



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
CORRECTIVE SERVICES NSW**

**Portfolio Committee No. 4 – Legal Affairs**

**PARKLEA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE AND OTHER  
OPERATIONAL ISSUES**

**Hearing: Friday 28 September 2018**

**Answers due by: Tuesday 16 October 2018**

1. What was the basis for your decision to choose MTC/Broadspectrum as the preferred tenderer for Parklea?

The process for selecting the preferred tenderer was in strict compliance with NSW Government procurement procedures for contracting of public services. Competitive procurement processes were adopted in the selection of the preferred tenderer.

In particular, the three shortlisted companies were evaluated based on their ability to deliver quality outcomes for community safety, and MTC/Broadspectrum provided the strongest option.

2. What is your response to media reports of MTC's poor track record in operating prisons overseas?

The NSW Government undertook a rigorous appraisal and comprehensive assessment of the business undertaken by the tenderer in the operation of contracted prison services.

The new contract is informed by lessons learned during the almost 12 years since Labor signed the current agreement for Parklea Correctional Centre. Monitoring mechanisms within the new contract will hold the new operator accountable for achieving the required standards and performance indicators are met, including for security, safety and rehabilitation.

3. What mechanisms has Corrective Service NSW put in place to ensure that the problems with security, contraband, safety etc at Parklea under GEO Group's management do not continue under the new operator?

The new operator of Parklea will manage the centre under new contractual arrangements including a new performance regime. The performance regime is aligned to a payment framework which includes charge events and financial abatements if the operator has incidents such as escapes from custody, unnatural deaths, erroneous detention or releases or major disruptions to correctional operations. Both charge events and abatements can be substantial and are powerful incentives to deliver quality services.

The new contract model also reinforces enhanced governance structures to ensure that Corrective Services remains aware of all aspects of operations at privately managed correctional centres. Mandated reporting requirements are embedded in contracts between Corrective Services and service providers, supporting the system of financial incentives. The approach is integrated and outcomes focused, with Corrective Services considering the impact of service delivery rather than the processes involved in service delivery. This allows service providers to deploy resources appropriately and remain agile and responsive to change.

Under the new performance regime, service providers are assessed against quantitative Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Performance Indicators (PIs) as well as qualitative Outcome Specifications. KPIs are linked to financial abatements and if a service provider does not meet KPI targets, they do not receive full payment.

To ensure that Corrective Services understands the quality of service delivered at contracted correctional centres, Service Specifications are routinely assessed by

Corrective Services Monitors. The frequency of monitoring that occurs for Service Specifications is determined on the basis of risk, which is adjusted to reflect changes in the operating environment.

During transition, Corrective Services will review the approach proposed by the new operator, including the operator's Staff Deployment Plan, Safety and Security Plan, Emergency Management Plan, Business Continuity Plan, Quality Assurance Plan and Operating Manuals. Working in partnership with the new operator allows Corrective Services to ensure that the operational approach is safe, appropriate and contractually compliant.

Corrective Services has learned from the existing contract signed by the Labor Government with GEO Group at Parklea, and we are confident the new contract will provide strong results for the community.

4. What thought is being given to addressing the problems in the built environment at Parklea, especially the gatehouse and reception area?

As part of the maximum security expansion at Parklea, extra holding cells were added to the reception area.

Changes are also being made to the gatehouse, which is being redesigned and expanded to support the safe and secure entry and egress of an increased number of staff and visitors.

5. What was the rationale for excluding GEO Group from the Parklea tender?

GEO Group responded to an Expression of Interest (EOI) launched by the NSW Government in 2017, inviting private companies to submit bids to run Parklea from 1 April 2019. Due to the strength of responses from other bidders, GEO Group was not shortlisted.

The bid evaluation was made based on the responses by the bidders to the EOI criteria and not based on the operations of Parklea Correctional Centre under the GEO Group.

6. Given that GEO Group was excluded, what measures has Corrective Services NSW put in place to ensure that the problems at Parklea are not also problems for Junee Correctional Centre?

Corrective Services continues to contract manage, monitor and report on operations at both Parklea Correctional Centre and Junee Correctional Centre. These activities include regular meetings with GEO Group. They also include the establishment of governance and project management frameworks related to construction and expansion works and changes in contractual arrangements.

7. On what basis was Corrective Services NSW itself excluded from tendering to manage Parklea?

This decision was made by the NSW Government. When Parklea Correctional Centre was privatised by a previous Labor Government, Corrective Services NSW was also not given an opportunity to bid for the contract.



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

---

**REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS BEFORE**

**PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE NO. 4 – LEGAL AFFAIRS**

**PARKLEA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE AND OTHER OPERATIONAL  
ISSUES**

**UNCORRECTED**

**At Macquarie Room, Parliament House, Sydney on Friday 28 September 2018**

**The Committee met at 9:30 am**

**PRESENT**

The Hon. Robert Borsak (Chair)  
The Hon. David Clarke  
The Hon. Scott Farlow  
The Hon. John Graham  
The Hon. Trevor Khan  
Mr David Shoebridge (Deputy Chair)  
The Hon. Lynda Voltz

**PETER SEVERIN**, Commissioner, Corrective Services NSW, on former oath

**KEVIN CORCORAN**, Assistant Commissioner, Custodial Corrections, Corrective Services NSW, on former oath

**CARLO SCASSERRA**, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Governance and Continuous Improvement, Corrective Services NSW, affirmed and examined

**GAYLE ROBSON**, Commissioner's Chief of Staff, Corrective Services NSW, on former oath

**GLEN SCHOLES**, Director, Custodial Corrections North, Corrective Services NSW, on former oath

**The CHAIR:** Would you like to that make a short opening statement, Commissioner?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Very short. I appreciate the opportunity to address the Committee again. The Committee has now had the opportunity to take evidence from witnesses and to extensively visit our facilities and get a firsthand impression of the operation. It is always very beneficial from a practitioner's point of view that people who need to concern themselves with the subject matter had the opportunity to actually look at what it is like on the front line. I am happy to take questions in relation to the terms of reference. As we did on the last occasion we will take the questions and share them between the experts at the table.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Commissioner, last time you were before us we were speaking about your monitoring at Parklea and the fact that on 2 February 2007 you instituted a wellbeing report and sent a governor in to make changes. Firstly, that is the only wellbeing review that has been undertaken anywhere, is it not?

**Mr SEVERIN:** It is the only review that we have undertaken in Parklea. We have certainly had some reviews of other operations in my time here in New South Wales. For example, we had a quite significant event, an escape at Goulburn and I introduced an expert from New Zealand, together with an expert from our security operations group to do a comprehensive security review. We have done a comprehensive review of the mobile phone introduction into prisons.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** That was not my question. My question was: Is that the only wellbeing review that has been undertaken in New South Wales?

