenders on supervised bail orders.

All jurisdictions have reparation and supervision orders. Restricted movement orders were available in all jurisdictions except Queensland, Tasmania and the ACT in 2012‑13 but ceased to operate in Victoria during the reporting period following the abolition of home detention in January 2012. Table 8A.24 shows the range of sanctions involving corrective services that operated across jurisdictions during the reporting period.

These services vary in the extent and nature of supervision, the conditions of the order (such as a community work component or a requirement to attend an offender program) and the level of restriction placed on the offender’s freedom of movement in the community (for example, home detention). No single objective or set of characteristics is common to all jurisdictions’ community corrections services, other than that they generally provide a non-custodial sentencing alternative or a post‑custodial mechanism for reintegrating prisoners into the community under continued supervision.

Nationally, an average of 54 616 offenders per day were serving community corrections orders in 2012‑13 — a decrease of 0.7 per cent from the previous year (table 8A.3). This daily average comprised 44 874 males (82.2 per cent), 9708 females (17.8 per cent) and 33 offenders whose gender was not reported. The daily average comprised 11 044 Indigenous offenders (20.2 per cent of the total community correction population), 42 607 non‑Indigenous offenders (78.0 per cent) and 964 people whose Indigenous status was unknown (table 8A.3).

The community corrections rate represents the number of offenders serving community corrections orders per 100 000 people in the corresponding adult population. The adult population refers to people at or over the minimum age at which offenders are generally sentenced as adults in each jurisdiction (17 years in Queensland and 18 years in all other jurisdictions for the reporting period).

The national community corrections rate was 313.0 per 100 000 adults in 2012‑13 compared to 315.2 in 2011‑12 (figure 8.5).

Figure 8.5 Community corrections rates, total offenders, 5 year trendsa

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.5  Community corrections rates, total offenders, 5 year trends.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Non-age standardised rates based on the daily average offender population numbers supplied by State and Territory governments, calculated against adult population estimates. Rates as of 2011‑12 use population estimates based on the 2011 Census while those for prior years are based on estimates using the 2006 Census.

*Source*: ABS (unpublished) *Australian Demographic Statistics*, as at December of each year, Cat. no. 3101.0; State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.5.

The national rate for female offenders was 109.7 per 100 000 adult females, compared with the corresponding rate of 522.1 for adult males in 2012‑13 (table 8A.4). The national rate for Indigenous offenders in 2012‑13 was  
3198.2 per 100 000 Indigenous adults compared with 249.1 for non‑Indigenous offenders (figure 8.6).

Comparisons need to be interpreted with care, especially for those jurisdictions with relatively small Indigenous populations, because small changes in offender numbers can cause variations in rates that do not accurately represent either real trends over time or consistent differences from other jurisdictions. Further, community corrections rates presented in figure 8.6 are not age standardised (that is, they are not adjusted to account for the different age structures of the Indigenous and non‑Indigenous populations). Data are not available for calculating age standardised community correction offender rates.

Figure 8.6 Indigenous and non-Indigenous community corrections rates, 2012‑13a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.6 Indigenous and non-Indigenous community correction rates, 2012-13.  More details can be found within the rext surrounding this image. |

a Non-age standardised rates based on the daily average offender population numbers supplied by State and Territory governments, calculated against adult Indigenous and non-Indigenous population estimates. b Excludes offenders whose Indigenous status was reported as unknown.

*Source*: ABS (unpublished) *Australian Demographic Statistics*, Cat. no. 3101.0; ABS (unpublished) *Experimental Estimates and Projections, Indigenous Australians* (series B), Cat. no. 3238.0; State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.4.

## 8.2 Framework of performance indicators

Corrective services performance is reported against objectives that are common to corrective services agencies in all jurisdictions (box 8.2). The performance indicator framework shows which data are comparable in the 2014 Report (figure 8.7). For data that are not considered directly comparable, the text includes relevant caveats and supporting commentary. Chapter 1 discusses data comparability from a Report‑wide perspective (see section 1.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.2 Objectives for corrective services |
| Corrective services contribute to the whole-of-government priority, in all jurisdictions, to create safer communities through the administration of correctional sentences and orders. Objectives common to all jurisdictions are outlined below.  **Provide a safe, secure and humane custodial environment**  Corrective services aim to protect the community through the effective management of prisoners commensurate with their needs and the risks they pose to the community.  **Provide an effective community corrections environment**  Corrective services aim to protect the community through the effective management of offenders commensurate with their needs and the risks they pose to the community, and to provide advice services to courts and releasing authorities in the determination of orders and directions for offenders.  **Provide program interventions to reduce the risk of re-offending**  Corrective services aim to reduce the risk of re-offending among prisoners and offenders by providing services and program interventions that address the causes of offending, maximise the chances of successful reintegration into the community, and encourage offenders to adopt a law-abiding way of life.  These objectives are to be met through the provision of services in an equitable and efficient manner. |
|  |
|  |

Definitions and counting rules were refined during the reporting period as part of the continuing effort to improve comparability of indicators across jurisdictions. Data for previous years have been updated, where possible, in accordance with any revisions made to counting rules and definitions. As a result, this Report may present some historical data that vary from data published in previous reports. In other cases, it has not been possible to recalculate data for past years and inconsistencies within reported data are footnoted in relevant figures and tables.

Figure 8.7 specifies the performance indicators associated with the objectives identified in box 8.2. For periodic detainees, effectiveness indicators, such as assault and death rates, are reported separately. For applicable efficiency indicators (such as cost per prisoner), periodic detainees are counted as two sevenths of a prisoner, because they generally spend two days a week in prison.

The Report’s statistical appendix contains data that may assist in interpreting the performance indicators presented in this chapter. These data cover a range of demographic and geographic characteristics, including age profile, geographic distribution of the population, income levels, education levels, tenure of dwellings and cultural heritage (such as Indigenous and ethnic status) (Appendix A).

Figure 8.7 Corrective services performance indicator framework

|  |
| --- |
| **Figure 8.7 Corrective services performance indicator framework.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image.** |

## 8.3 Key performance indicator results

Performance is reported against the objectives for corrective services set out in   
box 8.2, using the indicator framework shown in figure 8.7. Jurisdictional differences in service delivery settings, geographic dispersal and prisoner/offender population profiles have an impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of correctional service systems.

### Outputs

Outputs are the actual services delivered (while outcomes are the impact of these services on the status of an individual or group) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

#### Equity, access

Equity, access in corrective services has been identified as a key area for development in future reports (box 8.3).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.3 Performance indicator — access |
| An indicator of access to appropriate programs and services for people under the responsibility of corrective services has yet to be developed. |
|  |
|  |

#### Effectiveness

##### Assaults in custody

‘Assaults in custody’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing a safe, secure and humane custodial environment, which includes providing a prison environment in which there is a low level of violence, whether perpetrated by prisoners/detainees on other prisoners/detainees or on staff (box 8.4).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.4 Assaults in custody |
| ‘Assaults in custody’ is defined as the number of victims of acts of physical violence committed by a prisoner that resulted in physical injuries reported over the year, divided by the annual daily average prisoner/detainee population, multiplied by 100 (to give the rate per 100 prisoners or 100 detainees). Rates are reported separately for assaults against another prisoner/detainee and assaults against a member of staff and by the seriousness of the impact. ‘Assaults’ refer to acts of physical violence resulting in a physical injury but not requiring overnight hospitalisation or on-going medical treatment. ‘Serious assaults’ refer to acts of physical violence resulting in injuries that require treatment involving overnight hospitalisation in a medical facility or ongoing medical treatment, as well as all sexual assaults. |
| (Continued next page) |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.4 (continued) |
| Low or decreasing rates of assaults in custody indicate better performance, however rates reported for this indicator need to be interpreted with caution. A single incident in a jurisdiction with a relatively small prisoner or detainee population can significantly increase the rate in that jurisdiction, but would have only a minor impact in jurisdictions with larger prisoner or detainee populations. A relatively high rate in a jurisdiction with a small prisoner or detainee population may represent only a very small number of actual incidents.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable over time but not directly comparable across jurisdictions due to different reporting practices and variation in service delivery arrangements for delivering prisoner health care whereby not all jurisdictions have access to the medical information needed to accurately classify incidents into the assault categories used in this indicator * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2012‑13, the rate of prisoner on prisoner assaults was 9.2 per 100 prisoners and the rate of prisoner on prisoner serious assaults was 0.6. Prisoner on officer rates were 0.8 per 100 prisoners for assaults and 0.1 for serious assaults (table 8A.14). Assault rates by jurisdiction for prisoners and periodic detainees are reported in table 8A.14.

