



**Department of Corrections
Annual Report - Part D**

Appendices

APPENDIX ONE: RECIDIVISM INDEX

RECIDIVISM INDEX – 12 MONTHS FOLLOW-UP (PERCENTAGES) FOR 2012/13

Category	Group	Released from prison		Beginning community sentence	
		Reimprisoned	Reconvicted	Imprisoned	Reconvicted
All (2012/2013)		25.9	41.7	4.4	26.4
Gender	Female	12.9	30.1	2.1	18.8
	Male	27.2	42.9	5.0	28.4
Ethnicity	Māori	29.3	46.2	5.9	30.9
	European	23.7	38.2	3.6	25.0
	Pacific	16.9	31.9	3.6	24.7
	Other (incl. Asian)	11.3	22.0	2.8	20.7
Age (at prison release or start of community sentence)	<20 years	39.5	64.6	5.9	41.1
	20-24 years	29.3	50.3	4.7	30.0
	25-29 years	31.1	47.2	4.9	26.5
	30-39 years	25.2	39.0	4.7	25.1
	40 and above	16.3	26.9	2.6	16.5
Gang Affiliate	Yes	37.4	55.3	15.7	51.6
	No	20.2	35.0	3.1	23.6
Offence Group (Most serious for original sentence)	Breaches	27.8	46.4	8.9	32.6
	Burglary	39.4	59.7	7.2	37.5
	Dishonesty	37.3	54.5	5.6	31.4
	Drugs	11.1	21.4	3.2	20.4
	Property damage	28.6	48.2	5.3	36.6
	Sexual	10.4	18.4	1.0	11.5
	Traffic	13.3	26.2	2.5	21.8
	Violence	22.3	37.9	4.6	27.1
	Weapons	22.3	43.8	5.9	31.8
	Other	34.7	47.9	3.9	24.0
Community Sentence	Community work	n/a	n/a	4.5	27.8
	Supervision	n/a	n/a	4.5	24.5
	Intensive supervision	n/a	n/a	7.5	34.3
	Community detention	n/a	n/a	1.3	23.3
	Home detention sentence	n/a	n/a	5.6	19.4
Prisoner Security Classification (at release)	Maximum	65.2	82.6	n/a	n/a
	High	48.6	65.8	n/a	n/a
	Low Medium	34.7	53.2	n/a	n/a
	Low	21.1	37.8	n/a	n/a
	Minimum	10.0	19.7	n/a	n/a
Release Type	Parole	15.8	25.9	n/a	n/a
	Post-release conditions	28.9	46.7	n/a	n/a
Sentence Length	6 mth or less	29.8	48.3	4.1	26.8
	> 6mth but <= 1 yr	29.4	46.6	4.9	24.3
	>1 to 2 yr	26.9	41.8	8.9	32.3
	>2 to 3 yr	14.8	28.0	n/a	n/a
	>3 to 5 yr	17.1	25.7	n/a	n/a
	>5 yr	11.2	17.9	n/a	n/a
All (2011/2012)		26.7	44.2	4.4	26.8
All (2012/2013)		25.9	41.7	4.4	26.4

RECIDIVISM INDEX – 24 MONTHS FOLLOW-UP (PERCENTAGES) FOR 2011/12

Category	Group	Released from prison		Beginning community sentence	
		Reimprisoned	Reconvicted	Imprisoned	Reconvicted
All (2011/2012)		36.8	58.9	6.6	38.7
Gender	Female	23.1	48.7	3.1	29.4
	Male	38.3	60.0	7.5	41.2
Ethnicity	Māori	41.2	64.4	8.6	44.7
	European	31.8	53.4	5.5	36.5
	Pacific	32.8	53.0	6.0	37.5
	Other (incl. Asian)	16.1	25.5	4.0	28.8
Age (at prison release or start of community sentence)	<20 years	55.2	81.9	8.1	53.9
	20-24 years	42.0	68.4	7.1	43.9
	25-29 years	43.9	66.2	7.3	39.4
	30-39 years	34.7	57.3	7.0	36.7
	40 and above	23.3	39.3	4.2	24.4
Gang Affiliate	Yes	54.5	74.9	22.9	69.2
	No	28.3	51.3	4.8	35.4
Offence Group (Most serious for original sentence)	Breaches	40.4	63.9	11.1	46.4
	Burglary	51.2	74.6	10.8	53.2
	Dishonesty	45.2	68.7	8.9	44.6
	Drugs	18.1	38.5	5.1	31.9
	Property damage	37.6	63.4	9.6	50.1
	Sexual	16.9	23.4	5.6	18.9
	Traffic	25.2	49.0	4.0	33.2
	Violence	36.1	59.2	6.7	40.0
	Weapons	47.5	68.3	8.9	49.1
Other	39.2	60.3	5.8	34.4	
Community Sentence	Community work	n/a	n/a	6.8	39.6
	Supervision	n/a	n/a	7.2	36.2
	Intensive supervision	n/a	n/a	8.9	47.4
	Community detention	n/a	n/a	2.2	36.7
	Home detention sentence	n/a	n/a	8.4	33.8
Prisoner Security Classification (at release)	Maximum	76.2	92.9	n/a	n/a
	High	56.0	78.6	n/a	n/a
	Low Medium	47.9	70.2	n/a	n/a
	Low	30.5	55.9	n/a	n/a
	Minimum	16.8	33.1	n/a	n/a
Release Type	Parole	26.6	42.8	n/a	n/a
	Post-release conditions	39.6	64.7	n/a	n/a
Sentence Length	6 mth or less	41.2	65.9	6.3	39.0
	> 6mth but <= 1 yr	40.4	63.2	7.6	36.8
	>1 to 2 yr	35.7	57.7	9.3	47.2
	>2 to 3 yr	27.6	48.9	n/a	n/a
	>3 to 5 yr	26.0	40.7	n/a	n/a
	>5 yr	19.5	27.6	n/a	n/a
All (2010/2011)		37.3	58.8	7.2	40.8
All (2011/2012)		36.8	58.9	6.6	38.7

