

APPENDICES

Appendix one: Recidivism index	96
Appendix two: Information on rehabilitation quotient	100
Appendix three: Report under Section 190 of the <i>Corrections Act 2004</i> and Section 15A of the <i>Parole Act 2002</i>	101



APPENDIX ONE: RECIDIVISM INDEX

RECIDIVISM INDEX – 12-MONTHS FOLLOW-UP (PERCENTAGES) FOR 2011/12

Category	Group	Released from prison		Beginning community sentence	
		Re-imprisoned	Reconvicted	Imprisoned	Reconvicted
All (2011/12)		26.7	44.2	4.4	26.8
Gender	Female	16.8	35.0	1.9	19.9
	Male	27.9	45.3	5.1	28.7
Ethnicity	Māori	30.1	48.4	5.7	31.3
	European	23.2	40.1	3.7	25.0
	Pacific	23.6	40.3	4.2	25.7
	Other (incl. Asian)	10.7	18.6	2.2	18.7
Age (at Prison release or start of Community sentence)	<20 years	45.5	69.1	6.0	40.5
	20-24 years	31.2	52.4	4.7	30.8
	25-29 years	31.4	51.0	4.8	26.1
	30-39 years	24.5	41.3	4.7	24.7
	40 and above	16.0	27.4	2.6	16.1
Gang Affiliate	Yes	40.8	57.9	16.5	52.2
	No	20.5	38.2	3.2	24.3
Offence Group (Most serious for original sentence)	Dishonesty	37.0	57.7	6.7	35.9
	Property Damage/Abuses	30.1	48.5	7.2	36.0
	Admin	42.6	57.0	11.4	34.7
	Violence	26.7	43.7	4.7	27.7
	Traffic	15.0	33.8	2.5	21.9
	Drug & Anti-social	18.6	33.8	4.6	25.3
	Sexual	12.6	17.8	4.1	13.3
	Other Minor Offences	20.7	39.2	3.4	22.4
Offence Type (Most serious for original sentence)	Car Conversion	45.9	70.7	9.4	43.6
	Theft	37.6	63.3	7.2	39.5
	Burglary	38.1	58.4	7.3	39.1
	Fraud	21.2	32.5	2.8	16.7
	Intimidation and Threats	35.9	59.8	6.4	34.4
	Robbery	28.1	43.0	5.0	25.0
	Assaults	26.3	43.7	4.4	26.5
	Homicide	4.7	10.6	20.0	40.0
	Disqualified Driving	21.3	46.0	5.2	31.8
	Drink Driving	9.6	24.9	1.5	17.7
	Family Offences	36.8	56.5	9.6	37.2
	Drugs (Not Cannabis)	12.9	25.8	4.6	23.9
	Drugs (Cannabis Only)	12.3	28.3	2.7	19.8
	Sexual (Other)	21.1	27.1	4.4	15.2
	Sexual (Child Sex)	7.3	11.8	3.7	10.7

Category	Group	Released from prison		Beginning community sentence	
		Re-imprisoned	Reconvicted	Imprisoned	Reconvicted
All (2011/12)		26.7	44.2	4.4	26.8
Community Sentence	Community Work	n/a	n/a	4.6	28.1
	Supervision	n/a	n/a	4.7	24.3
	Intensive Supervision	n/a	n/a	6.4	33.6
	Community Detention	n/a	n/a	1.4	24.0
	Home Detention Sentence	n/a	n/a	5.2	20.4
Prisoner Security Classification (at Release)	Maximum	64.1	84.6	n/a	n/a
	High	44.1	65.1	n/a	n/a
	Low Medium	35.6	55.2	n/a	n/a
	Low	21.0	38.7	n/a	n/a
	Minimum	10.3	21.0	n/a	n/a
Release Type	Parole	18.3	28.0	n/a	n/a
	Post-release Conditions	28.6	49.2	n/a	n/a
Sentence Length	6 mth or less	31.2	51.5	4.3	27.2
	> 6mth but <= 1 yr	27.9	48.2	5.1	24.6
	> 1 to 2 yr	25.4	42.8	6.5	32.0
	> 2 to 3 yr	19.8	32.0	n/a	n/a
	> 3 to 5 yr	18.6	26.5	n/a	n/a
	> 5 yr	11.4	15.9	n/a	n/a
All (2010/2011)		27.0	43.3	4.8	28.4
All (2011/2012)		26.7	44.2	4.4	26.8