##### Apparent unnatural deaths

‘Apparent unnatural deaths’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing a safe, secure and humane custodial environment including providing a custodial environment in which there is a low risk of death from unnatural causes (box 8.5).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.5 Apparent unnatural deaths |
| ‘Apparent unnatural deaths’ is defined as the number of deaths, divided by the annual average prisoner or detainee population, multiplied by 100 (to give the rate per 100 prisoners or 100 detainees), where the likely cause of death is suicide, drug overdose, accidental injury or homicide, and is reported separately for Indigenous and non‑Indigenous prisoners or detainees.  A zero, low or decreasing rate of apparent unnatural deaths indicates better performance, however rates for this indicator need to be interpreted with caution. A single incident in a jurisdiction with a relatively small prisoner or detainee population can significantly increase the rate in that jurisdiction, but would have only a minor impact in jurisdictions with larger populations. A relatively high rate in a jurisdiction with a small prisoner or detainee population can represent only a very small number of deaths.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, the rate of deaths from apparent unnatural causes for all prisoners was 0.05 per 100 prisoners in 2012‑13 (table 8A.15). Table 8.1 presents data on number and rates of death from apparent unnatural causes in 2012‑13, for Indigenous and non-Indigenous prisoners.

Table 8.1 Rate and number of prisoner deaths from apparent unnatural causes, by indigenous status, 2012‑13

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| Deaths/100 prisoners | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Indigenous | – | – | – | 0.05 | – | – | – | – | 0.01 |
|  | Non-indigenous | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.03 | – | – | – | – | 0.07 |
| Number of deaths | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Indigenous | – | – | – | 1 | – | – | – | – | 1 |
|  | Non-indigenous | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | – | – | – | – | 15 |

– Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 8A.15, 8A.26, 8A.34, 8A.40, 8A.46, 8A.52, 8A.58, 8A.64, and 8A.72.

At 0.01 per 100 Indigenous prisoners, the national rate of deaths from apparent unnatural causes for Indigenous prisoners in 2012‑13 has declined from the previous reporting period. The non-Indigenous rate of 0.07 is higher than in 2011‑12 but similar to levels of the prior three years (table 8.2).

Table 8.2 Rate of prisoner deaths from apparent unnatural causes, five year trends, by indigenous status (per 100 prisoners) a

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | NT | Aust |
| Indigenous | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 2007‑08 | 0.05 | – | – | 0.06 | – | – | – | – | 0.03 |
|  | 2008‑09 | 0.04 | – | – | 0.10 | – | – | – | 0.11 | 0.05 |
|  | 2010‑11 | 0.04 | – | – | 0.06 | 0.21 | – | – | – | 0.04 |
|  | 2011‑12 | 0.05 | – | 0.06 | – | – | – | – | – | 0.03 |
|  | 2012‑13 | – | – | – | 0.05 | – | – | – | – | 0.01 |
| Non-indigenous | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 2007‑08 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.10 | – | 0.07 | – | 1.01 | – | 0.06 |
|  | 2008‑09 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.14 | – | – | – | – | 0.08 |
|  | 2010‑11 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.08 | – | 0.07 | – | – | 0.48 | 0.08 |
|  | 2011‑12 | 0.07 | – | 0.03 | – | 0.06 | 0.23 | – | – | 0.04 |
|  | 2012‑13 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.03 | – | – | – | – | 0.07 |

a Data for previous years may vary from rates given in previous Reports. Deaths reported as 'unknown cause', where there is insufficient evidence to assess, subject to a Coroner's finding, whether the cause of death was natural or unnatural are not included in the calculation of rates. Deaths occurring in past years where cause of death was recorded as unknown at the time of the Report but were subsequently determined to have been from unnatural causes are updated in the relevant year's figures and rates when known.

– Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.16.

There were no deaths from apparent unnatural causes for periodic detainees in 2012‑13 (table 8A.15).

##### Time out-of-cells

‘Time out-of-cells’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing a safe, secure and humane custodial environment including managing prisoners in a manner that minimises the risks they pose to the community following discharge from prison while, at the same time, enabling them to achieve an acceptable quality of life during their period in custody (box 8.6).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.6 Time out-of-cells |
| ‘Time out-of-cells’ is defined as the average number of hours in a 24-hour period that prisoners are not confined to their cells or units.  A relatively high or increasing average time out-of-cells per day indicates better performance. The periods during which prisoners are not confined to their cells or units provides them with the opportunity to participate in a range of activities that may include work, education, wellbeing, recreation and treatment programs, the opportunity to receive visits, and interacting with other prisoners and staff.  Prison systems with higher proportions of prisoners who need to be accommodated in more secure facilities because of the potentially greater risk that they pose to the community are more likely to report relatively lower time out-of-cells.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2012‑13, the average number of hours of time out‑of‑cells per prisoner per day was 10.0 (figure 8.8). Average time out-of-cells was higher for prisoners in open custody than those held in secure custody (13.0 compared with 9.2 hours per prisoner per day, respectively).

Figure 8.8 Time out-of-cells (average hours per day), 2012‑13 a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.8  Time out of cells (average hours per day) 2012-13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Tasmania did not report open/secure disaggregation of this indicator in 2012‑13.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.18.

##### Employment

‘Employment’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing program interventions to reduce the risk of re‑offending including providing access to programs that address the causes of offending and maximise the chances of successful reintegration into the community (box 8.7).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.7 Employment |
| ‘Employment’ for prisoners is defined as the number of prisoners employed as a percentage of those eligible to work (that is, excluding those unable to participate in work programs because of full-time education, ill health, age, relatively short period of imprisonment or other reason). Employment for detainees is calculated as a percentage of the total daily average detainee population.  A high or increasing percentage of prisoners in employment indicates better performance. Addressing the limited vocational skills and poor employment history of some prisoners has been identified as a key contributor to decreasing the risk of re‑offending.  This indicator needs to be interpreted with caution because of factors outside the control of corrective services, such as local economic conditions, which affect the capacity to attract commercially viable prison industries, particularly where prisons are remote from large population centres.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2012‑13, 74.4 per cent of the eligible prisoner population was employed (figure 8.9). Most prisoners were employed in service industries (43.6 per cent) or in commercial industries (29.9 per cent), with only a small percentage (0.8 per cent) on work release (table 8A.20).

Figure 8.9 Percentage of eligible prisoners employed, 2012‑13

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.9 Percentage of eligible prisoners employed, 2012-13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.20.

##### Community work

‘Community work’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing an effective community corrections environment including delivering a program of appropriate community work projects to enable offenders to perform unpaid community work as part of the requirements of their community corrections orders (box 8.8).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.8 Community work |
| ‘Community work’ is measured as the ratio between (i) the number of hours directed to be worked on new orders made during the year, plus the hours of community work remaining on orders made in the previous year that were still in force and (ii) the hours actually worked during the current year.  This ratio indicates the extent to which corrective services were able to administer effectively the community work components of community corrections orders. Low or decreasing ratios of community work indicate that corrective services have been more effective in administering the community work hours required to be performed by offenders. Offenders are required to complete the community work requirements by the expiry of their orders. However, hours worked in the current counting period can relate to hours directed to be worked in orders made in the previous year and hours ordered to be worked in the current counting period may not have to be completed until the following year. Therefore, the ratio does not represent a direct correlation between the hours ordered to be worked and the hours actually worked in relation to individual orders. Neither is it a direct measure of the extent of compliance by an individual offender in completing the requirements of the order pertaining to that particular offender.  The ratio can be affected by factors such as availability of suitable community work projects in some geographic areas or for some categories of offenders, the levels of general compliance across all offenders with the requirements of their orders and by variations in the number of orders with community work requirements made by the courts. This indicator does not measure other aspects of effectiveness such as the amount of benefit incurred by the community as a result of the work.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * not complete for the current reporting period. Data for 2012‑13 are not available for NSW or Tasmania and, on two of the three measures, for Victoria.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

The ratio for jurisdictions reporting on this indicator ranged between 1.6 and 3.9 (that is, for every hour worked in the year, between 1.6 and 3.9 hours had been ordered to be worked in the year or had been carried over as incomplete work hours from the previous year) (table 8A.20).