**Mr SEVERIN:** At Parklea, that is correct, yes.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You made significant changes after you sent a governor to head up that review? Made systemic changes.

**Mr SEVERIN:** The wellbeing review was led by Governor Sue Wilson—who happens to be in the room here actually—and supported by a team of operational experts from various disciplines. The review was aimed very cooperatively with GEO to identify matters that require attention and improvement. The review resulted in a report which was made available to the GEO Group. As a result of that the GEO Group confirmed with us after a period of time the type of actions they were going to take, and we were then proceeding to monitor the implementation. Sorry, I erred there. The wellbeing review was actually not led by a governor. The wellbeing review was undertaken by the Operational Performance Review Branch. It was the intervention that was led by a governor, which was intervention under the contractor. I apologise.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Are all deaths in custody reported in the public domain?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Yes, they have to be under law. Every death in custody is subject to coronial inquiry. That is dealt with under the Coroners Act. There is a police investigation, there is an operational investigation that is always undertaken by Corrective Services NSW investigations group, and both the investigation undertaken internally, as well as the police investigation, are made available to the coroner, together with all the relevant evidence in relation to the occurrence. Then there is a formal coronial inquiry conducted into every death in custody.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Is that a public inquiry?

**Mr SEVERIN:** That is a public inquiry. The coroner has got the ability to conduct desktop inquiries, but in New South Wales to the best of my knowledge—but it is not my area of responsibility—these inquiries are public.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** In December 2017 there was a death at Parklea of an inmate undergoing withdrawal treatment, a person who was on a drug and alcohol program in Parklea. Was that information released to the public?

**Mr SCASSERRA:** Again, if I may, it is currently under coronial inquest. Matters that are ongoing we generally cannot comment on.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** That does not prevent you commenting here, as you know.

**Mr SCASSERRA:** Yes, the public—we will make the reports available from our investigation, et cetera. The coroner then makes the findings or recommendations available and is responsible for whether something is public or held.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Follow my train of thought here: in February 2017 you brought in a wellbeing team; in July you put in a team to make changes; in December 2017 you had a death, and I understand people were removed from their positions after you had sent in a team. When did you inform the public that that was the case?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Sorry, they are completely unrelated matters. If I may just clarify that. The wellbeing review was done as a result of concerns that I was having in relation to some operational realities at Parklea. The intervention followed a continued concern about management's attention to detail in relation to the operation of the centre. The death in custody is obviously a very tragic event, there is absolutely no question about that. That immediately becomes a matter for the coroner. We are not acting on behalf of myself, we are acting on behalf of the coroner. The coroner is completely responsible for that process.

However, if we identify that as a result of a death it is clearly evident that there was negligence, that there were matters that are of concern, which I understand related to staff who are part of Justice Health—which obviously is a separate statutory authority under the Ministry of Health—and there was disciplinary action taken. That was not disciplinary action that Corrective Services NSW took or the GEO Group took. The matter of the drug-related death I understand is still before the coroner, so we are not in a position to talk about the detail there—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I am not asking you to talk about the details. I am saying, you have a prison that you are so concerned about that you have put in the only wellbeing review in the State and you have put a governor in to make changes. Subsequent to you taking that action there is the death of an inmate who is meant to receive pharmaceuticals—

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** That may not be what the issue was.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** They were being treated for severe withdrawal.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** It may not have been pharmaceuticals that was the issue.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** They were being treated for severe withdrawal.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** It was so much of a concern that Justice Health reported to the Committee today that staff were removed from their positions.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** They removed their staff from the positions.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes. In Parklea Correction Centre, where a Minister has already said that he is outraged about contraband and you have prohibited the company from taking on the contract again, my question to you is: When did you release that information to the public?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Sorry, I can only reiterate that a death in custody is a very tragic event. In this particular case the information that is available to me at the moment indicated that it was staff from the Justice Health & Forensic Mental Health Network which were obviously in some way not acting as they should have under their code of practice. The Act governing the way Corrective Services administer it, is very clear about the fact that the responsibility for the provision of health services rests with the Justice Health & Forensic Mental Health Network. In that particular case they actually also provided the service, not just provided the monitoring of the service.

So, again, for me this is not about saying that we were not concerned about the operation of Parklea, and we had a very unfortunate death in custody, which evidently was the result of the medical treatment. I do not want to go any further because this is subject to coronial investigation. We do not publicise deaths in

custody. It is a very tricky and very difficult area of administration in corrections. On one hand we are not at liberty to make any comment about deaths until the coroner has had the opportunity to investigate.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** That is not true, commissioner.

**Mr SEVERIN:** On the other hand, we obviously have a very clear objective of making sure that those who are affected by the death, particularly families and loved ones, have every opportunity to inquire and to be provided with answers where we can do that. It is a very fine balancing act, one that is dealing with the most tragic event that can possibly happen in somebody's family's life, and we treat that with utmost seriousness.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** You had your monitors telling you time and time again there are contraband and other issues in Parklea. You implemented a wellbeing review. None of that was reported in the public domain. All we got was a comment from the Minister when a video was released to the media of a person with a mobile phone in Parklea, that he was shocked and outraged that that had happened, somehow had missed it in all your briefings. We have now had these ongoing issues. We should not have Ministers saying they are outraged when time and time again there are these issues and there is a pattern in Parklea— **The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** What is the question?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** —where they are not being reported in the public domain. Why did you not release to the public that there had been a death in custody? There are other instances of deaths in custody that are reported well before there is a coronial inquiry. Why was it not reported in this instance?

**Mr SEVERIN:** We do not. We have a policy of not reporting on deaths in custody in the public domain. That is absolutely clear. Of course, they are reported and then we obviously respond to media requests, and we do that as responsibly as we possibly can. But we do not go out and report to the public incidents of deaths in custody.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Are you aware of any circular that was provided to other corrective centres about what happened in Parklea, so there can be early warnings and corrective measures taken in other correctional centres?

**Mr SEVERIN:** No, I would have to take that on notice.

**ANSWER:** Corrective Services uses a number of approaches to communicate operational information throughout the organisation. While no specific circular regarding Parklea Correctional Centre's operational performance has been disseminated, Corrective Services circulates a daily incident summary, which covers information regarding serious events from all correctional centres throughout the state. This summary is circulated to approximately 130 senior staff each day.

In addition, the Corrective Services' Management of Deaths in Custody Committee considers the management and reporting of all inmate deaths in custody in NSW. The Committee ensures that the most appropriate and timely action is taken in response to internal reports, including investigation reports, and coronial findings and recommendations.

