

**INQUIRY INTO PARKLEA CORRECTIONAL CENTRE AND
OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES**

Name: Name suppressed

Date received: 28 February 2018

Partially
Confidential

Submission to the Parliament of New South Wales

Regarding Parklea Correctional Centre and other operational issues

In reference to the benchmarking of prisons in New South Wales.

Dear Committee

I would like to draw the committee's attention toward the lack of an transparent industry standard regarding NSW Correctional Centres. In particular with regard to the current benchmarking process being undertaken by CSNSW.

I have concerns with substantial inconsistencies regarding the allocation of resources in regards to staffing numbers.

Primarily that all centres are bound by Key Performance indicators (KPI's). Of note is that the placement of staff can affect the outcomes of these KPI's and that an unequal distribution of those staff attracts penalties to centre's unable to meet the requirements through no fault of their own. In essence a greater staff to inmate ratio has been noted within Mary Wade CC and Macquarie CC, whilst it is recognised that Macquarie CC is a newly built rapid prison, it is not unique in open living arrangements for inmates throughout the system.

The massive distortion of staffing at Mary Wade is of note. Emu Plains CC and Mary Wade are based on a small centre profile which houses less than 250 inmates. Emu Plains has a maximum state of 186 staffing profile of 49. Mary Wade has a capacity of approximately 93 inmates and a staffing profile of 72 staff. I am at a loss to understand how both centres are affected by the same KPI's being under the same model of small centre staffing profile, yet Mary Wade is clearly not staffed under that profile. There does not appear to be a similar industry standard on staffing regarding the centres ability to meet KPI's.

It should be noted that Mary Wade is a Maximum security facility whilst Emu plains is a Minimum security facility. However Mary Wade is a newly refurbished centre that contains advanced electronic security, minimal industries and programs and in my opinion an unequal staffing profile compared to Emu Plains. Emu Plains has also not yet been allocated the funds to undertake the recommendation by the State Coroner in 2017 in relation to an upgrade of security around the centre.

Emu Plains conducts Extensive programs, Industries, External Leave Programs and most importantly a Mothers and Children's section housing Inmates with their children. I fail to understand why this centre receives only 1 x SAS position whilst Mary Wade receives 4 x SAS positions as this contravenes the CSNSW staffing model for a small centre.

These are only a small numbers of inconsistencies that I have noted, and are cause for great concern. The impact on Staff inmate and the community at large will be notable in a negative context and will ultimately result in the opposite of governmental goals regarding the reduction of recidivism, providing a safe and secure environment for offenders and providing a safe workplace for staff.

I believe that an extensive review of the benchmarking process is essential for any form of progress towards an acceptable outcome. As a stakeholder in the process I have noted on many occasions a

lack of communication in the way of information and clarification on projected outcomes when drivers of the reform have been questioned. In short the answer is usually "We're not sure." I cannot believe that this is the way that the New South Wales Government implements change regarding the safe and secure incarceration of its prisoners.

Of late I have noted greater amounts of information being reported to the media. This denotes to me a substantial level of staff and industry experts who obviously feel like they are not being heard when they voice concerns regarding current conditions or changes. I feel that it would be of benefit to the committee to take note of this action and not undertake suggestions from some parties that these are the comments of malcontents or agitators.

In summary I would like to highlight the point that I am only trying to draw the committee's attention to the inequity of the process of benchmarking. I am not what could be considered an industry expert but have gained some foresight and experience regarding corrections over a 25 year period as a correctional officer. I, like many others within CSNSW am not opposed to change and would like to see an improvement in efficiencies and effectiveness in reducing recidivism. I am not outlining all the issues or concerns that I am aware of but suggesting that with independent unbiased analysis of the reform that an effective and efficient reform could be enacted rather than what appears to be a misuse of public funds. I believe that the reform should be suspended until such time as investigation by the committee outlines the best course of action for the state.

Thanking you for your time and consideration.