



## QUEENSLAND POLICE SERVICE

COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE  
200 ROMA STREET BRISBANE QLD 4000 AUSTRALIA  
GPO BOX 1440 BRISBANE QLD 4001 AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE: 07 3364 6488 FACSIMILE: 07 3364 4650



Our Ref:

Your Ref:

13 April 2018

Mr Alan MacSporran QC  
Chairperson  
Crime and Corruption Commission  
GPO Box 3123  
BRISBANE QLD 4001

Email: [TaskforceFlaxton@ccc.qld.gov.au](mailto:TaskforceFlaxton@ccc.qld.gov.au)

Dear Mr MacSporran 

I refer to your letter of 27 March 2018 regarding an invitation to make written submissions on corruption risks in Queensland corrective services facilities.

In direct response, I have sought to have the Queensland Police Service Ethical Standards Command coordinate a response, seeking relevant input from State Crime Command, due to their requisite knowledge with regard to the functions and operations of the Corrective Services Investigation Unit (CSIU).

The Queensland Police Service is grateful for the opportunity to contribute to Taskforce Flaxton and I trust the points for consideration that have been generated will assist to inform your important work concerning the examination of corruption risks in Queensland corrective service facilities.

Should the Taskforce have any inquiries concerning this submission, please do not hesitate to 

Yours sincerely 





**Queensland Police Service**

**SUBMISSION TO THE QUEENSLAND CRIME AND  
CORRUPTION COMMISSION**

**Taskforce Flaxton**

**Corruption Risks in Queensland Corrective  
Services Facilities**

**- APRIL 2018 -**

## INTRODUCTION

The Queensland Police Service (QPS) appreciates the invitation by the Chairperson of the Queensland Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC), Mr A J MacSporran to provide a submission concerning an examination of corruption and corruption risks in Queensland corrective service facilities.

In support of the content found in the recently released Crime and Corruption Commission, Taskforce Flaxton Issues Paper (March 2018), the QPS acknowledges and endorses the relevance and intent of an examination of this kind by the CCC.

As a major entity in the criminal justice system here in Queensland, the QPS works collaboratively across a range of statutory, investigative and operational roles with Queensland Corrective Services (QCS).

Functional responsibilities which involve both the QPS and QCS are monitored and audited as part of ongoing and established QPS corruption prevention strategy. Prisoner removals by police are audited monthly and the QPS Inspections Teams, conduct on site establishment inspections of the State Crime Command, Corrective Services Investigation Unit (CSIU) as part of the Ethical Standards Command, Inspections Program.

The format by which the QPS has made its submissions, has followed that which was sought in the original Taskforce Flaxton - Invitation for Public Submissions and Issues Paper of March 2018. The submissions themselves are a combination of experience and insight derived on principles of corruption detection and prevention that the QPS monitors and considers as part of its Police Integrity Framework.

## SUBMISSIONS

In relation to each of the key questions for stakeholders and community members as posed in the aforementioned Issues Paper, the QPS submits that:

**Q1. In relation to complaints made to the CCC (see page 3), what may account for the increase in the number of corrupt conduct allegations received, over the last three years, about:**

**a. assaults/excessive use of force –**

There are a number of factors which may account for the increase in allegations received. Those factors may include:

- An increase in the prisoner population putting more pressure on resources and increasing frustration from QCS employees;
- Increased prisoner population reducing personal space for prisoners, causing individual aggressive behaviours to escalate and/or numbers of prisoners increasing risk to employees. QCS employees' use of force may be excessive to deter poor behaviour.
- Access to complaints system and confidence in the system to investigate complaints;

- An increased awareness of reporting expectations and reduced tolerance of poor behaviour by co-workers
- Improved surveillance/CCTV
- Improved internal investigative practices increasing legitimacy of system
- Validation of the official visitor program and the office of the Chief Inspector