APPENDIX TWO: INFORMATION ON REHABILITATION QUOTIENT

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

RQ scores are calculated separately for programmes delivered in prison and in the community. The cohort of prisoners is those who completed programmes in prison and were released in the 12 months ending 31 March 2013. We analyse their re-offending over the 12 month period following their individual release dates. The cohort of community offenders is those who completed a programme on a community sentence, where the programme end date occurred within the 12 months ending 31 March 2013; we measure their re-offending over the 12 months following completion of the programme.

The figures represent percentage-point changes in the rates of reimprisonment or reconviction of treated offenders compared to the equivalent 'untreated' offenders. A reimprisonment score of – 10.0 indicates that the rate of reimprisonment for 'treated' offenders was 10 percentage points lower than for the comparable 'untreated' offenders (for example, 12% compared to 22%). '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 used in the analysis '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.

APPENDIX THREE: REPORT UNDER SECTION 190 OF THE CORRECTIONS ACT 2004 AND 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 year has seen a continued 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 Auckland South Corrections Facility at Wiri. Community engagement is carried out ahead of any construction.

Corrections has spent more time working with employers, government agencies and community groups to both 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. In addition to our relationships with over 200 employers to provide Release to Work opportunities for offenders who are close to release from prison, we have signed Memoranda of Understanding with 15 employers agreeing to provide 156 jobs for prisoners upon release.

Early in 2013/14 the 'From Prison Gate to Plate' gala dinner prepared by prisoners at Rimutaka Prison as part of the Visa Wellington On a Plate festival 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; in particular our Out of Gate, Tiaki Tangata and Rotorua, Taupō and Tokoroa reintegration initiatives.

Engagement with family/whānau, 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 locally initiated programmes of activity funded by our Regional Initiative Fund. These stakeholders continue to assist us in identifying 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 2013/14 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 offenders traditionally generate a very low volume of complaints to the Inspectors. Only 13 were received for the year which is two fewer than received for the previous year.

The effective and timely resolution of prisoner complaints is the primary area of focus for Inspectors 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 the involvement of external agencies or court action. There were 1,608 formal complaints received for the year. This was a decrease of 536 complaints from 2012/13 year complaints.

It should be noted that the Inspectorate has altered the manner in which it handles 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, which 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 38 of the 1,608 complaints received in the 2013/14 year were found to be justified. At 2.36 per cent of total complaints this is a low proportion of the thousands of interactions that occur between the Department and offenders every year.

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. While a complaint may not be categorised as justified, it does not mean that the complaint was without merit or validity. 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 was anticipated that with the alteration to the Inspectorate complaint handling process, the ratio of justified complaints would 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 (19) related to internal complaint forms not being processed or actioned appropriately by prison staff. 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 the issue or provide a formal response to the prisoner.

0800 Complaints Line

Since 1997, the Inspectorate has operated a 0800 free-call phone line that offenders, and in particular prisoners and their families/whānau could use to raise a complaint directly with an Inspector during normal business hours. In 2013/14 year there were 3,028 calls received, of which 1,013 were recorded as a formal complaint. The remaining contacts were for general information or clarification of issues or repeat calls about the same issue.

This facility still generates the vast majority of the contacts prisoners make with the Inspectors every year. While only 1,013 of these contacts resulted in formal complaints during 2013/14, 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 13 prisoner deaths in custody (10 assumed natural causes, three assumed suicides). This is an increase of 40 per cent on the 10 deaths investigated for 2012/13. 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.

In the interests of transparency, the Inspectors have also continued to monitor the conduct and outcome of a number of internal prison investigations into prisoners' allegations of assault/abuse by staff. Twenty-four such monitoring reviews were carried out during the year, with only four cases being progressed to employment investigations against the staff involved. Five cases are still currently under active investigation.