RECIDIVISM INDEX – 24-MONTHS FOLLOW-UP (PERCENTAGES) FOR 2009/10

Category	Group	Released from prison		Beginning community sentence	
		Re-imprisoned	Reconvicted	Imprisoned	Reconvicted
All (2011/12)		37.3	58.8	7.2	40.8
Gender	Female	25.3	48.9	3.8	31.0
	Male	38.7	59.9	8.1	43.4
Ethnicity	Māori	41.8	63.5	9.2	46.9
	European	32.8	53.5	6.2	39.0
	Pacific	30.7	54.9	6.1	37.3
	Other (incl. Asian)	21.8	36.1	3.9	32.2
Age (at Prison release or start of Community sentence)	<20 years	53.3	78.2	8.3	55.5
	20-24 years	43.1	69.0	7.7	45.8
	25-29 years	42.2	64.8	7.8	41.7
	30-39 years	36.4	57.7	7.7	37.9
	40 and above	23.3	38.5	4.8	25.4
Gang Affiliate	Yes	57.8	77.4	24.9	71.2
	No	29.0	51.2	5.5	37.9
Offence Group (Most serious for original sentence)	Dishonesty	53.1	75.2	10.6	51.6
	Property Damage/Abuses	35.6	61.4	9.6	48.7
	Admin	55.2	73.1	15.9	45.8
	Violence	36.8	58.2	7.5	42.8
	Traffic	22.1	46.2	4.8	35.2
	Drug & Anti-social	28.4	46.0	7.6	38.4
	Sexual	14.5	24.1	3.9	20.6
	Other Minor Offences	27.0	54.9	5.3	35.0
Offence Type (Most serious for original sentence)	Car Conversion	65.7	83.8	13.0	63.4
	Theft	48.2	72.3	11.4	57.0
	Burglary	55.8	79.3	11.8	55.5
	Fraud	36.2	50.6	5.5	27.2
	Intimidation and Threats	49.6	68.6	10.6	48.9
	Robbery	36.8	58.3	7.6	42.2
	Assaults	36.6	59.7	6.9	41.7
	Homicide	14.1	16.5	11.8	17.6
	Disqualified Driving	31.0	58.7	8.1	46.7
	Drink Driving	14.4	36.1	3.3	29.9
	Family Offences	58.0	71.6	15.0	54.2
	Drugs (Not Cannabis)	21.7	34.8	6.8	34.2
	Drugs (Cannabis Only)	19.9	40.6	5.4	32.8
	Sexual (Other)	20.7	32.6	5.1	21.2
	Sexual (Child Sex)	9.3	16.7	2.2	19.6

Category	Group	Released from prison		Beginning community sentence	
		Re-imprisoned	Reconvicted	Imprisoned	Reconvicted
All (2011/12)		37.3	58.8	7.2	40.8
Community Sentence	Community Work	n/a	n/a	7.3	41.5
	Supervision	n/a	n/a	7.9	38.7
	Intensive Supervision	n/a	n/a	10.0	51.2
	Community Detention	n/a	n/a	2.5	38.0
	Home Detention Sentence	n/a	n/a	9.0	35.9
Prisoner Security Classification (at Release)	Maximum	75.0	87.5	n/a	n/a
	High	60.6	80.1	n/a	n/a
	Low Medium	47.2	71.3	n/a	n/a
	Low	30.6	54.9	n/a	n/a
	Minimum	16.3	32.8	n/a	n/a
Release Type	Parole	27.3	42.4	n/a	n/a
	Post-release Conditions	41.1	64.8	n/a	n/a
Sentence Length	6 mth or less	41.9	65.6	6.9	40.9
	> 6mth but <= 1 yr	37.7	61.3	8.2	39.7
	> 1 to 2 yr	38.9	59.8	11.5	50.1
	> 2 to 3 yr	27.9	45.2	n/a	n/a
	> 3 to 5 yr	25.9	39.5	n/a	n/a
	> 5 yr	20.6	32.7	n/a	n/a
All (2010/2011)		37.0	59.9	7.7	43.1
All (2011/2012)		37.3	58.8	7.2	40.8