Corrective Services also ensures the continuous improvement of policies and work practices through ongoing review of the Custodial Operations Policy and Procedures (COPP). Changes to the COPP are informed by issues and incidents that occur at all correctional centres in NSW. All changes to the COPP are disseminated throughout the organisation via a Memorandum from the Assistant Commissioner Custodial Corrections.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** If you do not make information like this public and you do not have another method for sharing the information internally, then the mistakes may be repeated and you are not doing your job to address risks.

**Mr SEVERIN:** Sorry, your question was very specifically to a circular that related to sharing any findings from investigations. Of course we have mechanisms to communicate with our senior staff and, indeed,



all staff on systemic issues that require attention across the system. We do that very regularly. Assistant Commissioner Corcoran, and he can talk for himself, has a regular teleconference with all his governors. We have regular updates of our corrections procedures manual. We make changes and adjust those procedures manuals accordingly. We have a very clear line of communicating with staff anything that is relevant, not just for one particular centre but for the system as a whole.

**Mr CORCORAN:** We have a fortnightly teleconference with all the governors and their management teams in the centres. We go through a whole range of issues that impact on governors and the operations of centres, and when we have a death in custody that raises alarm with us in respect of a particular issue that is communicated through to governors.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The question about this death, you had multiple staff of Justice Health being disciplined, you had a death, which raises a variety of troubling issues. Was that communicated and, if so, in what form?

**Mr CORCORAN:** No, it was not.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** My question goes to the jurisdictional issue. My understanding is that this death occurred in the area controlled by Justice Health. Is that right?

**Mr SEVERIN:** That is correct.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** How much control, whether it be in a public facility or a private facility, does Corrective Services have for what goes on in the Justice Health area of a jail?

**Mr SEVERIN:** I might pass to Mr Scholes, who is clearly involved with the operation, but very clearly, only as it relates to security not as it relates to treatment.

**Mr SCHOLES:** The normal process is if there is a death in custody or a serious event, the Coroner will make the recommendations, unless it is something that is glaringly obvious that Justice Health needs to address immediately, in which case they would inform us. We have policy people in our operations branch who will immediately respond, amend policy and then implement it. At the moment in relation to Parklea, I cannot recall seeing anything coming from Justice Health to us at this point in time about those matters. I am not aware of the background of this particular sad outcome, but I am sure from the recommendations that will come from the Coroner if there is something with security or operationally that we need to do differently, we will absolutely do it.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I will take you to the evidence of GEO representatives at the last hearing. They said:

The most significant group of prisoners who are at risk of self-harm and unnatural death are those that in that period are first received into custody.

Originally Parklea agreed to take six fresh custodies a day and that was ramped up to fresh custodies of up to 30 a day. That is well within your control, is it not?

**Mr SCHOLES:** Yes. When they come in, there is an extensive screening process that includes custodial, Justice Health, welfare, psychs. They go through a screening process to identify if there are any factors that immediately need to be addressed. Anything that is to do with the health of the inmate, particularly with respect to withdrawals or detox, which is what I am picking up from the conversation, that would be normally in the domain of Justice Health. They will make recommendations as to whether or not there should be some sort of intervention. They might put them on Valium. It might be an observation cell issue if there are concerns of self-harm. It might be a two-hour placement if it is a medical issue.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** What is a two-hour placement?

**Mr SCHOLES:** That is a placement where that particular inmate will go in with another inmate on the understanding that they will provide support to them. Even someone to talk to can be enough to help them through that process. It varies with each individual. The staff at correctional centre level and particular with Justice Health, I cannot talk directly to Parklea, but from my operational area, they take it seriously and people understand the implications in that reception process and making sure they get it right. We are all human. The process is that if someone does not declare something, and it will happen with inmates occasionally, you can only go on the information and advice you garner from them.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We asked them, "Did you get more resources?" Their response was: Our obligation is to always do our best but there are a number of risk factors associated with the receipt of fresh custodies...

There is no indication they have fresh resources.

**Mr SCHOLES:** There is always risk factors with fresh custodies. Anyone who is coming off the street that is impacted by drugs, alcohol or abuse, essentially coming into a jail environment is stressful.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I am not talking about fresh custodies, I am talking about the increase in numbers that are going through that centre.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** This person was put into the care of— **Mr SEVERIN:** Justice Health.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Justice Health.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Can we deal with my question first? I am talking about the increase of numbers from six a day to 30 a day.

**Mr SCHOLES:** The processes are that they go into the holding cells—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I am not asking what about the process is. I am asking: What did you put in place? Your original contract had six fresh custodies a day and then you demanded they take 30 fresh custodies a day.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** We all agree it is resource intensive, a high-risk situation, a lot of additional time and work. What was done?

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** And it is becoming more complex.

**Mr SEVERIN:** If I can answer the question, we will take on notice the number of additional staff that were provided, but as a result of changes to the operational requirements for Parklea there were certainly additional resources made available, the number of which I do not have in front of me. If I can make one other comment in relation to deaths in custody, we have a committee that deals with any recommendation resulting from a coronial inquiry or our own inquiries. The Coroner has a person who attends that committee. It is otherwise made up of staff from within Corrective Services. Every recommendation is very carefully considered. What is more important, any action taken as a result of recommendations is monitored by that committee so that we do not end up losing any action that is important as a result of an investigation or a review being lost.

#### **ANSWER:**

In early 2015, the number of new receptions at Parklea Correctional Centre was increased to up to 30 inmates per day, Monday to Friday. Previously, Parklea Correctional Centre had received around 30 new receptions per week. This increase was part of a broader change to the inmate profile and purpose of Parklea Correctional Centre.

Around the same time as the increase in receptions, Parklea Correctional Centre's maximum population was increased and the Violent Offenders Therapeutic Program was relocated to another correctional centre. Area 3 at Parklea underwent refurbishment to become the prison's reception unit, including enhancements to the satellite clinic.

To ensure that the increase in new receptions and other operational changes were managed safely, Corrective Services requested that GEO Group submit a proposal outlining the risks and resource requirements associated with the increase in new receptions. GEO Group's proposal was accepted by Corrective Services and a number of additional positions were funded. Newly created positions included:

#### Non-custodial positions

- 1 x Administration Support Officer (Case Management), 1.20 FTE
- 1 x Registered Psychologist, 1.20 FTE
- 1 x Counsellor, 1.20 FTE

- Increased relief factor for the position of Correctional Supervisor (Inmate meals)

#### Custodial positions

- 3 x Corrections Officers, Area 3 (Security and Rovers), 4.56 FTE
- 1 x Reception Screening and Induction Coordinator (Supervisor), 1.20 FTE

Seven additional Corrections Officer posts were also retained following the relocation of the Violent Offenders Therapeutic Program to another correctional centre. These positions remained in Area 3 when it was converted to a reception area.