##### Education

‘Education’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing program interventions to reduce the risk of re‑offending, including providing access to programs that address the causes of offending and maximise the chances of successful reintegration into the community (box 8.9).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.9 Education |
| ‘Education’ is defined as the number of prisoners participating in one or more accredited education and training courses under the Australian Qualifications Framework as a percentage of those eligible to participate (that is, excluding those unable to participate for reasons of ill health, relatively short period of imprisonment or other reason). Education figures do not include participation in non-accredited education programs or a range of offence related programs that are provided in prisons, such as drug and alcohol programs, psychological programs, psychological counselling and personal development courses.  A high or increasing education participation rate of prisoners indicates better performance. The rates reported for this indicator need to be interpreted with caution as the indicator does not assess participation relative to individual prisoner needs, or measure successful completion of education programs.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally in 2012‑13, 33.1 per cent of eligible prisoners participated in accredited education and training courses (figure 8.10). Vocational Education and Training courses had the highest participation levels (26.3 per cent). Nationally, 5.2 per cent of eligible prisoners took part in secondary school education, 3.7 per cent in pre‑certificate Level 1 courses, and 1.7 per cent in higher education (table 8A.21).

Figure 8.10 Percentage of eligible prisoners enrolled in education and training, 2012‑13

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.10 Percentage of elegible prisoners enrolled in education and training 2012-13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.21.

##### Offence related programs

‘Offence related programs’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing program interventions to reduce the risk of re‑offending including providing offence related programs that address criminogenic behaviour and, for prisoners released from custody, maximising their prospects for successful reintegration as law‑abiding citizens into the community (box 8.10).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.10 Offence related programs |
| Offence related programs are yet to be defined.  Data for this indicator were not available for the 2014 Report. |
|  |
|  |

#### Efficiency

The data presented for efficiency indicators are affected by factors other than differences in efficiency, including:

* composition of the prisoner population (such as security classification and the number of female or special needs prisoners)
* size and dispersion of the geographic area across which services are delivered
* scale of operations.

For community corrections, efficiency indicators are also affected by size and dispersion factors, particularly in jurisdictions where offenders reside in remote communities. These indicators can also be affected by differences in criminal justice system policies and practices — for example, the availability and use of sentencing options that impose particular program or supervision requirements.

##### Cost per prisoner/offender

‘Cost per prisoner/offender’ is an indicator of governments’ aim to provide corrective services in an efficient manner (box 8.11).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.11 Cost per prisoner/offender |
| ‘Cost per prisoner/offender’ is defined as the average daily cost of providing corrective services per prisoner and per offender, reported separately for net operating expenditure and for capital costs per prisoner and offender and for secure and open custody for prisoners.  Unit cost per prisoner and offender provides a measure of efficient resource management by corrective services. A low or decreasing unit cost suggests better performance towards achieving efficient resource management.  Efficiency indicators are difficult to interpret in isolation and should be considered in conjunction with effectiveness indicators. A low cost per prisoner, for example, can reflect less emphasis on providing prisoner programs to address the risk of re‑offending. Unit costs are also affected by differences in the profile of the prisoner and offender populations, geographic dispersion and isolation factors that limit opportunities to reduce overheads through economies of scale.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

The capital costs included in this section are the user cost of capital, depreciation, and debt servicing fees. The user cost of capital is the cost of the funds tied up in government capital used to deliver services (for example, the land and buildings used to house prisoners). The user cost of capital makes explicit the opportunity cost of this capital (the return forgone by using the funds to deliver services rather than investing them elsewhere or using them to retire debt). The equivalent capital costs for privately owned prisons are debt servicing fees. These fees are paid to private owners in addition to payments relating to prison operations.

The user cost of capital was calculated by applying a nominal cost of capital rate of 8 per cent to the value of government assets. The costs of capital for land and other assets are shown separately in table 8A.7, to allow users to consider any differences in land values across jurisdictions when comparing the data.

Nationally in 2012‑13, the total cost per prisoner per day, comprising net operating expenditure, depreciation, debt servicing fees and user cost of capital, was $297 (figure 8.11).

Figure 8.11 Total cost per prisoner per day, 2012‑13a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.11 Total cost per prisoner per day 2012-13.  More details can be found within the rext surrounding this image. |

a Total cost per prisoner per day is the combined operating expenditure and capital costs per prisoner per day, net of operating revenues and excluding payroll tax. Capital costs include the user cost of capital (including land), depreciation and debt servicing fees where applicable. Total cost excludes expenditure on transport and escort services where these are reported separately by jurisdictions.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.7.

The real net operating expenditure (which excludes capital costs and payroll tax) per prisoner per day was $233 nationally in 2008‑09 compared with $222 in   
2012‑13 (figure 8.12).

Figure 8.12 Real net operating expenditure per prisoner per day   
(2012‑13 dollars)a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.12 Real net operating expenditure per prisoner per day 2012-13 dollars.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Based on operating expenditure on prisons, net of operating revenues, and excluding payroll tax, capital costs, and transport and escort services expenditure where this is reported separately by jurisdictions. b Data are adjusted to 2012‑13 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012‑13 = 100) (table AA.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous Reports. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.9.

Nationally, the real net operating expenditure (which excludes capital costs and payroll tax) per offender per day increased from $19 in 2008‑09 to $23 in 2012‑13 (figure 8.13).

Figure 8.13 Real net operating expenditure per offender per day   
(2012‑13 dollars)a, b

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.13 Real net operating expenditure per offender per day 2012-13 dollars.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Based on operating expenditure on community corrections, net of operating revenues, and excluding payroll tax and capital costs. b Data are adjusted to 2012‑13 dollars using the General Government Final Consumption Expenditure (GGFCE) chain price deflator (2012‑13 = 100) (table AA.53). The GGFCE replaces the Gross Domestic Product implicit price deflator used in previous Reports. See Chapter 2 (section 2.5) for details.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.11.

##### Offender-to-staff ratio

‘Offender-to-staff ratio’ is an indicator of governments’ aim to provide corrective services in an efficient manner (box 8.12).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.12 Offender-to-staff ratio |
| ‘Offender-to-staff ratio’ is defined as the daily average number of offenders per full‑time community corrections staff member employed, and is reported separately for operational staff (who are involved in the direct supervision of offenders) and other staff.  The number of staff relative to the number of offenders provides a measure of efficient resource management by corrective services. A high or increasing ratio suggests better performance.  Efficiency indicators are difficult to interpret in isolation and need to be considered in conjunction with effectiveness indicators. A low or decreasing ratio can, for example, represent more intensive levels of supervision and program provision, commensurate with the risk and offence-related needs of the particular offender population, which are aimed at producing greater efficiencies in the longer‑term. Offender‑to‑staff ratios are also affected by differences in geographic dispersion and isolation factors that limit opportunities to reduce overheads through economies of scale.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, on a daily average basis, there were 16 offenders for every one (full‑time equivalent) community corrections staff member in 2012‑13 (figure 8.14). The ratio was 22 offenders per operational staff member and 67 offenders per other staff member (table 8A.22).

Figure 8.14 Community corrections offender-to-staff ratios, 2012‑13

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.14 Community corrections offender to staff ratios 2012-13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.22.

##### Prison utilisation

‘Prison utilisation’ is an indicator of governments’ aim to provide corrective services in an efficient manner (box 8.13).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.13 Prison utilisation |
| ‘Prison utilisation’ is defined as the annual daily average prisoner population as a percentage of the number of single occupancy cells and designated beds in shared occupancy cells that is provided for in the design capacity of the prisons, reported separately for open and secure prisons.  It is generally accepted that prisons require spare capacity to cater for the transfer of prisoners, special-purpose accommodation such as protection units, separate facilities for males and females and different security levels, and to manage short-term fluctuations in prisoner numbers. Percentages close to but not exceeding 100 per cent indicate better performance towards achieving efficient resource management.  Efficiency indicators are difficult to interpret in isolation and need to be considered in conjunction with effectiveness indicators. A high utilisation percentage, for example, can impact adversely on effectiveness indicators such as ‘assaults’.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * not complete for the current reporting period. Data for 2012‑13 are not available for Victoria or SA.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Nationally, prison utilisation was 96 per cent of prison design capacity in 2012‑13. The figure for open prisons was 90 per cent and 99 per cent for secure facilities (figure 8.15).

Figure 8.15 Prison design capacity utilisation, 2012‑13 a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.15 Prison design capacity utilisation 2012-13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Victoria and SA did not report on this indicator and Tasmania did not report open/secure disaggregation of this indicator in 2012‑13

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.23.

### Outcomes

Outcomes are the impact of services on the status of an individual or group (while outputs are the actual services delivered) (see chapter 1, section 1.5).