APPENDIX TWO: INFORMATION ON REHABILITATION QUOTIENT

The Department's Rehabilitation Quotient (RQ) measures the impact of the major rehabilitative programmes. RQ shows the extent to which re-offending is reduced by comparing rates of reconviction and re-imprisonment, amongst 'treated' offenders (who completed a rehabilitative intervention), with the rates observed amongst 'untreated' offenders (similar offenders, matched to a range of risk-related factors, who had no involvement in the programmes).

RQ scores are calculated separately for programmes delivered in prison and in the community. The cohort of prisoners are those released in the 12 months ending 31 March 2012, and we analyse their re-offending for the 12 month period following their release. The cohort of community offenders are those who commenced a community sentence in the 12 months ending 31 March 2012, and we measure their re-offending for the 12 months following completion of the programme.

The figures represent percentage point changes in the rates of re-imprisonment or reconviction of treated offenders compared to equivalent 'untreated' offender groups. A re-imprisonment score of -10.0 indicates that the rate of re-imprisonment for 'treated' offenders was 10 percentage points lower than for 'untreated' offenders (for example, 12 percent compared to 22 percent).

'Untreated' includes those who did not receive any form of treatment whatsoever, and those who received other forms of intervention but not the specific one being tested. The statistical method 'controls for' the influence of these factors.

Note that many prisoners and offenders participate in more than one programme. Where this occurs, the beneficial effects of this exposure to multiple programmes are not "double-counted" in each of the different programme RQs. The effect size of some programmes reported are small and below the level of statistical significance. However, this does not necessarily mean that this particular programme has no impact on re-offending.

Participation in less intensive programmes with smaller effect sizes may instead enhance the effect sizes of the more intensive rehabilitation programmes (for example, participation in a special treatment unit rehabilitation programme).

APPENDIX THREE: REPORT UNDER SECTION 190 OF THE *CORRECTIONS ACT 2004* AND SECTION 15A OF THE *PAROLE ACT 2002*

SECTION 190(1)(A)

Requires the Chief Executive to report on how he has carried out his functions under section 8(1)(k) and Prison Managers have carried out their functions under section 12(d), of ensuring that processes are established and maintained to identify communities significantly affected by policies and practices in the corrections system, and giving opportunities for those communities to give their views on those policies and practices, and ensuring those views are taken into account.

The last year has seen a marked increase in Corrections' stakeholder engagement. As well as actively engaging with individuals and groups where our operations could potentially impact communities, e.g. the construction of a new 960 bed Public Private Partnership prison in Wiri, South Auckland, Corrections has spent more time working with employers, government agencies and community groups to gain a greater understanding of stakeholders' views and, in turn, provide a wider picture of what Corrections is doing to make a difference in people's lives.

We have worked closely with a number of large employers and industry leaders to encourage greater employment and training options for offenders.

Prison Open Days around the country were very well attended by thousands of members of the public, in particular the open days held as part of the closure of Wellington and New Plymouth Prison. This year we closed two of our oldest prisons and several units that were no longer fit-for-purpose. Staff, local councils and communities were consulted as part of this process. We also opened new service centres in several centres, including Kapiti, Papakura and Napier. Community engagement is carried out ahead of any construction.