Since that time staffing levels have been adjusted to respond to changes in centre operations and inmate cohort, including an additional control room operator post, additional roving security posts and an additional Corrections Officer dedicated to the reception area from 1400 to 2200 hours.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Commissioner, when you have a death in custody, irrespective of what the Coroner does, I am assuming you and officers under your command would undertake some sort of investigation and make some conclusions as soon as possible?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Otherwise you could be waiting 18 months or years?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Three years for the decision.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Exactly, for the Coroner.

**Mr SEVERIN:** Absolutely not. We go in straightaway. If there are any obvious matters that need to be addressed immediately, we do that. The report that comes out of it ultimately will also go to the Coroner. As I said, any action that we need to take straightaway is taken straightaway as it relates to systemic issues, but also issues relating to the particular occasion when the incident has occurred.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** The others might want to go back to these issues, but I want to go back to the wellbeing report. You will be surprised to know we actually talk civilly to each other sometimes outside the context of the hearings.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** They might have seen that in the jails.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** That is right. In terms of the wellbeing report, what were the issues that concerned you sufficiently to take that step? I think that is what we were talking about earlier. Again, you might have told us. I want it clear in my mind now: What were the trigger points of what GEO was doing that set alarm bells for you?

**Mr SEVERIN:** We had a series of incidents that included deaths in custody. We had incidents of security breaches.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** I know there might be operational incidents, but what were those generally?

**Mr SEVERIN:** The detail of all of them I would have to take on notice, but they were issues like a set of keys not being properly returned, a person being discharged and allowed to take their keys with them. There were certainly incidents that related to self-harm and deaths in custody, contraband matters. For me, it was an assurance process. Very clearly I needed to not only assure myself that GEO was taking it very seriously but also that every action that needed to be taken was being taken and that we were in a position to say that we could satisfy ourselves that the action was taken. The only way you can do that, it is not what you expect in corrections, it is what you inspect. We had to inspect it and that is what the wellbeing review

did.

**ANSWER:** In 2016/2017, Corrective Services Monitors raised concerns about a number of issues at Parklea, including contraband and the practices used by GEO Group to roster and deploy staff throughout the centre. During this period, an incident also occurred in which a key bunch was stolen by an inmate being released from the centre.

The Review was undertaken by CSNSW Operational Performance Review Branch staff and subject matter experts from a variety of areas within Corrective Services.

The scope of the review included:

- staff retention;
- staff supervision and oversight;
- the effectiveness of staff deployment strategies;
- interactions between staff and inmates;
- inmate discipline and management; and
- gatehouse operations.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What surprises me about that—I recall the evidence—is that it was not a failing in one area; it was a failing in multiple critical areas. But the same company is running the prison in Junee. I assume that similar corporate structures apply to how they oversee their facilities. What, if anything, have you done to run the ruler over Junee?

**Mr SEVERIN:** We have onsite monitoring in our privately managed facilities on a daily basis. We have monitors that are physically in the facility.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Every day?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Every day, yes. Sorry, they may not be there on weekends but certainly Mondays to Fridays.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** And at Junee?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Yes, absolutely, at Junee.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** And that is a full-time position at Junee?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Full-time.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** For how long has that been?

**Mr SEVERIN:** The whole time; ever since the contract came into being.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** If the Committee heard evidence today that suggested the monitor at Junee had been withdrawn is that an error?

**Mr SEVERIN:** If that is the evidence—

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I can read to you the evidence.

**Mr SCASSERRA:** There may have been a few occasions where if staff are being redeployed to Parklea we did put extra monitoring staff into Parklea at some point, but they are very small absences. But, no, there are monitors attached to Junee.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The evidence is this:

The contract for Junee Correctional Centre includes provision for an on-site monitor but the Government has not always taken up this option. During the initial contract period the Commissioner of Corrective Services decided that an on-site monitor would only be required for the first six to 12 months, moving off-site thereafter.

Subsequently the Public Accounts Committee's value for money inquiry of 2005 noted that the Junee monitor was also responsible for the mid North Coast Dillwynia and Wellington prisons. Therefore, the monitor was not fixed to a single site as is the case in Western Australia.

And that is referenced.

**Mr SEVERIN:** Sorry, that precedes my tenure.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** By a long way.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** That is the 1990s and then 2005.

**Mr SEVERIN:** Ever since I have been here we had a monitor in Junee.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Are they also responsible for mid North Coast, Dillwynia and Wellington, or any other prisons?

**Mr SEVERIN:** No, they are not.

**Mr SCHOLES:** Can I just answer that? I was around in that time. I have been around a few years. The monitor from Junee was never deployed to Dillwynia or mid North Coast or any other government location.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** That would be a heck of a stretch.

**Mr SCHOLES:** Yes. For those government-run facilities, which they always have been, it has been the role of Operations Branch, which is oversighted with the Governor on site, the operation, including the commissioning processes. Absolutely not; the Junee monitor was not redeployed to go and look at those sites.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** In 2009 the predecessor of this Committee recommended onsite monitors for all private prisons because of the evidence it had before it. It has obviously been an ongoing issue. I am more than happy if you want to review that on notice. We can provide you with these references so that you can doublecheck on it.

**Mr SEVERIN:** All I can say is that when I started in September 2012 there were monitors at Junee and Parklea, and they are still there. If we have had short periods of time where a monitor was redeployed that was not the rule; that is not the norm. But we take on notice the detail in reference to the inquiry to which you referred.

**ANSWER:** Since GEO Group commenced operations at Parklea Correctional Centre in 2009 under the then Labor Government, at least one onsite Corrective Services Monitor has been based at the prison on a full-time basis.

At least one full-time Corrective Services Monitor has also been dedicated to monitoring Junee Correctional Centre since 2009. For the majority of this period, the Junee Correctional Centre Monitor has been deployed onsite; however, at times this has occurred remotely, with the Junee Monitor attending the centre on a visiting basis.

At all times, the monitoring of Junee Correctional Centre has met requirements, including the review of Performance Linked Fees and the development of regular performance reports.

The decision to allow monitoring to occur on a visiting basis was based on Junee's risk profile. Throughout the life of the contract, Junee has achieved the majority of performance targets and only minor compliance issues have been identified. As a regional correctional centre, Junee also has a stable workforce and is not located in a high density built environment. The inmate cohort at Junee is also more stable than Parklea, since Parklea fills a metropolitan remand function.

From time to time additional staff are deployed to undertake monitoring functions at both Parklea and Junee.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** How many monitors do you have at Junee and how many do you have at Parklea?