##### Escapes

‘Escapes’ is an indicator of governments’ objective to create safer communities, by effectively managing prisoners in a safe, secure and humane custodial environment, commensurate with their needs and the risks they pose to the community. This objective includes ensuring that all prisoners and detainees comply at all times with the requirements of the court order that has resulted in their imprisonment, particularly if their supervision in the community poses a risk to the safety of any person (box 8.14).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.14 Escapes |
| ‘Escapes’ is defined as the number of escapes divided by the annual average prisoner/detainee population, multiplied by 100 (to give a rate per 100 prisoners or 100 detainees), and is reported separately for prisoners escaping from secure custody and from open custody.  A zero, low or decreasing rate indicates better performance, however rates reported for this indicator need to be interpreted with caution. A single incident in a jurisdiction with a relatively small prisoner or detainee population can significantly increase the rate in that jurisdiction, but would have only a minor impact in jurisdictions with larger populations. A relatively high rate in a jurisdiction with a small prisoner or detainee population can represent only a very small number of actual incidents.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

Table 8.3 presents data on number and rates of escapes in 2012‑13. Nationally, the rate of escapes from open custody was 0.23 per 100 prisoners held in open prisons and the rate of escape from secure custody was 0.03 per 100 prisoners held in secure prisons.

Table 8.3 Rate and number of prisoner escapes, 2011‑12

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NSW | Vic | Qld | WA | SA | Tas | ACT | | NT | Aust |
| Escapes/100 prisoners | | | | | | | | | | |
| Open | 0.17 | 0.44 | – | 0.38 | 0.46 | – | – | | 0.20 | 0.23 |
| Secure | 0.02 | – | – | 0.05 | – | 0.21 | – | | 0.21 | 0.03 |
| Number of escapes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Open | 6 | 3 | – | 4 | 1 | – | – | 1 | | 15 |
| Secure | 1 | – | – | 2 | – | 1 | – | 2 | | 6 |

– Nil or rounded to zero.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); tables 8A.17, 8A.26, 8A.34, 8A.40, 8A.46, 8A.52, 8A.58, 8A.64, and 8A.72.

There were no escapes by periodic detainees in 2012‑13 (table 8A.17).

##### Completion of community orders

‘Completion of community orders’ is an indicator of governments’ objective of providing an effective community corrections environment, including ensuring that offenders comply at all times with the requirements of the court order that has imposed particular conditions on their behaviour. This may include restrictions on the offender’s liberty (as with home detention), a requirement to undertake community work or other specified activity (such as a drug or alcohol program), regularly attending a community corrections centre as part of supervision requirements, or other conditions (box 8.15).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.15 Completion of community orders |
| ‘Completion of community orders’ is defined as the percentage of orders completed during the year that were not breached for failure to meet the order requirements or because further offences were committed.  A high or increasing percentage of order completions indicates better performance towards achieving an effective community corrections environment.  Completion rates need to be interpreted with caution. The indicator is affected by differences in the overall risk profiles of offender populations and risk assessment and breach procedure policies. High-risk offenders subject to higher levels of supervision have a greater likelihood of being detected when conditions of orders are breached. High breach rates could therefore be interpreted as a positive outcome reflecting the effectiveness of more intensive management of offenders. A high completion rate can mean either exceptionally high compliance or a failure to detect or act on breaches of compliance.  Data reported for this measure are:   * comparable (subject to caveats) across jurisdictions and over time * complete for the current reporting period (subject to caveats). All required 2012‑13 data are available for all jurisdictions.   Data quality information for this indicator is at www.pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2014. |
|  |
|  |

In 2012‑13, 73 per cent of community corrections orders were completed. National completion rates were relatively similar across order types, at 74 per cent for restricted movement and reparation orders and 72 per cent for supervision orders (figure 8.16).

Figure 8.16 Completion of community corrections orders, by type of order, 2012‑13 a

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8.16 Completion of community corrections orders by type of order 2012-13.  More details can be found within the text surrounding this image. |

a Data for restricted movement orders are not applicable to Queensland, Tasmania and the ACT as these jurisdictions do not have this category of order.

*Source*: State and Territory governments (unpublished); table 8A.19.

## 8.4 Future directions in performance reporting

The Steering Committee, through the Corrective Services Working Group and the National Corrections Advisory Group, will continue to improve data quality of existing indicators and develop new indicators. Data quality information for all indicators has now been completed.

Work will also continue to further improve the comparability of financial indicators, with a particular focus on the treatment of expenditure on prisoner health services. Disaggregation of health costs from prison operating expenditure is currently being trialled as the basis for possible revision of prisoner cost indicators in future reports.

The disaggregation of various indicators by Indigenous and non-Indigenous status is being trialled for possible incorporation in future reports as the basis for equity‑access indicator rates.

Prisoner health indicators and data collection to monitor prisoner health and their access to services over time is a prospective focus area in future (box 8.16).

|  |
| --- |
| Box 8.16 Prisoner Health |
| Prisoner health services are delivered through a range of service delivery models and funding arrangements involving both corrective services agencies and health departments. In most jurisdictions, the health services to prisoners, including forensic mental health, are delivered by health departments, specialist agencies or private health services contractors, rather than directly by corrective services agencies.  The setting for the delivery of the services also varies considerably — in some jurisdictions, the health facilities located within the prison system enable the delivery of secondary health care services, while in others, medical services delivered within prisons are limited to primary care, with more complex services delivered in external health facilities.  Even where medical facilities are located within prisons, performance-related information is generally maintained by the relevant health authority in the jurisdiction, and not necessarily available to corrective services. This limits the current capacity to develop and report meaningful comparative performance measures within the corrective services indicator framework. |
|  |
|  |

Data on prisoner health can be extracted from *The health of Australia’s* *prisoners 2012* — the third report in a series published by the AIHW. The indicators in the AIHW report are designed to provide information about the health of Australian prisoners and should not to be interpreted as ‘performance indicators’ in the same manner as performance indicators reported elsewhere in the RoGS.

The AIHW report is the most comprehensive of its type in Australia and is the source of the information that follows. It is not the purpose of the RoGS to duplicate the large volume of data in the AIHW report. However, the following extracts from the report explain why prisoner health is relevant from a whole-of-government perspective and why the Steering Committee continues to be interested in the topic.

Prisoners often arrive at prison with several health problems (AIHW 2011d). These include high rates of mental health problems, certain chronic conditions, communicable diseases, alcohol misuse, tobacco smoking and illicit drug use. Mental health disorders and harmful drug use are particularly prevalent in the prisoner population, with only about one-quarter of prisoners having neither problem (Friestad & Kjelsberg 2009, Smith & Trimboli 2010).

Prisoners lose access to Medicare and the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme upon entry into prison, with all medical services provided by the State or Territory in which they are imprisoned. For prisoners who underuse health services in the general community, prison can provide an opportunity to access treatment to improve their health.

The Australian Medical Association (AMA) states that ‘prisoners and detainees have the same right of access, equity and quality of health care as the general population’ (2012). This right to equivalence is outlined in a United Nations Declaration on basic principles for the treatment of prisoners (United Nations Secretariat 1990).

The importance of national prisoner health data was highlighted in the 2012 AMA Position Statement on Health and the Criminal Justice System, which recommends that:

Data collected in different jurisdictions should feed into national reporting against standardised benchmarks, with the outcomes used as a basis for continuous improvement in terms of identifying gaps in service delivery, prioritising areas of need, and allocating resources (AMA 2012, p. 12).

The median time spent on remand for un-sentenced prisoners in custody at 30 June 2012 was 2.7 months. The median time sentenced prisoners spent in prison was 23 months (ABS 2012). As a result, each year, thousands of prisoners are released back into the community and the health issues and concerns of prisoners become those of the general population. The World Health Organisation’s Health in Prisons Project supports this view of prisoner health as an aspect of community health (WHO 2007).

According to the World Health Organization (WHO 1948), health can be defined as ‘a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity’. For this reason, indicators about aspects of prisoners’ lives, including homelessness, contact with family and friends while in prison, correctional programs undertaken in prison and educational qualifications obtained in prison, were included in the AIHW’s National Prisoner Health Data Collection (NPHDC).

The NPHDC was conducted over a 2-week period in May 2012 in 74 public and private prisons in all states and territories of Australia except Western Australia. The NPHDC was designed to monitor 110 indicators which are aligned to the National Health Performance Framework (see AIHW 2009a) to help ensure appropriate health services are in place to meet the needs of the prisoner population.

The indicators and data collection were developed by the AIHW with assistance and advice from the National Prisoner Health Information Committee (NPHIC). This committee includes representatives from each State and Territory department responsible for prisoner health, and other experts in the field.

The first two editions of the AIHW report provided information on the health status of prisoners on entry only. The third edition was the first to report data collected on discharge, with the hope that discharge data might enable monitoring of prisoner health at both entry and discharge. The third edition notes that data about discharges should be treated with caution and that entry and discharge data are not directly comparable.