This year saw the closure of the Faith Based Unit at Rimutaka Prison as part of a move to a new rehabilitation model. Our relationship with Prison Fellowship New Zealand (PFNZ) remains strong, with a new agreement between our organisations and new programmes that give prisoners greater access to reintegration services than ever before.

The From Prison Gate to Plate gala dinner prepared by prisoners at Rimutaka Prison was a sell-out. The first night was an event held for key stakeholders to showcase our work.

Stakeholders have been invaluable in their input around the support people need on their release from prison. They were also a driving force behind our provision of reintegration services in communities.

Engagement with whanau, iwi and local communities is an essential part of preparing people for reintegration ahead of leaving prison and once they are in the community. Iwi and community groups contributed to our reduced re-offending work through our new Regional Initiative Fund and helped us identify new and effective rehabilitation activities in prisons and in the community.

SECTION 190(1)(B)

A report on the work undertaken by the inspectors of Corrections, including statistical information about the disposition of complaints made by people under control or supervision and comment on issues arising from complaints or visits.

CHIEF INSPECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2012 / 2013 PURSUANT TO SECTION 190(1)(B) OF THE *CORRECTIONS ACT 2004*

Introduction

The Corrections Inspectorate is established under the provisions of section 28 of the *Corrections Act 2004* as a dedicated complaints resolution, investigation and assurance function, with accountability directly to the Chief Executive independently of operational line management. The legislation acknowledges the high level of risk attached to sentence management by providing an appropriate level of legislative prescription, protection and access for the agents of the Chief Executive in matters related to sentence management generally and the secure prison environment in particular.

Complaints to the Inspectors of Corrections

Community-based sentences traditionally generate a very low volume of complaints to the Inspectors. Only 15 were received for the year which is the same number as received for the previous year.

The effective and timely resolution of prisoner complaints is the primary area of focus for Inspector's and generates the majority of their workload. For reasons of safety, security, fairness and the mitigation of risk the Department expects prisoner issues and concerns to be resolved as soon as practicable and at the lowest possible organisational level. In the normal course of events that is within the prison, at unit level. It is the responsibility of Unit staff to resolve prisoner concerns by taking the appropriate action before they escalate into complaints or incidents. For those occasions where lower level resolution does not occur, or is not possible, the legislation provides the Department with a two-tiered system of internal complaints resolution. At prison site level, a robust, auditable internal complaints system exists so that prisoners can formally take matters for resolution to their Residential Manager or Prison Manager. This constitutes the first tier.

The Inspectorate is the Department's second tier of complaints resolution. As such it is effectively the Department's last opportunity to resolve a complaint before external agencies or Court action become involved. There were 2144 formal complaints received for the year. This was a decrease of approximately 33 percent on the 2011/2012 year total of 3169.

It should be noted that the Inspectorate had altered the manner in which it handled complaints from 1 April 2013 which would account for a significant portion of this decrease. Contacts from prisoners who had not used the internal complaints processes in the first instance are now referred back to prison management and are recorded as an information contact and not as a complaint. Complaints are now only recorded by the Inspectorate following a formal decision on their complaint being made by management that the prisoner did not accept. The exception to this rule is where there is an identified risk to the safety of any individual, or the matter relates to a statutory review where timeframes are critical, in these cases the Inspectorate will immediately become involved.

Only 11 of the 2144 complaints received in the 2012/2013 year were found to be justified. At 0.51 percent of total complaints this is in my view a very low proportion of the thousands of interactions that occur between the Department and offenders every year. It is also a decrease on the 2011/2012 year which resulted in 1.54 percent of complaints being categorised as justified (49 of the 3169).

The actual number of justified complaints is considered as somewhat artificial as the Inspectorate has previously endeavoured to negotiate a resolution to the complaint rather than categorising the complaint as justified. It was considered that in most cases prison management may not have been given the opportunity to resolve the matter in the first instance. It is anticipated that with the alteration to the Inspectorate complaint handling process, the ratio of justified complaints will rise. It is also assumed that the actual number of justified complaints may rise as prison management would have had the opportunity to address the issue prior to the Inspectorate becoming involved.