**Mr SEVERIN:** We have one monitor at any given point in time in Junee. In Parklea we have increased it because we are obviously dealing with transition now. We have dealt with the issues that are subject to the inquiry here as well. We have up to three monitors there at any given point in time—not consistently three monitors.

**Mr SCASSERRA:** Again, depending on the need and the shift patterns to cover all the activities that we would like to review during the week, we deploy them as such so that they can span a greater time period and look through a greater component of operations on site.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** So do you do it as a two-shift thing or something like that?

**Mr SCASSERRA:** We stagger the shifts, yes, that is correct. Some may start early, some start later and again cover the critical components of the day or look at risk areas that we have identified.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** If there is just one monitor at Junee does that mean they only do the standard daytime shift?

**Mr SCASSERRA:** We actually have two staff assigned. There are two MOS grades for Junee but there is one on site and there will be one back in Sydney and then they correspond back and forth.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Is the one on site only there during day time hours? Do they have fixed hours and therefore the bulk of the 24-hour cycle is not covered? Maybe you can provide the Committee with details on notice.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** We were complaining before that there was not one there.

**Mr SEVERIN:** I will take that on notice but certainly the experience would be that you might have an eight-hour day but you work your eight hours at different times of the day.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Will you provide the Committee with details on notice?

**Mr SEVERIN:** We will.

**ANSWER:** In accordance with section 242 of the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999, monitors have free and unfettered access at all times to all parts of the correctional centre, to all correctional centre records, to all offenders held in custody in the correctional centre and to all persons employed at the correctional centre.

Monitors are full-time employees and are on duty for an eight hour shift/five days per week. Monitors are rostered across varying shifts, including weekends. Varied rostering ensures that operational performance and contractual compliance is monitored across all time periods on a cyclic basis. Shift patterns depend on a number of factors including risk, the operational area being assessed and the availability of resources.

Although Monitors are not deployed 24 hours per day, they can attend the prison or other relevant locations at any time.

Monitoring positions at Parklea and Junee are also backfilled to cover leave and planned absences.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** On 1 September a death in custody of a 36-year-old Aboriginal man occurred at the Outer Metropolitan Multi-Purpose Correctional Centre. Concerns have been raised publicly that Corrections Services officers took between 20 and 40 minutes to call for medical assistance. What do you say to those assertions?

**Mr SEVERIN:** First of all, that is still very much subject to investigation so I will be very careful in how much information I provide. We are certainly following those lines of inquiry as to what, if any, delays occurred between the call system being used and the staff responding.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** So you are aware of an allegation that there was a delay between the call and the response?

**Mr SEVERIN:** There certainly have been some responses which were published. The responses were also raised through the media from inmates, but we are aware of those. Our investigators are aware of those. What I am aware of is that once the call was made that the person actually had collapsed it took five minutes for the staff to physically get to the place, which is consistent with the time it takes. What we are still investigating is whether there were previous occasions when alarms were raised that may or may not have been responded to in a timely manner. That is as far as I will take it.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Are you aware that Justice Health did not have an onsite nurse at that facility and there was a 15-minute delay in the nurse arriving to the facility?

**Mr SEVERIN:** I am.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Have you reviewed the decision that was made seven years ago to rationalise resources and not have a nurse on site at that facility?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Again, this is something I would have to raise with the chief executive and the board of Justice Health and the Forensic Mental Health Network.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Have you?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Not at this point in time.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Will you?

**Mr SEVERIN:** If there is a concern that is clearly linked to the response that was provided and the response that should have been provided, and if there is an indication that is due to a lack of resources, then of course I would raise that.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** When do you expect your internal investigation to be completed about, amongst other things, the alleged delay in Corrections Services officers attending this 36-year-old Aboriginal man who was presenting with medical issue?

**Mr SEVERIN:** I need to take that on notice because we obviously have a whole range of investigations happening. We are trying generally to finalise investigations within about 12 weeks. Sometimes that is not possible because we cannot get all the witnesses organised within that time. There might be other complexities relating to post mortem matters, et cetera. Police always have the right to talk to staff in the first instance because they are conducting a police investigation. I will take that on notice and get back to you.

**ANSWER:** This death in custody occurred at the Outer Metropolitan Multi-Purpose Correctional Centre in September 2018.

It is not appropriate for CSNSW to interfere with the NSW Police investigation being conducted on behalf of the State Coroner and their scheduling of interviews with potential witnesses. On this basis, the CSNSW Investigation Report is anticipated to be completed in December 2018.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Will you commit to bringing the family in and communicating directly with the family on completion of the report and not wait for the coronial inquiry?

**Mr SEVERIN:** I am very happy to do that.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Did the police carry out an investigation in regard to the death in December 2017 in Parklea?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Absolutely, yes, under law.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** So you would have the outcomes of that police investigation?

**Mr SEVERIN:** I do not. They report that to the Coroner, not to us.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** To move on to a different point, the contract for the Parklea facility was awarded recently. Will you publish that contract in its entirety?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Yes. The contract has not been awarded yet so there is nothing to publish. We only have a preferred tenderer. But all contracts—that is, the contract for Junee, the current contract Parklea and the contract for Grafton—are publicly available on the government website. I will hand over to Mr Scasserra to explain it.

**Mr SCASSERRA:** We publish all our contracts online. So our website will contain the list. We can send the link or provide the link that has those contracts available to them. This contract, once signed, will go up on the website as well, with the exception of some minor commercial-in-confidence components.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** How minor?

**Mr SCASSERRA:** These are internal workings. They are the formula of how you work out the inner workings of some of the KPIs. But the KPI is still listed and so are the outcomes. The achievement and the nonachievement of the KPIs listed are formula only. They do not get listed.

**Mr SEVERIN:** I will explain why that is necessary. It is not to withhold information from the public. They are formula, and if we go back and tender for another facility again, that would give bidders the ability to very clearly manipulate the desired outcome. This is done for entirely commercial reasons. It has nothing to do with the operator or the operation of the centre. We are talking about formulas for KPIs. We will publish the whole contract, including the KPIs and the abatement regimes. I remember indicating in my previous evidence, that we will then publish all the outcomes of our contract monitoring on a quarterly basis for publicly and privately managed centres.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But if you ever go to tender again on a facility, you would obviously need to put that information in the tender documents because otherwise the operator who has access to that information—

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Has an advantage.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** —would have a grossly unfair commercial advantage.

**Mr SEVERIN:** That is correct.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I cannot comprehend the rationale— **The**

**Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Let him answer.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** —for excluding it now.