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 change to the Inspectorate work plan for the 2013/14 year has been approved which saw the Inspectorate conducting special focus reviews of various aspects of prison operations using the Healthy Prison Standards¹⁶, as developed and used by other international jurisdictions. Two reviews have been concluded into Directed Segregation and Prisoner Activities. Planning is currently underway for a third review which will consider rehabilitation and reintegration services.

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. Incidents are a fact of prison life in particular, and no jurisdiction in the world has developed an effective immunity to them.

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 may 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.

Andy Fitzharris

Chief Inspector of Corrections

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 prisons 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 to protect victims from 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.

¹⁶ Standards for the treatment of prisoners worldwide all derive from Article 10 of the United Nations International Covenant on civil and political rights which state "All persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and respect for the inherent dignity of the human person".

Spark New Zealand* provides 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/whānau 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 prisoner telephone call control system – which restricts the calls that prisoners are able to make. Only 10 numbers are able to be loaded onto the prisoner's 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 2013/14, 54,575 calls were monitored, 90 per cent of these monitored calls produced valuable information to support the prevention and reduction of crime. 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, enhanced community safety and led to the discovery 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.

The effectiveness of our prison-based drug and alcohol interventions has been significantly improved since the introduction of a screening tool during the 2012/13 year to better identify alcohol and drug issues among prisoners and help staff determine which interventions will be needed. During 2013/14 Corrections delivered brief and intermediate level alcohol and other drug treatment programmes to over 2,500 prisoners, and provided over 1,000 placements in our more intensive three month and six month Drug Treatment Unit programmes.

Corrections focuses on both the treatment of prisoners with drug and alcohol problems and the prevention of opportunity for prisoners to consume alcohol and drugs. The introduction of our prisoner television rental scheme during the year has enabled us to more easily detect contraband that has entered prison, due to the clear plastic casing from which the rental televisions are made.

The percentage of general random drug tests returning a positive drug result has been falling since 2008/09. In 2013/14 we undertook 4,295 drug tests under our general random drug testing regime; 3.8 per cent of the 4,226 resulted tests returned a positive drug result, a further improvement on the four per cent result recorded for the previous two years.

To reduce drug and alcohol use by offenders in the community, our probation officers are delivering effective brief alcohol and drug interventions to community-based offenders with an identified need for intervention. We have also worked with the Ministry of Health to increase the availability of alcohol and other drug services to community-based offenders. More than 9,000 brief interventions were delivered by probation officers and over 6,000 offenders were referred for more intensive treatment options during the year.

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 69 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.

* Spark New Zealand previously known as Telecom New Zealand.

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 were two reported incidents 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 were no reported incidents 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 was one reported incident 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 11 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 39,827 searches were recorded by security officers employed by the Contractor during the reporting year. This included four 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 third year of operation the site has seen over 25,000 movements through the receiving office, including over 2,000 inter-prison transfers.

Serco's performance in the third 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.

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 85 per cent of their performance measured against these is consistent, all of the missed targets have 100 per cent compliance requirements. Where appropriate the Department has issued performance notices in relation to the missed targets.

Serco is also measured against nine key performance indicators which provide a financial incentive for Serco to exceed baseline performance in some key areas. Serco has achieved all nine of the key performance indicators.

Serco's results in the Department's Prison Performance Table have seen them move from a rating of "exceeding" in the first and second quarters of 2013/14 to "exceptional" in both the third and fourth quarters.

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 2013/14, 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 continued improvement in the approach to highlighting issues with Serco has resulted in the timely resolution of areas of concern. These process improvements have provided an improved level of assurance that MECF is being run in a safe, secure and humane manner.

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 innovation proposals Corrections has agreed to pilot at MECF. These are being closely monitored and if successful maybe adopted by Corrections.

Serco continued to embed its Violence Reduction and Safer Custody Strategies at MECF. 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 Training gained approval under Section 252 of the *Education Act 1989* which will enable them to assess the NZQA unit standards that lead to qualifications for their own staff in New Zealand.

Ultimately, the success of the contract will be reflected in reduced re-offending. To that end, in the third year of the contract, seven key performance indicators were replaced with two reducing re-offending focussed measures titled the 'Out of Custody' index.

The new measures 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. In order to achieve their target Serco must perform 10 per cent better than the Department. Serco has performed well against the new measures, and the end of year results are currently being finalised.

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, 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). Corrections 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 2014.

For the financial year ending 30 June 2014 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 244. 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 2014 was 425. The average length of time they were subject to such conditions during the financial year was 6.7 months.

During the year ending 30 June 2014, there were 63 offenders subject to extended supervision with residential restrictions or electronic monitoring. Of those 63 offenders:

- > 7 (11.1%) were convicted of a breach of their electronic monitoring/residential restriction condition
- > 3 (4.8%) were convicted of other offences
- > 21 (33.3%) were convicted of a breach 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.