The highest category of justified complaints (5) related to the management of prisoner's personal property. These were isolated incidents of individual staff non-compliance with the system requirements rather than any systemic issues and in general were related to excessive time taken to resolve a property claim.

The Department had completed a comprehensive review of prisoner property and implemented new property handling processes. As was anticipated the number of total complaints related to prisoner property management have decreased by 37 percent with the implementation of the new policy and justified complaints in this category have also reduced from eighteen in the 2011/2012 year to five in the 2012/2013 year.

0800 Complaints line

Since 1997, the Inspectorate has operated a 0800 free-call phone line that offenders, and in particular prisoners and their families could use to raise a complaint directly with an Inspector during normal business hours. In 2012/2013 year there were 4664 calls received, of which 1815 generated a formal complaint. The remaining contacts were for general information or clarification of issues.

This facility still generates the vast majority of the contacts prisoners make with the Inspectors every year. While only 1815 of these contacts resulted in formal complaints during 2012/2013, the service is of considerable value as it allows a prisoner to immediately bring a serious concern to the attention of an Inspector. The Inspector is also in a position to immediately highlight a concern to prison management regarding a prisoner's state of mind and potential risk to themselves, or others, as a result of these calls.

Investigations

In addition to the prison visiting and complaints resolution activities, the Inspectors have conducted full investigations of ten prisoner deaths in custody (seven assumed natural causes, three assumed suicide). This is a decrease of 24 percent on the 13 deaths investigated for 2011/2012. The conduct of these investigations has been monitored by Investigating Officers from the Office of the Ombudsmen who attended most scene examinations and interviews and were kept apprised of developments throughout. Three further investigations of serious incidents in prisons have also been undertaken at the direction of the Chief Executive.

In the interests of transparency, the Inspectors have also continued to monitor the conduct and outcome of a number of internal prison investigations into prisoner's allegations of assault/abuse by staff. Twenty-four such monitoring reviews were carried out during the year, with only two cases being substantiated with disciplinary action being taken against the staff involved. This represents a decrease of 43 percent on 2011/2012 when 42 monitoring reviews were conducted.

The issues identified in these investigations tend to reflect isolated instances of non-compliance with some specified systems, usually by an individual, rather than any systemic issues in practice with those systems.

A proposed change to the Inspectorate work plan for the 2013/2014 year has been approved which will see the Inspectorate conducting thematic reviews of various aspects of prison operations using the Healthy Prison Standards, as developed and used by other international jurisdictions.

Conclusion

The Inspectorate has reported progressively throughout the year on the matters arising out of their various activities to operational management, to the Chief Executive, and to the Department of Corrections Audit Committee.

It cannot be stressed enough that Corrections is, and will remain, a difficult and potentially dangerous environment to manage and in which to work, as highlighted with the recent serious incident at Springhill Corrections Facility. Incidents are a fact of prison life in particular, and no jurisdiction in the world has developed an effective immunity to them. When they occur, incidents provide an easy target for criticism, generalisation and sensationalism.

Nonetheless, it remains the Inspectorate's view that the Department can be proud of the overall quality of its services and of the ongoing dedication and professionalism of its staff and managers. While isolated incidents will from time to time generate a disproportionate level of negative attention, the Inspectorate's overall view is derived from the largely positive findings arising out of the Inspectors visiting, investigation and review activities and the low level incidence of justified complaints to the Inspectorate throughout the year.

SECTION 190(1)(C)(D)(E)

A report on the processes and systems in place to supervise and control the monitoring of prisoner phone calls, including statistics on the proportion of prisoner calls monitored (otherwise than merely by being recorded) and the number and percentage of calls disclosed under section 117(1) and (2):

- > to any person other than an employee of the Chief Executive or a contractor
- > to an employee of the Chief Executive or a contractor, and
- > of those disclosed, the number of proceedings against a person for a disciplinary offence in which a recording of any of those calls was used in evidence.