During the NPHDC, there were around 29 000 prisoners in custody in Australia. Detailed data were collected for 794 prison entrants, 387 dischargees (prisoners expecting to be released in the 4 weeks following the collection), just over 4000 prisoners in custody who visited a clinic, and about 9000 prisoners who were taking prescribed medication. The magnitude of two particular prisoner health measures: referrals to prison mental health services; and engagement in illicit drug use, are illustrated below.

### Referrals to prison mental health services

Following initial health screening, 26 per cent of the 794 prison entrants surveyed were referred to prison mental health services for further observation or assessment (table 8.1). The table includes data on the sex, age and Indigenous status of those referred.

Table 8.4 Prison entrant referrals to prison mental health service, 2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Referred to prison mental health service | |
|  | *Number* | *Number* | *Per cent* |
| **Sex** |  |  |  |
| Male | 714 | 187 | 26 |
| Female | 80 | 21 | 26 |
| **Age group (years)** |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 228 | 44 | 19 |
| 25-34 | 276 | 77 | 28 |
| 35-44 | 195 | 63 | 32 |
| 45+ | 85 | 23 | 27 |
| **Indigenous status** |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 273 | 46 | 17 |
| Non-indigenous | 496 | 156 | 31 |
| **Total** | **794** | **208** | **26** |

*Source*: *The health of Australia’s prisoners*, 2012 AIHW p. 46.

### Incidence of illicit drug use

Upon entry, 70 per cent of the 794 prison entrants surveyed reported being engaged in illicit drug use in the previous 12 months (table 8.2). The table includes a breakdown by gender, age and Indigenous status.

Table 8.5 Prison entrants illicit drug use in previous 12 months, 2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total | Illicit drug use in previous 12 months | |
|  | *Number* | *Number* | *Per cent* |
| **Sex** |  |  |  |
| Male | 714 | 504 | 71 |
| Female | 80 | 49 | 61 |
| **Age group (years)** |  |  |  |
| 18-24 | 228 | 167 | 73 |
| 25-34 | 276 | 198 | 72 |
| 35-44 | 195 | 145 | 74 |
| 45+ | 85 | 37 | 44 |
| **Indigenous status** |  |  |  |
| Indigenous | 273 | 183 | 67 |
| Non-indigenous | 496 | 353 | 71 |
| **Total** | **794** | **553** | **70** |

*Source*: *The health of Australia’s prisoners*, 2012 AIHW p. 75.