**Mr SCASSERRA:** That is correct. It is within the procurement process, which is a confidential process so that those operators do not or cannot publish that information. They have not published the current tender and will not. They are under the confidential bounds of this tender, and that is how all tenders in New South Wales are conducted.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But all the key players already have access to the formula. What possible damage is being done?

**Mr SCASSERRA:** There may be new players that are attracted to the market. So, again we do provide—

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But then you will give them the formula. I cannot comprehend the commercial-in-confidence issue. If you give it to them eventually when they are tendering, how does publicly releasing it now cause some sort of commercial damage when a future tender happens if you are going to give it to them anyhow?

**Mr SCASSERRA:** As I said, there are only small components of the contract that are commercialinconfidence. These are those commercial-in-confidence—



**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You are still not answering my question.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Do not do this. Let him answer.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You are not still answering my question.

**Mr SCASSERRA:** Again, as I said, they are the commercial components that make this contract particular to the tender we agree to. They are negotiated; we have not completed the tender yet. Again, if they were kept in the standard format, we would look at releasing as much as we possibly can. There are components that remain commercial-in-confidence, which gives the State its ability to leverage in terms of the outcomes we are achieving.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Can we ask about benchmarking?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I want to continue before we move away from the current contract. I do not know whether you have had the opportunity to look at the submission from Dr Jane Andrew and Dr Max Baker, two academic accountants. It would take too long to read parts of their submission into the record. However, in the appendix to their submission they have set out a variety of criteria that they believe should be contained in "Performance measures" and "Performance according to performance measures and inspections". I refer to pages 15, 16 and 17 of their report. Can you take on notice and respond to whether or not those matters are proposed to be dealt with in the current contract? They also set out transparency provisions about the contract on page 11 of the report.

**Mr SEVERIN:** We will do that.

**ANSWER:** Corrective Services responds to the concerns raised in Andrew and Baker's article in consideration of:

- the content and publication of contracts;
- the operational performance monitoring framework; and
- the approach to contract management.

#### Content and publication of contracts

Corrective Services has greatly strengthened its contract model for private operators of NSW prisons. The new contract model is intended to provide greater comparability between publicly and privately managed prisons and a more transparent picture of performance across the prison system in order to ensure community safety and reduce the rate of reoffending. In future, Corrective Services intends to publish a prison performance league table on an annual basis, which will allow a comparison of performance between prisons.

Corrective Services publishes all contracts for privately managed correctional centres online. This will include the Parklea Correctional Centre contract, once it is executed.

#### Operational performance monitoring framework

Corrective Services ensures accountability of private operators through:

- robust and comprehensive service standards and performance indicators;
- strong performance management, monitoring and reporting frameworks; and
- mechanisms for ensuring a decisive response to any issues impacting on operational integrity and performance.

Under the current Parklea Contract, there are 34 Performance Linked Fees (PLFs). Before these fees are paid or withheld each year, a number of performance indicators are assessed. Each year, a review of performance against PLF criteria is undertaken and a recommendation is made regarding the value of the management fee to be withheld. Recommendations are considered and endorsed by the Commissioner before being applied.

Corrective Services is also developing a future rating system that is designed to ensure greater transparency and comparability in the assessment of correctional centre performance. This rating system will apply for both public and privately operated correctional centres.

Within this system, performance will be assessed by qualitative and quantitative metrics grouped under the outcomes of Rehabilitation and Reintegration; Safety and Security; Decency and Respect; and Professionalism and Accountability. New performance metrics target key risk areas and strategic priorities to drive quality service provision and the achievement of strategic outcomes.

#### Contract management

The approach to contract management is risk based and focused on the achievement of outcomes. An outcome focus ensures that Corrective Services is focused on the impact of contracted services rather than individual outputs, processes or activities. It also allows service providers to be flexible and agile in their use of resources and approach to service delivery.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We will go back to benchmarking. I assume the KPIs come into this as well. I know, Mr Scholes, that you went through this last time in regard to case plans and the different levels. Having looked at all the prisons ourselves and the great differences across them that relate at the design of the prison, the type of prisoner—

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** And the size.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Yes, the size. There are things such health facilities. You know about the problems at Junee. Perhaps you can explain why no dental facilities were built in the pop-up prisons, which creates a complexity. It is difficult for the Committee to comprehend how benchmarking prisons gives you a good indication and an efficacy about what the State is getting out of the contracts for the prisons and also how they are performing.

**Mr SCHOLES:** From a benchmarking point of view, I think I said in my evidence previously that it is predominantly the north that has rolled into benchmarking. We are operating all centres in the north of the State under benchmarking. Essentially, it has moved us into an outcomes focus for the KPIs—that is, prisoners going to work, programs and education. The focus is on that and not the cost per inmate per day. It is an outcomes focus for reducing re-offending.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Junee is a good example because it has training. It has three inmates who are currently employed as part of its KPIs. However, it can have only C category prisoners in employment. The reality is that it could actually move more into that KPI. How are you working those criteria? The prison could be performing better, but it does not because of the type of prisoners it has.

**Mr SCHOLES:** I will use the rapid-build prisons as an example. We were all out there and we had a look at the centre. Everyone in the rapid-build does half a day working in employment. Everyone is employed. In the afternoon, they do half a day in programs, education and other services. That is a full-engagement model so that every inmate is getting the maximum amount of exposure to those activities. The rapid-builds arguably are different from our traditional system.

If you look at a maximum security environment, for example, a mid-North Coast correctional centre, the vast number of inmates are working or are in education or programs. It is a different model in terms of how it operates. It is not as structured as the rapid-builds. Although Corrective Services Industries' arm has its KPIs around what they are producing and how they produce it, for us it is vocational training, whether we are getting people qualified and whether they are going through the EQUIPS programs to address their addictions and other matters that are criminogenic. That is the important thing, to make sure that when these people get out—whether they are in the maximum side or they progress through to the medium side and they are released from

minimum security—we have done everything we possibly can to give them the best opportunity not to reoffend in the community. Have I answered the question?

**The Hon. LYNDIA VOLTZ:** Now I am thinking that we are not benchmarking necessarily; we are just into KPIs.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What are we benchmarking against? That sounds like KPIs, which I think we all understand. What is the benchmarking against?

**Mr SEVERIN:** In the first instance, we benchmark against ourselves. In the analysis undertaken at the start of this process we looked at 30 different areas of activity in a correctional facility, from the gatehouse through to programs. Ms Voltz is right, it was evident that you cannot benchmark a Long Bay with a Manus. That would not make sense. We ended up grouping like prisons in four different categories. Some hang right outside. Supermax is not part of it and a couple of other operations are not part of it because they are very different. Then within them we establish how many we need to undertake a certain function in a centre that is very much like another centre.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Is that how many officers?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Yes, staff. It is the staff you need to achieve the KPIs, but also to make sure we are efficient as we can be and offer the best value for money.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** I am not being critical.