Legislative authority for the Department to monitor prisoners' telephone calls is provided under section 113 of the *Corrections Act 2004*.

The monitoring of prisoner phone-calls made from payphones in prisons¹³ is an important part of our commitment to safety in the community and in our prisons. We use information collected from these calls to prevent drug use, violence, and escapes and protect victims and crimes being organised and committed in the community. We also share this information with the New Zealand Police, the Inland Revenue Department, the Ministry of Social Development, and other agencies to these ends.

Telecom New Zealand provide standard payphones for prisoner use in units across all prisons. Prisoners can purchase phone cards to pay for their calls through the prisoner canteen system, or they can be posted to the prisoner by family members and friends. All calls are recorded and monitored on a random or targeted basis. The exception is prisoners' calls to the Office of the Ombudsman, legal representatives, Crimestoppers, Members of Parliament and selected Government agencies, which are exempt from monitoring.

All prisoner calls are managed through a control centre – which restricts the calls that prisoners are able to make. Only ten numbers are able to be loaded onto the prisoners "approved calling" list. This is to prevent criminal activity or harassment of victims, or members of the public, from within the prison. All numbers are verified by prison staff and permission sought from the call recipient before the number is approved.

In 2012/13, the cost of calls made from payphones became cheaper due to changes in Telecom's pricing strategy. This increased the number of calls made by prisoners in 2011/12, as well as the number of calls that were monitored (approximately 62,500 – up from 59,305 from the previous year). Ninety percent of these monitored calls produced valuable information to support the prevention and reduction of crime – up from 81 percent in 2011/12.

We are unable to capture specific details about each call we share with other agencies, but we know that doing so has resulted in a number of arrests (of prisoners, visitors, members of the community) for a variety of offences. We also know that sharing this information with our partners has made it possible to identify visitors who may pose a threat to staff and prisoners in our prisons, and led to the discover of drugs and other contraband.

SECTION 190(1)(F)

A report on measures to reduce drug and alcohol use by prisoners and the effectiveness of those measures, random-testing programmes and the results of those programmes.

New interventions have been introduced in our prisons, and more of our staff have been provided with skills and resources to rehabilitate prisoners. We have also made changes to the *Corrections Amendment Act* which apply to the rules around water loading (where prisoners drink a lot of water to intentionally dilute their urine samples when they are being tested for drugs).

To reduce drug and alcohol use by offenders in the community, our probation officers are delivering effective brief interventions to offenders with identified need subject to community-based sentences and orders.

The effectiveness of our prison-based interventions has been significantly improved through the introduction of a new screening tool to better identify alcohol and drug issues in prisoners and help staff determine which interventions will be needed. The number of positive random drug tests has been falling dramatically since 2008/9 and has remained at four percent for the last two years.

¹³ Telephone monitoring was progressively introduced throughout prisons in 2008. Every prison payphone in New Zealand now has phone monitoring facilities.

SECTION 190(1)(G)

A report on the operation of every security contract in force for the whole, or any part, of the year to which the Annual Report relates, including:

- > a summary of reports forwarded to the Chief Executive under section 171(2) or (3) and a summary of reports made to the Chief Executive under section 172(2)(b)
- > a summary of actions taken in relation to the operation of security contracts as a result of matters raised in any report forwarded or made.

Training provided to security officers employed by the Contractor

A total of 97 training courses were attended by security officers employed by the Contractor. Security officers received training in control and restraint (including both Instructor and Refresher training) and first aid. Security officers also achieved Full class 2 Drivers Licence qualifications.

The number and nature of complaints made by persons in relation to the carrying out, by security officers employed by the Contractor, of escort duties in respect of those persons, and how those complaints were resolved

There were no complaints made in relation to security officers employed by the Contractor.

The number and nature of any incidents involving violence by or against prisoners while in the custody of security officers employed by the Contractor

There was one reported incident involving violence by and against prisoners while in the custody of security officers employed by the Contractor. This assault resulted in minor injuries and was considered non-serious.