## 8.5 Jurisdictions’ comments

This section provides comments from each jurisdiction on the services covered in this chapter.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **New South Wales Government comments** |  |
| Over the past year, CSNSW has been implementing important change to help break the cycle of re-offending and enhancing community safety. This includes planning for the future operation and configuration of the NSW custodial correctional system; provision of targeted and efficient supervision of offenders in the community and the delivery of high quality rehabilitation programs proven to help reduce re-offending.  NSW is responsible for managing the largest correctional system in Australia. In 2012‑13, after two years of declining prisoner numbers, NSW experienced an increase in the daily average prison and community offender populations. The prison population increased from an average of 9752 in 2011‑12 to 9808 in 2012‑13. The highest daily prison population in 2012‑13 was 10,071. The daily average community corrections offender population in 2012‑13 increased from 16,373 in 2011‑12 to 16,411.  The rate of successful completions of community corrections orders remained high at 77.7% in 2012‑13, well above the national average of 72.7%. During 2012‑13 a new service delivery model was developed and implemented which adopts a standardised approach to risk assessment and case management in the management and supervision of offenders.  Prisoner education enrolments continued to increase with enrolments increasing from 35.1% in 2011‑12 to 36.1%. Prisoner education was enhanced with several initiatives such as the Intensive Learning Centre (ILC) at the South Coast Correctional Centre and the expansion of the ILC program at Wellington and Lithgow Correctional Centres. Also, TAFE teaching hours were expanded to increase vocational qualifications for prisoners in high risk work licences and general construction training.  The number of assaults and serious assaults on officers decreased in 2012‑13 with the prisoner on officer assault rate decreasing from 0.65 in 2011‑12 to 0.58 which is well below the 2012‑13 national average of 0.79.  In February 2012, Stage 1 of an Intensive Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program (IDATP) commenced at John Morony Correctional Centre with the opening of a 62 bed dedicated drug and alcohol treatment unit. The IDATP incorporates a range of therapeutic, health, education, vocation and pre-release interventions aimed at addressing substance dependence, offending behaviour and reintegration. Implementation of Stage 2 of IDATP occurred in July 2012 with the program expanded with another 62 bed unit. Stage 3 of the implementation commenced in July 2013. In total, the program will house 248 male offenders.  A new 250 bed maximum security section at Cessnock Correctional Centre was opened in February 2013. The expansion makes Cessnock Correctional Centre the largest centre outside of Sydney with an operating capacity of 762 beds. | **”** |
| **“** | **Victorian Government comments**  The Government has been implementing significant reforms to the Victorian parole system. These improvements, which reflect the community’s clear expectation that parole is a privilege, not a right, and that community safety is paramount, make the Victorian parole system the toughest in Australia. In May 2013, the Government commissioned former High Court Judge Justice Ian Callinan AM to conduct a major review of the Adult Parole system. Mr Callinan’s report was published in August 2013, and the Government has already commenced work on implementation of the Callinan recommendations, including a first tranche of legislative reform that was passed in October 2013.  The new single flexible Community Correction Order continued to be strengthened during 2012‑13 with new conditions and powers. The use of electronic monitoring has been significantly expanded to improve the monitoring of compliance with specific order conditions, including the introduction of GPS technology. Parolees can now be electronically monitored, and the higher courts have been given the power to impose electronic monitoring on offenders on Community Correction Orders. Offenders continue to be involved in a range of community work programs including the successful landmate program and graffiti removal.  Victoria’s prison population increased from a daily average of 4,831 in 2011‑12 to 5,120 prisoners in 2012‑13. To accommodate anticipated growth in the prison population, the 2013‑14 State Budget allocated more than $131.5 million in infrastructure funding for 357 beds across the male prison system, and an expansion of maximum security facilities.  The Government subsequently decided that the new 500-bed medium security male prison to be located at Ravenhall in Melbourne’s north-west, which was funded in the 2012‑13 State Budget, would be expanded to its projected footprint of 1,000 beds.  These funding allocations are part of a broader prison expansion program underway which, overall, mean that Victoria’s prison system will grow by over 2,500 beds by 2017‑18, an increase of 50 per cent on the current system.  In addition, the Corella Place residential facility for serious sex offenders on post-sentence supervision orders will be expanded from 40 to 55 beds, in a $3 million expansion project.  Despite the continuing growth in the size of the prison population, Victoria’s real net operating expenditure on prisons and community corrections per head of population continues to be the lowest in Australia, and substantially below the national average.  In addition, Victoria’s rate of return to prison was the third lowest in Australia, and well below the national average of 40.3 per cent, despite increasing to 36.8 per cent in 2012‑13. | **”** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **“** | **Queensland Government comments**  During 2012‑13, Queensland experienced record growth in prisoner numbers. Based on the average daily numbers there were 199 additional prisoners in 2012‑13 compared to 2011‑12, which represents growth of 3.5 percent. This is reflected in the total prison utilisation rate increase compared with the previous year (from 84.9% to 89.8%).  Queensland Corrective Services (QCS) reduced excess low security capacity for male prisoners with the closure of Darling Downs Correctional Centre and increased low security capacity for female prisoners at Numinbah Correctional Centre and male prisoners at Palen Creek Correctional Centre. In turn, low security facility utilisation increased by 10 percentage points since 2011‑12 (from 53.3% to 63.3%).  Throughout the year, QCS continued to focus resources on maintaining community safety by holding offenders accountable and reducing their future risk to the community. The 2012‑13 cost of containment per prisoner per day was approximately 7% lower than the 2011‑12 result. Additionally, Queensland’s return rate for prisoners to prison or corrective services showed minimal change from the 2011‑12 result and remains below the national average.  QCS improved its strong record on community safety, with no escapes from high security or low security facilities during the year. Correctional staff safety continued to be a key focus in 2012‑13. A series of strategies were introduced to protect staff from harm by prisoners. The rate of assaults in all categories decreased in 2012‑13 from 2011‑12. No assaults on staff are acceptable and there is continuing work to be done to reduce harm to staff in 2013‑14.  During 2012‑13 the average daily number of offenders under supervision in the community declined. QCS continues to prioritise community based correctional resources to the highest risk offenders. The successful completion of supervision and reparation orders in the community for 2012‑13 are consistent with or higher than the 2011‑12 result.  The 2014 Report shows that Queensland’s return rate for offenders returning to corrective services, either under a new prison sentence or community based order has increased by 1.87 percentage points from the 2011‑12 result. This partly reflects the delivery of swift and certain responses to offenders who have contravened order conditions or are a risk to community safety, particularly on parole. In 2012‑13, the cost of supervision per offender per day decreased when compared to the previous year. Queensland provides good value for money in community supervision while maintaining a strong focus on supervising, managing and breaching offenders where required. | **”** |
| **“** | **Western Australian Government comments**  After a small increase in 2011‑12, the State’s adult prisoner population peaked at 5032 on 23 May 2013. The daily average prison population for 2012‑13 increased by 3.2% as compared with 2011‑12. The daily average Aboriginal prisoner population rose by 6.4%, with the non-Aboriginal population also rising slightly by 1.2%. The female prisoner cohort grew by 16.0%.  Adult Community Corrections managed 9,873 persons during the financial year, including 3,743 Aboriginal persons. During 2012‑13 the daily average community corrections population dropped by 3.0%, following a 9.1% decrease the previous year. As at 30 June 2013, 4,360 persons were subject to community corrections orders.  The Department continued to implement its Custodial Infrastructure Program in 2012‑13 to expand its prison capacity to meet the growing demand and improve existing facilities. The program is the most significant custodial accommodation program in the history of Western Australia and should deliver 2661 beds. This included opening the Wandoo Reintegration Facility and the West Kimberly Regional Prison in November 2012.  Despite the increasing prisoner population, WA achieved again the second lowest rate for serious assaults by prisoners on other prisoners in the country. However, the prisoner-on-staff rate was the highest and above the national average. Current risk mitigation strategies include the effective use of intelligence and dynamic security. These are constantly evolving and being enhanced. In addition, a more defined approach to managing specific prisoners who pose a threat is currently being introduced so as to reduce these incidents.  WA had an apparent unnatural death rate of 0.04 deaths per 100 prisoners. Although this was an increase on the previous year it was below the national average. The Department has a number of strategies to identify and manage prisoners at risk, including a comprehensive suicide prevention strategy.  Within community corrections, adult offenders performed 117,000 hours of (unpaid) community work at 270 projects during 2012‑13. Community work orders enable offenders to repay their debt to WA for crimes committed by contributing to important not-for-profit community projects while gaining new skills. Furthermore, WA reported the second best ratio in Australia of community work hours ordered to hours actually worked. This is evidence of the effective administering of the community work component of community corrections orders.  Future directions for WA’s community corrections include decentralising administration of community work orders and returning case management to the States individual branches. Monitoring offenders under the Dangerous Sexual Offenders Act 2006 using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology commenced on 20 May 2013. | **”** |
| **“** | South Australian Government comments  Growth in the South Australian prisoner population continued in 2012‑13 at a rate of 4.76%. With the system operating at or near capacity and in response to the growth in projected prisoner numbers, the 90 bed ‘Banksia Unit’ was commissioned at Port Augusta Prison. In addition, the department completed construction of a 108 bed unit at Mount Gambier Prison (which will be commissioned in early 2013‑14). Other enhancements include the progression of the significant program of works at the Northfield sites (as part of the $42.6 million upgrade).  The management of prisoners and offenders with complex needs continues to be a challenge and a key focus for the department. In 2012‑13 the department upgraded the ‘Sandalwood Unit’ at Port Augusta Prison – this unit now caters for the management and care of female prisoners with complex needs (including mental health and aged-related requirements) within a multi-purpose facility.  Efforts are continually made to keep South Australian prisons in line with international security standards. As a result of extensive works in 2012‑13, the new Gatehouse at Yatala Labour Prison and Reception at the Adelaide Remand Centre both now host some of the most advanced access control technologies available on the market. This includes biometric iris scanning, drug and explosive monitoring equipment and state-of-the-art metal detection systems.  In 2012‑13 the department’s suite of offender programs was bolstered with the inclusion of a family violence prevention program in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands (specifically for female offenders), as well as through the development of a pilot Reintegration Program (for prisoners serving sentences greater than 12 months) and a pilot Domestic Violence Program. A program for sexual offenders, assessed as having an inherited or acquired cognitive deficit, was also included as an ongoing program following a successful trial in 2012.  The tremendous partnership between the department and BHP Billiton has continued this year where eligible prisoners from Port Augusta Prison are provided with qualifications in areas such as elevated work platform, fork lift operation and front loader training whilst gaining hands-on work experience. The ground breaking Sierra Program also continued this year to target young offenders by focusing on self-discipline, education, fitness and teamwork.  As reported in the 2014 Report on Government Services, SA has the lowest rate of return to prison and community corrections in comparison to other Australian jurisdictions; SA exceeds the Aust national average of eligible prisoners participating in accredited vocational programs; and had no prisoner deaths as a result of either natural or unnatural causes in 2012‑13. | **”** |
| **“** | **Tasmanian Government comments**  The Community Corrections offender population showed signs of stabilising in 2012‑13, after increases over many years. Whilst there was a continued increase in reparation orders, supervision orders were on the decrease.  Requests for Court reports have also stabilised. Consultation with the Magistrates Court has resulted in the introduction of a new shorter process for the provision of Pre Sentence Reports. Previously Reports were very detailed, and in many cases provided more information than Magistrates required.  Community Corrections is currently rolling out a new 5 stage intervention and case management model for managing sex offenders on community-based orders. This is based upon contemporary empirical research and other systems currently operational in other states and countries.  Court Mandated Diversion for drug offenders continues to address offenders’ risk of reoffending through case management and therapeutic intervention.  Tasmania Prison Service  The prison population in Tasmania peaked at 507 in the spring/summer of 2012 but then decreased and was relatively stable during 2013 at around 460.  In 2013 Mr Brian Edwards was appointed to the role of Director of Prisons for five years, while retaining his focus on change management to progress the recommendations made in the Palmer Inquiry and Breaking the Cycle Strategic Plan. Mr Edwards has experience as a senior governor in the UK prison system.  The ongoing Prisons Infrastructure Redevelopment Program (PIRP) will provide additional facilities in the Risdon Prison Complex (RPC). In 2012‑13 the procurement phase was concluded and the construction phase began. The project includes:   * a new Industries building and an Activities and Education Centre; * additional multi-purpose rooms and exercise facilities; and * upgrades to various security systems and staff facilities.   Hayes Prison Farm was officially decommissioned in September 2012. Steps in this process included the recommissioning of two divisions at the Ron Barwick Minimum Security Prison (RBMSP) and the redevelopment of cottages at the Risdon site into independent living units.  Other current directions in the TPS include:   * Addressing budget pressures; and * A closer working relationship with the Correctional Primary Health Service.   Further detail on these developments is provided in the Tasmanian Department of Justice Annual Report 2012‑13, which is available online. | **”** |
| **“** | **Australian Capital Territory Government comments** |  |
| In 2012‑13, the ACT Government provided ACT Corrective Services with additional funding of $1.2m in order to meet operational costs associated with increases in service demand including increases in community supervision orders. In 2013‑14 we will see $3.0m provided toward the design of additional facilities at the Alexander Maconochie Centre to meet future accommodation requirements.  Building on the ACT Government’s strategic direction of creating a safer more secure community, $1.1m was provided over two years to provide Throughcare beyond an offender’s custodial sentence to support transition into the community and help reduce rates of recidivism. The Throughcare model has been developed and includes:   * a centralised assessment process identifying the primary needs and risks surrounding an individual’s release into the community; * a multidisciplinary panel made of peak bodies, agencies across the community sector and ACT and Commonwealth agencies to advise on the best support for each individual as they integrate; * support services coordinated to address key integration areas: housing, jobs, health and community connections; and * establishment of service agreements with key agencies on the level of support that will be provided to Throughcare clients.   In addition, ACT Corrective Services has made changes to its executive structure, a new General Manager for Community Corrections has been engaged completing our executive structure. A deputy General Manager, Custodial Operation has also been engaged enhancing our operational capacity and governance.  Implementing the recommendations of the *Review of Statistical Extraction and Collection Methods* has also been a focus for ACT Corrective Services in 2012‑13 this has been supported by the initiation of a major project our data collection system, data collection and integrity. | **”** |
| **“** | **Northern Territory Government comments**  In the year ahead the Northern Territory will embark upon a fundamental philosophical change in the delivery of correctional services. In July 2014 the new Darwin Correctional Precinct (DCP) will be commissioned and fully operational. The facility will embrace new corrective industries and a broad range of programs aimed at assisting those serving a sentence to develop skills and knowledge that will provide them a solid platform for integration back into the community on release.  The delivery of services and programs in the Northern Territory is influenced by a variety of factors including the difference in climatic zones, a sparse population concentrated in major townships coupled with the tyranny of distance. Despite these challenges, the Northern Territory continues to deliver a quality correctional service fit for purpose.  According to Australian Bureau of Statistics estimates, as at December 2012 the NT has an adult populace of only 174 000 people, with approximately 26% of the population identifying as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander. This populace is spread over a vast 1.349 million square kilometres.  Whilst Indigenous people constitute 26% of the NT adult population, Indigenous prisoners constitute 87% of the NT prisoner population and Indigenous offenders constitute 79% of the NT offender population. The proportion of Indigenous prisoners and Indigenous offenders is at least double the proportion of all other states and territories.  This year the Northern Territory led the way in improving inmate health. On  1 July 2013, all correctional facilities and centres became smoke-free environments. The Northern Territory is the first jurisdiction in Australia to implement such a policy. An education campaign began 18 months prior to implementation advising prisoners and correctional staff of the policy. In the first half of 2013, quit smoking assistance was offered to those wanting to take this opportunity to quit in preparation of the implementation.  In September 2013, the *Sentenced to a Job* program was launched with a view of reinvigorating the corrective industries sector to provide employment opportunities to prisoners prior to release. 525 prisoners are currently employed across three categories of employment; commercial or service industries and work release. It is anticipated that this program will lead to an increase in the number of prisoners undertaking employment while serving a sentence.  The full-time custodial population continued to increase, rising from a daily average prisoner population of 1,337 in 2011‑12 to 1,438 in 2012‑13, an increase of 101 prisoners or 7.6%.  There has also been a corresponding rise in the numbers of offenders subject to community orders. The full-time offender population rose from a daily average of 1,082 in 2011‑12 to 1,210 in 2012‑13, an increase of 128 offenders or 11.8%.  Note: Owing to the NT’s small prisoner and offender population minor changes in numbers may result in significant changes to rates and/or percentages. | **”** |