**Mr SEVERIN:** For me the very clear objective was that we needed to be sure we did not just cut staff and that we had staff on the ground who could ensure that those KPIs could be reached, that we had people in employment and that we had prisoners in education et cetera.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But we have slipped from benchmarking to KPIs because you are working out how many staff you need to run a particular program. That is a benchmark. If you are working out what those staff produce, that is a KPI.

**Mr SEVERIN:** But it is intricately linked. For example, if we want to achieve better time out of cell, we need staff to be in the centre to do that, to facilitate that. In arriving at our staffing levels when it comes to time out of cell, we needed to test with the staff—that is a three-month consultation process—that they are sufficiently staffed to ensure that time out of cell meets the benchmark or the KPI. We have done that in four different categories, from very large centres to slightly smaller centres to medium centres to very small centres. Again then we still had to look at individual issues like, for example, design. You cannot do every centre exactly the same. That is what the moderation is there for. That is why we actually say, "Here's your draft benchmark, which may be exactly the same as it is for centre X, but we now give you three months to work through if it will work for you or not." That is essentially what has happened.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I think you talked us through the process in Wellington about how the basic benchmark was set and then there was this kind of negotiation or moderation process that you talk about. Largely that has been resolved now, so that has set your benchmarks. What are you measuring against now? Now that you say that you get 5.6 full-time staff on this particular day and 7.2 for this shift, what are you measuring against?

**Mr SCHOLES:** One of the key things for us is the time out of cells, whereas before we did benchmarking there were no requirements; however, the lockdowns were significantly greater. I missed the question, I am sorry, where you were going with that before, but the change to the formula in particular with how we calculate staff actually increased.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** We recall that complex formula that you put up.

**Mr SCHOLES:** The idea is the time out of cells but also the fact that you have to have enough custodials to be able to get them to the various areas, programs, industries and whatever and move them around the centre. There was never a requirement for that to happen in the past. If say, for example, education was on but we did not have the staff to get them there it would not necessarily occur. To the best effect we could try to move them with the staff we had. Now the expectation on governors is very clear: you will get them from point A to point B. Where we have previously had, for example, a hospital escort going on, one of the key things with benchmarking is we now no longer say that we are going to pull two people out of the centre, they are going to do the hospital escort and we are going to shut an area down. We now bring staff in or we cover off or we use

other resources to make sure that the operation of the structured day goes ahead so the inmates are getting access to the services.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** Let me cut to the chase. The Public Service Association came in here and told us that 378 people would go under the benchmarking. Is that true?

**Mr SEVERIN:** The total reduction in roles that is expected, we are still in one centre, is 215. That includes the rank of assistant superintendent. However, we are obviously creating new roles. So the total loss of staff through voluntary redundancy is actually now 29. We had a net loss of 29 staff.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** Let us just go through the numbers. The 378 is not true.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Well, it is not correct.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The 378 may have been on the initial figures were put out and there has been a moderation process that has reduced that to 215. Would that be a fair summary?

**Mr SCHOLES:** Yes.

**Ms ROBSON:** In actual fact, on our numbers the draft benchmarks were more around 312 staff going. As the commissioner has indicated, we expect it will be somewhere around 215. That is not staff; they are roles that are going. As the commissioner has pointed out, we have retained a large number of the people whose roles have been affected and they have been redeployed into either new roles that are coming about because of expansions, or because of new case management programs that are being rolled out, or indeed people are being promoted within the system into new roles.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Or people are leaving and you are not filling the positions. Would that be the case?

**Ms ROBSON:** In some cases going into benchmarking we did leave some roles unfilled, again very clearly so we did not put people in roles only to then affect them.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** So 215 roles no longer exist. How many new roles are there?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It is 176 or it is some other figure?

**Mr SEVERIN:** There are about 1,500 new roles overall with the prison program, but we did create the case management roles and we created more senior assistant superintendent roles, the exact number of which we would have to take on notice.

**ANSWER:** At 9 October 2018, the total new roles are anticipated to be 1,562. This includes prison new builds, expansions, reducing re-offending reforms and other role creation over and above July 2016 benchmarks.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** We are talking about in existing facilities, not the expanded or new facilities?

**Mr CORCORAN:** In existing facilities we also in this formula that Mr Scholes was talking about before put in a whole range of staff, about \$17 million worth of staff, at the base grade level as well.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Except at the Wellington rapid-build pop-up there had been the shift. You went through explaining where you were shifting roles in that facility and said that you were putting in nine case management positions. When we went to see the case managers, there were only five. I said, "You are short," and they said, "Yes, they are going to employ one more." That only brings it up to six. Are they positions that are all filled?

**Ms ROBSON:** The exact status of whether roles are filled in a particular location we would have to take on notice. Obviously, recruitment changes potentially on a daily basis.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Even the people working in the section only thought there were going to be six positions, but there had been a clear indication that the restructure had allocated nine to it.

**Ms ROBSON:** We will take that on notice.

**Mr SHOLES:** I would have to check the numbers too because we have had so many. I am not sure whether it was six or nine. From recollection, I think there were two roles still to be filled. If we can take it on notice we can provide that.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I accept it is complex, but you have been able to give us a pretty clear number of roles that have disappeared as a result of benchmarking, which is 215. Can you come back and tell us the number of additional roles that have been created, therefore we can work out what the net loss is?

**Mr SEVERIN:** We will do that.

**ANSWER:** There are nine case management roles at Macquarie Correctional Centre made up of two Senior Case Managers (clerk 7/8) and seven Case Managers (clerk 5/6).

The roles have all been filled since the commencement of the project. However with attrition, two Case Manager roles have recently been vacant. An officer has commenced training to fill one role and recruitment action will commence on the second vacant role in November 2018.

See response to previous response in regard to the number of new roles.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** One of the narratives in this inquiry is that we have seen the prison population across New South Wales increase.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Significantly.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** Has there been a commensurate increase in correctional staff as well?

**Mr SEVERIN:** Absolutely. We are recruiting more staff than we have ever recruited in the history of corrections in this State.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What would be really helpful would be a full-time staff to prisoner ratio going back over the past five years so that we could track that.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** That is not really helpful, is it?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I would find it helpful.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** This ratio exercise suggests a uniformity that does not really exist, does it?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I am asking about staff to inmates across the system.

**Mr SEVERIN:** It is almost meaningless. I apologise for using language like that. You really need to look at like functions. We need to look at a unit, for example, that has a similar size to another unit and look at the staffing levels in that unit compared to another unit.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** There may be an explanation of it but the overall number of full-time staff compared with the number of inmates would be a useful metric. It may be explained by the fact that you have opened new facilities that have lower staffing requirements because of a variety of other modern things. That can be explained in any answer you give.

