DCJ response to supplementary questions

For the financial years, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020, could you please provide the following information:

- 1. How many individuals were subject of a determination by a court to serve a:
 - a. Intensive Correction Order section 7 of the Crimes (Sentencing Procedures) Act 1999
 - b. Community Corrections Order section 8 of the Crimes (Sentencing Procedures) Act 1999
 - c. Conditional Release Order section 9 of the Crimes (Sentencing Procedures) Act 1999

See the attached table, entitled "Number of proven court appearances where the following penalties were applied: Intensive Corrections Orders, Community Corrections Orders and Conditional release orders".

There is no data for the financial year 2017/18, because Community Corrections Orders (CCOs) and Community Release Orders (CROs) did not exist at that time. The legislative framework for Intensive Corrections Orders (ICOs) and for suspension was also quite different.

The legislative reforms which established CCOs and CROs as sentencing options and revised the legislative framework for ICOs commenced on 24 September 2018, so data for questions 1 and 4 is for orders from this date onward.

NSW Criminal Courts Statistics July 2017-June 2020

Number of proven court appearances* where the following penalties^ were applied: intensive correction orders, community correction orders and conditional release orders.

by Aboriginality

		Jul 2017 - J	un 2018		Jul 2018 - Jun 2019				Jul 2019 - Jun 2020			
Penalty	Aboriginal	Non- Aboriginal	Unknown	Total	Aboriginal	Non- Aboriginal	Unknown	Total	Aboriginal	Non- Aboriginal	Unknown	Total
Intensive Correction Order	0	0	0	0	1710	4366	157	6233	2126	5100	215	7441
Community Correction Order with supervision	0	0	0	0	3308	8046	332	11686	4044	9514	346	13904
Community Correction Order without supervision	0	0	0	0	1566	5163	469	7198	1999	6759	686	9444
Conditional Correction Order - total	0	0	0	0	4874	13209	801	18884	6043	16273	1032	23348
Conditional Release Order with conviction, with supervision	0	0	0	0	347	1081	35	1463	163	553	16	732
Conditional Release Order with conviction, without supervision	0	0	0	0	785	2999	309	4096	662	2306	241	3211
Conditional Release Order with conviction - total	0	0	0	0	1132	4080	344	5559	825	2859	257	3943
Conditional Release Order without conviction, with supervision Conditional Release Order without conviction, without	0	0	0	0	78	435	29	542	82	422	39	543
supervision	0	0	0	0	894	8786	3645	13341	925	8134	2856	11933
Conditional release order without conviction - total	0	0	0	0	972	9221	3674	13883	1007	8556	2895	12476

Source: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

Reference: ap21-19871

Please retain this reference number for future correspondence

NOTE 1: Data sourced from the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research must be acknowledged in any document (electronic or otherwise) containing that data.

The acknowledgement should take the form of Source: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

NOTE 2: For information about Criminal Courts crime data please see our 'Criminal Courts - Glossary' webpage.

*Where a person has been found guilty of more than one offence, the offence which received the most serious penalty is the principal offence.

The persons included in the table above are not a count of unique people. Each person appears only once for each finalised court appearance (for either their principal offence or most serious unproven offence) but if a person has more than one finalised court appearance in the reference period they will appear in the table multiple times.

[^] In September 2018 sentencing reforms were implemented which meant several new penalty categories were created and others were revised. As such, some penalty categories in the table above did not exist prior to September 2018.

2. In each of those categories, how many people were deemed ineligible or unsuitable for those orders by Community Corrections?

3. Of those deemed ineligible or unsuitable, what were the reasons in each case?

Answers to questions 2 and 3 cannot be provided, because the questions are based on a flawed assumption.

Since the September 2018 sentencing reforms, Community Corrections does not assess offenders for suitability for an ICO, CCO and CRO.

Community Corrections provides Sentencing Assessment Reports (SARs) which advise the court of the risks presented by an individual offender and how Community Corrections would manage that offender if placed on supervision. This includes advice as to whether Community Corrections would be likely to suspend supervision. At the time of preparing an SAR, Community Corrections is not aware of whether an offender is likely to get an ICO, CCO or CRO, and it has no bearing on the assessment.

Community Corrections assesses offenders for suitability for community work or for home detention conditions, noting that the home detention assessment only occurs if requested by the court. If an offender is not suitable for those conditions, the court can still issue an order without them.

4. In each of those categories, how many orders were suspended by Community Corrections part way through the supervision period and for what reasons?

See the attached table entitled "Summary of Community Orders with Suspended Supervision Conditions".

It is important to clarify that, when supervision conditions are suspended, the community order itself continues until its expiry.

When supervision conditions are suspended, the offender is no longer required to report to a Community Corrections Officer; however, they remain subject to any other conditions of the order, such as community service work.

Community Corrections has reports in place to monitor offenders with suspended supervision conditions on their orders and can quickly identify any further incidents of concern through information received from sources such as NSW Police Force and Courts.

Supervision can be resumed at any time.

The main reason for suspending supervision conditions is that the offender is assessed as low risk. This practice is based on international evidence (the Risk-Needs-Responsivity model), which shows that supervision is most effective when applied to higher risk groups, and ensures that the finite resources available to Community Corrections are targeted where they will be most effective in improving community safety. If Community Corrections retained lower risk offenders on active supervision, fewer resources would be spent managing high risk offenders.

Table 1.Summary of Community Orders with Suspended Supervision Conditions

Financial Year	Order Type	Orders, as at end financial year (an offender may have multiple orders)							Offenders, as at end of financial year						
		Orders with suspended supervision condition Count		Total Orders Count		% of total orders with suspended supervision condition		Offenders with suspended supervision condition Count		Total Offenders Count		% of total offenders with supervision condition suspended			
		ATSI	Non-ATSI	ATSI	Non-ATSI	ATSI	Non-ATSI	ATSI	Non-ATSI	ATSI	Non-ATSI	ATSI	Non-ATSI		
2018/19*	ссо	2,790	11,753	11,013	30,266	7%	28%	1,561	7,044	4,836	14,612	8%	36%		
	CRO	395	2,286	970	4,337	7%	43%	237	1,388	520	2,344	8%	48%		
	ICO	1,453	9,312	6,252	21,788	5%	33%	614	4,075	1,906	7,470	7%	43%		
	ссо	4,376	17,742	16,076	46,754	7%	28%	2,502	10,802	7,063	23,310	8%	36%		
<u>2019/20</u>	CRO	525	2,493	1,421	6,541	7%	31%	298	1,510	784	3,606	7%	34%		
	ICO	2,519	13,300	10,790	35,005	6%	29%	991	5,240	3,148	11,577	7%	36%		

^{*} Financial Year 2018/19 is during 24 Sep 2018-30 Jun 2019 due to sentence legislation change