The number and nature of any incidents involving violence against security officers employed by the Contractor while carrying out escort duties or courtroom custodial duties

There was one reported incident involving violence against security officers employed by the Contractor while carrying out escort duties or courtroom custodial duties. This assault resulted in minor injury and was considered non-serious.

The number and nature of any incidents involving self-inflicted injuries to prisoners while in the custody of security officers employed by the Contractor

There were no reported incidents involving self-inflicted injuries to prisoners while in the custody of security officers employed by the Contractor.

The compliance, by security officers employed by the Contractor, with the requirements of sections 83, 84, 85, 87, and 88 of the *Corrections Act*

A total of 12 incidents were recorded in this area, all were deemed to be compliant with the requirements as specified in the *Corrections Act*.

The exercise, by security officers employed by the Contractor, of the powers conferred by sections 98 and 101 of the *Corrections Act* in order to perform the functions of security officers

A total of 43,769 searches were recorded by security officers employed by the Contractor during the reporting year. This included 12 strip searches.

The number and nature of any disciplinary actions taken against security officers employed by the Contractor, and the reasons for, and the outcomes of, those actions, including any penalties imposed

Disciplinary proceedings were initiated against one security officer employed by the Contractor, for offences related to staff conduct. The proceedings resulted in dismissal.

SECTION 190(1)(H)

A report on the operation of every contract prison in operation in whole or in part in the year, including:

- > **a summary of reports forwarded to the Chief Executive under section 199D (1A), (2) and (3)**
- > **a summary of reports made to the Chief Executive under section 199E(3)(b)**
- > **a summary of actions taken in relation to the management of contract prisons as a result of matters raised in any report forwarded or made.**

Management of Mt Eden Corrections Facility

This section provides a summary of the monthly reports submitted to the Chief Executive by the monitors of the Serco contract.

The Department has a contract with a private provider to run Mt Eden Corrections Facility (MECF). The primary outcomes of the contract are to achieve our goal of a reduction in re-offending, and to run the prison securely, safely and humanely.

MECF is the main remand prison for the Auckland and Northland area, with a maximum prison population of 966.

This makes it one of the largest prisons in the country and the largest prison with a predominantly remand population.

In MECF's second year of operation the site has seen over 20,000 movements through the receiving office, and over 1,000 inter-prison transfers.

Serco's performance in the second year managing MECF has seen improved and more consistent delivery. They have continued to embed their systems and become more familiar with the New Zealand legislative climate and environment. This year Serco published their 2013-2015 Strategic Plan for MECF, which highlights their commitment to supporting the Department's Creating Lasting Change strategy.

Our contract with Serco has 37 targets that must be met, with financial penalties imposed for non-performance on some of these targets. The results for Serco show that over 80 percent of their performance measured against these is consistent, most of the missed targets have 100 percent compliance requirements. Where appropriate the Department has issued performance notices in relation to the missed targets.

Serco are also measured against 14 key performance indicators, which provide a financial incentive for Serco to exceed baseline performance in some key areas. Serco have achieved 13 of the 14 key performance indicators.

Serco's results in the Department's Prison Performance Table have seen them move from a rating of "effective" in the first quarter of 2012/13 to "exceeding" in both the second and third quarters during the fourth quarter Serco have progressed to an "exceptional" rating.

Beyond our own monitoring and reporting activities, MECF remains subject to the wider justice sector's scrutiny, as well as through the independent Ombudsmen's proactive investigation of any issues and through the prison inspectorate.

During 2012/2013, under Serco's management, there have been no escapes or deaths in custody. Serco has again minimised the amount of drugs entering MECF and this is shown by having one of the lowest rates of positive drug tests in the country. Given that a large proportion of the prisoners that Serco manages are on remand, and remand prisoners generally have slightly higher positive general random drug test results, this is an encouraging result.