**Mr SEVERIN:** It very much relies on the role and function of the facility, for example.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I understand. It is a good starting point.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** A Long Bay is very different from a Berrima.

**Mr SEVERIN:** We will take that on notice and come back with as meaningful information as we possibly can.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I do not think that it is a linear test. I accept that it is complex.

**Mr SEVERIN:** As long as that is clear.

**ANSWER:****Public Correctional Centres Only**

	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15	2013-14
Ratio: Public prison prisoners and detainees to operational staff	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.1

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** We would expect the Wellington and Cessnock pop-ups to be almost similar.

**Mr CORCORAN:** They are identical.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Ms Voltz raised the issue of the dental facilities that are available or not available in the pop-ups when Justice Health was here. Is this a problem in jails?

**Mr CORCORAN:** Right at the outset we were trying to build these things very quickly and we thought we were going to have four of these things. One of the methodologies for getting the thing built quickly was to have a concept of a dental truck that would go between the facilities and provide dental services.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Like the old ones we used to have at school, for us that are old enough to remember.

**Mr CORCORAN:** That is right. If you look at the design of the facility you will notice that there is a rather large area outside the clinic where that truck was supposed to park. But we went through an extensive process in the commissioning phase of producing a number of papers to see whether that was a viable option. We settled eventually on having the inmates transfer over to Wellington and Cessnock prisons to get their dental care.

**Mr SEVERIN:** There may well be an opportunity further down the track to look at engaging another service for that. Again, it is a responsibility for Justice Health. At the moment, based on all the advice that was available eventually, the truck was not viable for Justice Health. I agreed to then organise the transfer of inmates and use the dental facilities in the adjacent facility.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** Would it not, in the long term—given how labour-intensive the transfers are—be easier to extend?

**Mr SCHOLES:** Believe it or not, it is very difficult to get the dentist—particularly in the Wellington area—out there. So the dental truck does do Wellington and Macquarie—they are co-located. At the Hunter Correctional Centre we take them over to Shortland—the other centre—because they have the appropriate facilities there; it is close. It makes sense to have the mobile service out west because it is very hard to get some of the services out west. They will do it as visiting arrangements more often, rather than trying to get a permanent position.

**The CHAIR:** My question is slightly less esoteric—noise in the rapid-build prisons. What practical solutions have you come up with? What complaints have you encountered?

**Mr CORCORAN:** That has not been an issue for us.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** It might be for the prisoners.

**The CHAIR:** You are not living there.

**Mr CORCORAN:** I have spent the night in there.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** And you complained about the noise, from memory.

**Mr CORCORAN:** Mr Scholes and I did spend the night there.

**The CHAIR:** Some people were saying to us that there were issues around snoring and stuff.

**Mr CORCORAN:** Mr Scholes and I spent half a day with the inmates from Macquarie. We were sitting with their representatives two days ago, as we are doing a review at the moment of the rapid builds. We were getting everybody together to see where we move in the future and what we can do to improve things there. I have to say that that did not feature at all as one of the issues that the inmates were raising. In fact, it was quite amazing to hear some of the things that they were saying about wanting to stay in these rapid builds, and what they had done for them in terms of changing their lives. Some of these people were very hardened criminals who had extensive and violent histories in prison. Their behaviour had changed to such an extent that they were— **The Hon. DAVID CLARKE:** You had no complaints about snoring at all?

**Mr CORCORAN:** Not one.

**Mr SEVERIN:** We have not had one complaint.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What about the sense of security?

**Mr SCHOLES:** That was really important. At the last lot of evidence I think we said that we were really surprised about the outcomes—how good it was going—yet the other day when we were there talking to the inmates we actually asked the question straight up, "How do you feel in terms of your personal security?" There were 30-odd inmates there who were the delegates for their units. They said, "It's great; not a problem." That was actually the terminology. We said, "What would you do to improve it?" The head delegate said, "You guys have really got this right. This is working. We're actually doing something." We said, "What is there that we should otherwise do differently?" The answer was, "Could we get some access to tertiary studies?" **The CHAIR:** Can we get some of the guys in green here to verify that?

**Mr CORCORAN:** We should have videoed it, because, quite frankly, I was blown away by it.

**The Hon. LYNDA VOLTZ:** I am not sure you would get anything out of them; you could do your own time in prison.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Could I ask a question on another front. There are about 60 forensic mental health patients that are being held primarily at Long Bay, who are being given involuntary mental health treatment within a corrective service setting. Do you agree with Justice Health that that is a poor outcome and that it would be far preferable if they were all held in a medical facility rather than a corrective setting?

**Mr SEVERIN:** That is almost a Dorothy Dixier.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I am just interested.

**Mr SEVERIN:** Of course we are concerned about having mental health patients in our custody. We obviously communicate with the Mental Health Tribunal about this. We have no ability to move them into forensic mental health facilities. That is a prerogative of the health system.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Is it a lack of beds in the forensic mental health system that means you cannot move them on?

**Mr SEVERIN:** I would not go as far as professing that I have the answers for that. We respond to it. We have a strategy in place for Long Bay to increase the availability of step-down arrangements—not just for those who are there and should be in a mental forensic mental health hospital under the direction of the Mental Health Tribunal, but also for those who have mental health issues that are not regulated. So we are acutely aware of this. It is not an issue that we are content with, or ever will be, but we need to constructively work on their safe management and supporting whatever Justice Health can do.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Do you agree that the answer does not lie in additional facilities within the prison system; that the answer lies in finding accommodation for them—secure forensic accommodation for them—in a medical setting outside of the prison system?

**Mr SEVERIN:** I would agree with that.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Lastly, are you aware of the recommendation from the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists—

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** You have got him over the line!

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** —that came out in December last year? Have you raised that with the department? Have you raised with the Minister the recommendation that recommended exactly that?

**Mr SEVERIN:** We certainly have dialogue, particularly at officer level. I am not responsible for the capital works program for the Ministry of Health—

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I understand that.

**Mr SEVERIN:** —but clearly it is an issue that we continue to have dialogue about. I do not think there is anybody—whether they are in Health or Corrections—who agrees that this is a good solution. It has been around, I understand, for decades almost. We have had some relief with the good facility out at Long Bay—the forensic mental health hospital. I would like to think there was more possible going forward.

**The CHAIR:** We might draw it to an end there. Thank you very much. There are no more questions. I note that you have taken a number of questions on notice. We have a slightly shorter notice period now—10 days, please.

**(The witnesses withdrew)**

**(The Committee adjourned at 16:05)**