## 8.6 Definitions of key terms and indicators

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **24-hour court cell** | Cells located in a court and/or police complex that are administered by corrective services. |
| **Assault** | An act of physical violence committed by a prisoner or periodic detainee that resulted in physical injuries. An assault is recorded where either:   * a charge is proved either by a jurisdictional correctional authority, a Governor’s hearing or a court of law, or * there is evidence that an assault took place because at least one of the following circumstances apply: * there is at least one apparently reliable witness to the assault, or the victim claims assault and there is no obvious reason to doubt this claim, or * a visible injury has occurred and there is sufficient circumstantial or other evidence to make an assault the most likely cause of the injury on the basis of the balance of probabilities.   The rate is expressed per 100 prisoners, calculated by dividing the total number of assaults by the daily average prisoner population, multiplied by 100. It is based on a count of victims of assaults not incidents, that is, an assault by two prisoners on one other prisoner is counted as one assault, whereas a single incident in which one prisoner assaults two other prisoners is counted as two assaults. |
| **Apparent unnatural death** | The death of a person:   1. who is in corrective services custody (which includes deaths that occur within prisons and periodic detention centres, during transfer to or from prison, within a medical facility following transfer from prison, or in the custody of corrective services outside a custodial facility) 2. whose death is caused or contributed to by traumatic injuries sustained, or by lack of proper care, while in such custody 3. who dies or is fatally injured in the process of prison officers attempting to detain that person 4. who dies or is fatally injured in the process of that person escaping or attempting to escape from prison custody 5. there is sufficient evidence to suggest, subject to a Coroner’s finding, that the most likely cause of death is homicide, suicide, an accidental cause or a drug overdose.   The rate is expressed per 100 prisoners, calculated by dividing the number of deaths by the daily average prisoner population, multiplied by 100. |
| **Average number of hours ordered per offender** | The total of community work hours ordered to be worked per offender with active work orders containing community hours on the first day of the counting period and/or imposed new community work hours ordered during the counting period. |
| **Average number of hours worked per offender** | The number of actual hours worked per offender with a work order in the counting period. |
| **Capital costs per prisoner/offender** | The daily cost per prisoner/offender, based on the user cost of capital (calculated as 8 per cent of the value of government assets), depreciation, and debt servicing fees for privately owned facilities. |
| **Community corrections** | Community-based management of court-ordered sanctions, post-prison orders and administrative arrangements and fine conversions for offenders, which principally involve one or more of the following requirements: supervision; program participation; or community work. |
| **Community corrections rate** | The annual average number of offenders per 100 000 population aged 17 years or over in those jurisdictions where persons are remanded or sentenced to adult custody at 17 years of age, or 18 years or over in those jurisdictions where the age for adult custody is 18 years old. |
| **Community corrections staff** | Full-time equivalent staff employed in community corrections. Operational staff refers to staff whose main responsibility involves the supervision or provision of support services directly to offenders, for example, probation/parole/community corrections officers, home detention officers, case managers, program co-ordinators, and court advice workers. Other staff refers to staff based in Head Office or officers in the field whose responsibilities are managerial or administrative in relation to offender management. Staff members who perform a mix of caseload and administrative functions are allocated proportionately to each category based upon the workload assigned to that position. |
| **Community work (offenders)** | Unpaid community work (hours) by offenders serving community corrections orders during the counting period. |
| **Completion  of community orders** | The percentage of community orders that were completed successfully within the counting period (by order type). An order is successfully completed if the requirements of the order are satisfied. An order is unsuccessfully completed if the requirements of the order were breached for failure to meet the order requirements or because further offences were committed. |
| **Detainee** | A person subject to a periodic detention order. |
| **Education** | The number of prisoners actively participating in education as a percentage of those who are eligible for education. Prisoners excluded as ineligible for education may include:   * prisoners in centres where education programs are not provided as a matter of policy or where education programs are not available (for example, remand centres, 24-hour court cells) * remandees for whom access to education is not available * hospital patients who are medically unable to participate * fine defaulters (who are incarcerated for only a few days at a time). |
| **Employment** | The number of prisoners or periodic detainees employed as a percentage of those eligible to participate in employment. Prisoners excluded as ineligible for employment includes those undertaking full time education and prisoners whose situation may exclude their participation in work programs, for example:   * remandees who choose not to work * hospital patients or aged prisoners who are unable to work * prisoners whose protection status prohibits access to work * fine defaulters (who are only incarcerated for a few days at a time). |
| **Escapes** | The escape of a prisoner under the direct supervision of corrective services officers or private providers under contract to corrective services, including escapes during transfer between prisons, during transfer to or from a medical facility and escapes that occurred from direct supervision by corrective services outside a prison, for example during escort to a funeral or medical appointment. The rate is expressed per 100 prisoners, calculated by dividing the number of escapes by the daily average open/secure prison population, multiplied by 100. The rate for periodic detainees relates to those detainees who have been convicted of escape from lawful custody, and is calculated by dividing the number of escapes by the daily average detainee population, multiplied by 100. |
| **Home detention** | A corrective services program requiring offenders to be subject to supervision and monitoring by an authorised corrective services officer while confined to their place of residence or a place other than a prison. |
| **Imprisonment rate** | The annual average number of prisoners per 100 000 population aged 17 years or over in those jurisdictions where persons are remanded or sentenced to adult custody at 17 years of age, or 18 years or over in those jurisdictions where the age for adult custody is 18 years old. |
| **Indigenous status** | Persons identifying themselves as either an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person if they are accepted as such by an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community. |
| **Net operating expenditure per prisoner/offender** | The daily cost of managing a prisoner/offender, based on operating expenditure net of operating revenues (see definitions below) divided by (i) the number of days spent in prison or detention by the daily average prisoner population and the daily average periodic detention population on a 2/7th basis or (ii) the number of days spent under community corrections supervision by the daily average community corrections population respectively. |
| **Offence-related programs** | A structured, targeted, offence focused learning opportunity for prisoners/offenders, delivered in groups or on a one-to-one basis, according to assessed need. |
| **Offender** | An adult person subject to a current community-based corrections order (including bail supervision by corrective services). |
| **Offender-to-staff ratio** | The daily average number of offenders divided by the number of fulltime (equivalent) staff employed in community corrections. |
| **Open prison** | A custodial facility where the regime for managing prisoners does not require them to be confined by a secure perimeter physical barrier, irrespective of whether a physical barrier exists. |
| **Operating expenditure** | Expenditure of an ongoing nature incurred by government in the delivery of corrective services, including salaries and expenses in the nature of salary, other operating expenses incurred directly by corrective services, grants and subsidies to external organisations for the delivery of services, and expenses for corporate support functions allocated to corrective services by a broader central department or by a ‘shared services agency’, but excluding payroll tax. |
| **Operating revenues** | Revenue from ordinary activities undertaken by corrective services, such as prison industries. |
| **Periodic detention** | An order of confinement, imposed by a court of law, requiring that a person be held in a legally proclaimed prison or periodic detention facility for two consecutive days within a one-week period. |
| **Periodic detention rate** | The annual average number of periodic detainees per 100 000 population aged 17 years or over in those jurisdictions where persons are remanded or sentenced to adult custody at 17 years of age, or 18 years or over in those jurisdictions where the age for adult custody is 18 years old. |
| **Periodic detention utilisation** | The extent to which periodic detention centre capacity meets demand for periodic detention accommodation, calculated as the total daily average periodic detention population attending a residential component of the order, divided by average periodic detention design capacity. |
| **Prison** | A legally proclaimed prison or remand centre, which holds adult prisoners, excluding police prisons or juvenile detention facilities. |
| **Prison utilisation** | The extent to which prison design capacity meets demand for prison accommodation, calculated as the total daily average prisoner population divided by average prison design capacity. |
| **Prisoner** | A person held in full time custody under the jurisdiction of an adult corrective services agency. |
| **Private prison** | A government or privately owned prison (see prison) managed under contract by a private sector organisation. |
| **Recurrent expenditure** | The combined total of operating expenditure (see previous definitions) and capital costs, that is, depreciation, debt servicing fees, and user cost of capital. |
| **Remand** | A legal status where a person is held in custody pending outcome of a court hearing, including circumstances where the person has been convicted but has not yet been sentenced. |
| **Reparation order** | A subcategory of community-based corrections orders that refers to an order with a community service bond/order or fine option that requires them to undertake unpaid work. |
| **Restricted movement order** | A subcategory of community-based corrections that refers to an order that limits the person’s liberty to their place of residence unless authorised by corrective services to be absent for a specific purpose, for example, Home Detention Orders. |
| **Secure prison** | A custodial facility where the regime for managing prisoners requires them to be confined by a secure perimeter physical barrier. |
| **Serious assault** | An act of physical violence committed by a prisoner that resulted in physical injuries requiring medical treatment involving overnight hospitalisation in a medical facility (e.g. prison clinic, infirmary, hospital or a public hospital) or on-going medical treatment. Serious assaults include all sexual assaults. The criteria for reporting described for ‘assaults’ above also apply. |
| **Supervision order** | A subcategory of community-based corrections that refers to an order that includes a range of conditions other than those categorised as restricted movement or reparation. |
| **Time out-of-cells** | The average number of hours in a 24-hour period that prisoners are not confined to their own cells or units, averaged over the year. |
| **Total cost per prisoner/offender** | The combined operating expenditure and capital costs per prisoner per day, net of operating revenues and excluding transport/escort expenditure where reported separately by jurisdictions. |
| **Transitional Centres** | Transitional Centres are residential facilities administered by corrective services where prisoners are prepared for release towards the end of their sentences. |
| **Transport and escort services** | Services used to transport prisoners between prisons or to/from external locations (for example, court), whether by corrective services officers or external contractors involved in escorting prisoners as part of the transport arrangements. |