The requirement to generate and share innovation is reflected in the contract. There are a number of innovations that Serco has implemented at MECF, and a number of new proposals The Department, has agreed in principal to pilot at MECF. These will be closely monitored and if successful, adopted by the Department.

Serco commenced the introduction of a Violence Reduction and Safer Custody Strategies. These are designed to combat incidents of violence and intimidation, while at the same time empowering staff to feel confident when challenging, guiding and supporting prisoners who display patterns of poor behaviour.

During the year Serco gained registration as a Private Training Establishment which will enable them to train their own Corrections Officers in New Zealand, for the first time.

Ultimately, the success of the contract will be reflected in reduced re-offending. To that end, the contract included a commitment to develop a Key Performance Indicator on recidivism, which is to come into effect from 1 July 2013/14. This new measure is intended to reflect "density" through measuring the average number of days a prisoner is out of custody in the 12 month period after his release from MECF. The measure incentivises Serco to reduce re-offending by maximising the amount of time a prisoner spends out of custody.

SECTION 15A OF THE PAROLE ACT 2002

Section 15A(4) of the *Parole Act 2002* requires the Department of Corrections to include in its Annual Report information about the use of electronic monitoring.

The information required covers:

- > the number of offenders who were at any time subject to an electronic monitoring condition
- > the average number of offenders who were subject to an electronic monitoring condition and the average duration of the condition
- > the percentage of offenders who offended, while subject to an electronic monitoring condition
- > attached to an extended supervision order, were convicted for a breach of the condition, or convicted of any other offence
- > a description of processes and systems relating to electronic monitoring that were in place during the year reported on.

Section 15A (4) of the *Parole Act 2002* requires the Department of Corrections to include in its Annual Report information about the use of electronic monitoring conditions as provided under section 15 (3) (f). The Department also manages offenders on parole and extended supervision who are electronically monitored on a residential restrictions special condition under the provisions of section 15 (3) (ab). The following information relates to offenders subject to electronic monitoring under either section 15 (3) (f) or section 15 (3) (ab) of the *Parole Act 2002* for the financial year to 30 June 2013.

For the financial year ending 30 June 2013 the average number of offenders who were at any time subject to parole or extended supervision, with a residential restriction or electronic monitoring special condition, was 165. The total number of offenders subject to parole or extended supervision with residential restrictions or electronic monitoring at some point during the year ended 30 June 2013 was 395. The average length of time they were subject to such conditions during the financial year was 4.85 months.

During the year ending 30 June 2013, there were 49 offenders subject to extended supervision with residential restrictions or electronic monitoring. Of those 49 offenders:

- > 8 (16.33%) were convicted of a breach of their electronic monitoring/residential restriction condition
- > 17 (34.69%) were convicted of other offences, including breaches (15 offenders) of extended supervision order conditions other than electronic monitoring/residential restrictions.

Offenders on parole and extended supervision can have a special condition of residential restriction imposed by the New Zealand Parole Board or Court. The Department of Corrections considers the suitability of the offender's proposed address for the New Zealand Parole Board or Court, and assesses the safety and welfare of any occupants proposing to reside with the offender. In all cases the other occupants in the premises must consent to having an offender with a residential restriction special condition residing with them.

Offenders subject to electronic monitoring are required to wear an electronic anklet at all times to allow the Department of Corrections to monitor their whereabouts. If the offender tries to remove the anklet or leaves the monitored address without permission, an alarm is triggered and a security guard is sent to the house.

Offenders subject to a residential restriction special condition on parole or extended supervision can work outside the address, but only if authorised by a probation officer. Offenders may also apply for approved absences to attend rehabilitation, study or healthcare. Offender compliance with the direction of such absences is monitored.

Some offenders subject to an electronic monitoring condition may be required to submit to Global Positioning System (GPS) monitoring. GPS monitoring enhances the ability of the Department of Corrections to monitor an offender's compliance with any special condition they have related to their whereabouts in the community. It provides real-time information on an offender's location, which allows early detection of an offender entering prohibited locations or leaving a place in which they must remain.