**b. the misuse of information? –**

- An increased awareness of reporting expectations and reduced tolerance of poor behaviour by co-workers;
- Increased vigilance by oversight bodies such as the Ethical Standards Unit (QCS)
- Organisational culture issue (potentially) of QCS employees belief that it is an entitlement to access all/any information
- Lack of engagement of staff, using system access as entertainment and means of building relationships and managing behaviour of prisoners
- Inappropriate relationships existing or forming between QCS employees and prisoners
- Limited background checking of new employees who may have associations with prisoners or criminal networks

**Q2. What are the most significant corruption risks in Queensland correctional facilities? –**

- Inappropriate relationships existing or forming between QCS employees and prisoners
- Declarable Associations
- Poor systems to manage intelligence and/or evidence
- Lack of integrity in information/intelligence management systems
- Lack of integrity in reporting systems - failing to report incidents as required or falsification of information (non-reporting culture?)
- provision of contraband to prisoners – drugs, mobile phones, cigarettes (inappropriate relationships)
- excessive use of force
- inappropriate access to information, such as computer systems, and disclosure of information
- accepting bribes in exchange for contraband or information

**a. What are the consequences of this type of corruption for prisoners and how the correctional facility operates? –**

- Disempowerment of QCS staff to report unethical or unlawful activity

- Noble cause behaviours which compromise QCS staff – such as supply of legal contraband. i.e. tobacco, phones, etc. Behaviour then escalates due to fear of consequences
- Prisoners manipulating QCS staff
- Acceptance of unethical behaviour to manage the prisoner population
- Bias or partiality impacting on reporting of unethical or unlawful behaviour
- Cultural issues within the QCS employee population including poor front line leadership
- Remuneration for QCS employees coupled with increased prisoner population leading to increased overtime, fatigue, and seeking means to supplement income
- Use of force or influence to manage prisoner population and/or QCS staff
- Belief that treatment is not fair or just increasing risk of harm to prisoners
- Increased potential for riots and officer assaults because prisoners resort to this behaviour if they think they won't receive justice or fair treatment
- Culture issues/ethical slippage leading to tolerance of poor behaviour amongst prisoner population and QCS employees
- Risk to safety of all persons within a correctional centre
- Lack of trust in the ability of the correctional centres to keep prisoners safe from harm
- Unethical or criminal behaviour within correctional centres may garner some public approval as social media forms/conventional media in a flippant manner intimating behaviour is consequential of incarceration.
- Correctional staff may hold a distorted belief that the public approve of their involvement in/tolerance of unethical or criminal behaviour within correctional centres.

**b. What are the consequences of this type of corruption for the community?**

- Failure of QCS and Qld Criminal Justice System to achieve strategic level outcomes in terms of the theory of punishment through incarceration/rehabilitation.
- Reduced confidence in the Justice/correctional system
- Increased costs associated with damage repairs to facilities; court costs; civil action by prisoners etc.
- That the Government is unable to control or manage crime or criminal behaviours
- Increased perception of fear within the community
- Increased costs associated with health care
- The organisation may lose legitimacy with the community

**c. How does this type of corruption undermine integrity and public confidence in QCS and engaged service providers?**

- Reduced trust in the integrity of the correctional system and rehabilitation of prisoners
- Reduction of service providers seeking to associate or support the correctional system
- Resources not being directed toward sustainable outcomes
- Increased media scrutiny of the correctional system
- Decreased support for the organisation including a lack of engagement from supports for the prisoner population
- Increase the perception of fear within the community

**Q3. What factors create a corruption risk or facilitate corruption in Queensland correctional facilities? –**

- Isolation of prisoners
- Control correctional officers have over prisoners
- Lack of vision/transparency of issues/incidents – inconsistent reporting.
- Limited mobility of QCS staff to work within multiple centres
- Limited consistency in management systems within correctional centres across the State
- Benchmarking recruitment standards – Robust vetting to assess integrity
- Susceptibility of new recruits to be exposed to unethical behaviours, and accept as a standard
- Limited diversity in recruitment for critical roles. i.e. Intelligence/investigations officers recruited from QCS administration stream or correctional officers
- Remuneration of QCS employees
- Close personal contact between QCS officers and prisoners
- Limited use of innovative technologies to reduce risk. i.e. CCTV rather than physical presence
- Understanding of boundary control with prisoner/staff relationships
- Limited controls on access to prisoner's personal information
- Leadership/supervisor training
- Organisational culture
- Safety risks to QCS employees