## 8.7 List of attachment tables

Attachment tables are identified in references throughout this appendix by an ‘8A’ prefix (for example, table 8A.1). Attachment tables are provided on the Review website (www.pc.gov.au/gsp).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Preamble** | **Corrective services** |
| **Table 8A.1** | Average daily prisoner population |
| **Table 8A.2** | Correctional custodial facilities, at 30 June 2013 (number) |
| **Table 8A.3** | Average daily community corrections offender population |
| **Table 8A.4** | Imprisonment, periodic detention and community corrections rates, by sex and Indigenous status (per 100 000 adults) |
| **Table 8A.5** | Imprisonment, periodic detention and community corrections rates, by year (per 100 000 adults) |
| **Table 8A.6** | Total recurrent expenditure on prisons and community corrections, 2012-13 |
| **Table 8A.7** | Net recurrent expenditure, per prisoner and offender, per day 2012-13 |
| **Table 8A.8** | Real net operating expenditure on prisons (2012‑13 $'000) |
| **Table 8A.9** | Real net operating expenditure, per prisoner per day (2012‑13 dollars) |
| **Table 8A.10** | Real net operating expenditure on community corrections (2012‑13 $'000) |
| **Table 8A.11** | Real net operating expenditure, per offender per day (2012‑13 dollars) |
| **Table 8A.12** | Real net operating expenditure on prisons and community corrections plus depreciation (2012‑13 $'000) |
| **Table 8A.13** | Real net operating expenditure on prisons and community corrections plus depreciation, per head of population per year (2012‑13 dollars) |
| **Table 8A.14** | Assaults in custody, 2012‑13 (per 100 prisoners/detainees) |
| **Table 8A.15** | Deaths from apparent unnatural causes, by Indigenous status, 2012‑13 (per 100 prisoners/detainees) |
| **Table 8A.16** | Deaths from apparent unnatural causes, by year and Indigenous status (per 100 prisoners) |
| **Table 8A.17** | Escapes, 2012‑13 (per 100 prisoners/detainees) |
| **Table 8A.18** | Time out-of-cells, 2012‑13 (average hours per day) |
| **Table 8A.19** | Completion of community corrections orders, by type of order, 2012‑13 (per cent) |
| **Table 8A.20** | Prisoner/detainee employment (per cent of relevant population) and offender community work (average hours), 2012-13 |
| **Table 8A.21** | Prisoner education and training, 2012‑13 (per cent of eligible prisoners) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 8A.22** | Community corrections offender-to-staff ratios, 2012-13 |
| **Table 8A.23** | Prison/detention centre design capacity utilisation, 2012‑13 (per cent) |
| **Table 8A.24** | Categorisation of sanctions administered by corrective services during 2012-13 |
| **Single Jurisdiction Data — NSW** | |
| **Table 8A.25** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.26** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.27** | Descriptors, periodic detention |
| **Table 8A.28** | Effectiveness, periodic detention |
| **Table 8A.29** | Efficiency, prisons and periodic detention |
| **Table 8A.30** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.31** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.32** | Efficiency, community corrections |
| **Single jurisdiction data — Vic** | |
| **Table 8A.33** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.34** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.35** | Efficiency, prisons |
| **Table 8A.36** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.37** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.38** | Efficiency, community corrections |
| **Single jurisdiction data — Qld** | |
| **Table 8A.39** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.40** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.41** | Efficiency, prisons |
| **Table 8A.42** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.43** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.44** | Efficiency, community corrections |
| **Single jurisdiction data — WA** | |
| **Table 8A.45** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.46** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.47** | Efficiency, prisons |
| **Table 8A.48** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.49** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.50** | Efficiency, community corrections |
| **Single jurisdiction data — SA** | |
| **Table 8A.51** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.52** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.53** | Efficiency, prisons |
| **Table 8A.54** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.55** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.56** | Efficiency, community corrections |
| **Single jurisdiction data — Tas** | |
| **Table 8A.57** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.58** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.59** | Efficiency, prisons |
| **Table 8A.60** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.61** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.62** | Efficiency, community corrections |
| **Single jurisdiction data — ACT** | |
| **Table 8A.63** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.64** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.65** | Descriptors, periodic detention |
| **Table 8A.66** | Effectiveness, periodic detention |
| **Table 8A.67** | Efficiency, prison and periodic detention |
| **Table 8A.68** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.69** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.70** | Efficiency, community corrections |
| **Single jurisdiction data — NT** | |
| **Table 8A.71** | Descriptors, prisons |
| **Table 8A.72** | Effectiveness, prisons |
| **Table 8A.73** | Efficiency, prisons |
| **Table 8A.74** | Descriptors, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.75** | Effectiveness, community corrections |
| **Table 8A.76** | Efficiency, community corrections |
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1. From 2004-05, NSW Corrective Services continues to manage one 40-bed facility that houses males aged 16 to 18. These young offenders are included in the daily average number of prisoners and are included in the calculation of indicators. As they represent only a very small proportion of NSW prisoners (less than one-half of one per cent) they will have a negligible effect on these indicators and are not footnoted to each table and figure. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Tasmania and the NT are unable to disaggregate prisoner transport costs from other prison operating costs. NSW and Queensland are unable to fully disaggregate all such costs in 2012-13 and therefore some transport and escort costs are included under operating expenditure. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)