**a. How do these factors create a corruption risk or facilitate corruption? –**

- Poor reporting practices
- Culture of accepting unethical behaviour as a control mechanism
- Limited overview/oversight of officer performance

- Conflict of interest or vulnerable to manipulation
- Withholding/non reporting of unethical or unlawful behaviours
- Limited accountability on officer behaviour
- Knowledge of personal information can influence behaviours, encourage threats or coercion

**b. Are these factors systemic (present across all correctional facilities) or symptomatic of local conditions (that is, factors specific to an individual prison or work camp)? –**

### **Systemic**

- Organisational
  - Private prison contract arrangements deter reporting of poor performance and encourages increased population
  - Vetting and Recruitment
  - Inconsistent training
  - Inconsistent management systems
  - Inconsistent leadership expectations/training for supervisors
  -
- Cultural
  - Tolerance of noble cause behaviours
  - Ethical slippage including tolerance of unethical behaviours to manage prisoners
  - Limited support for whistleblowers
  - Embedded informal power structures within centres

### **Symptomatic**

- Inconsistency in leadership/management of centres results in some centres being more susceptible to and/or tolerant of corrupt behaviours
- Informal leadership/influence affects corrupt behaviours and culture within individual centres
- Prisoner population (i.e. security assessment) affects constraints/controls both formal and informal to manage behaviours
- Limited overview/oversight of incidents

**Q4. What legislative, policy or procedural changes could be made to address corruption risks in correctional facilities? –**

- Consistency in leadership and centre management systems
- Specific Code of conduct for QCS staff
- Development a service wide risk management/control system

- Implement a consistent audit/inspection process
- Training/assessment of susceptibility to manipulation
- Awareness of unconscious bias
- Robust and supportive reporting procedures for unethical/corrupt behaviours – mandatory reporting
- Provision of a self-reflection program for officers to increase the identification of processes that may encourage corruption/misconduct.
- Introduction of employee psychological assessments to identify risk
- Training in corruption prevention and deterrence.
- Greater protection for whistle-blowers
- Significantly improve CCTV systems within correctional centres
- More extensive/compulsory use of body worn cameras
- Reduce personal contact between prisoners and QCS staff
- Introduction of random drug/alcohol testing of correctional officers within the workplace
- Improved vetting procedures for current and prospective employees, including annual reviews
- Mobility of correctional officers within various centres
- Leadership identification and training
- Review the Corrective Services Act to ensure compatibility current environment

**a. What are the barriers to successfully implementing these reforms and how could these barriers be removed or mitigated?**

- Cultural change – implement change champions
- Organisation wide cultural change program
- Embed new leadership from diverse industry
- Consultation, training and improved employment practices.
- Review remuneration and consider performance bonuses.
- Enhanced promotion system to identify potential leaders.
- Leadership training – pre-requisites

**Q5. Are there any other issues that are relevant to understanding corruption risks in Queensland correctional facilities or how to address these risks?**

- Ensuring reporting systems and relationships are robust to enable the QCS Ethical Standards Unit/Corrective Services Investigation Unit to monitor and react to any identified instances of corruption/misconduct.
- Consider innovation – Maintaining currency with new technology and addressing changes in the correctional environment.

- Education & training in ethical conduct and ethical leadership to alter organisational behaviours in a positive and ethical way.

## **CONCLUSION**

Should the Crime and Corruption Commission require clarification or further explanation on the content of the submissions made, the QPS would welcome the opportunity to participate in further discussion.