



CRIME AND MISCONDUCT COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC INVESTIGATIVE HEARING

CONDUCTED AT THE CMC, LEVEL 2, NORTH TOWER, 515 ST PAUL'S

10

TERRACE, FORTITUDE VALLEY, WITH RESPECT TO

FILE: OPERATION TESCO

HEARING NO: 06/2009

**DAY 46 – WEDNESDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2010
(DURATION: 140 MINUTES)**

20

Copies of this transcript must not be made or distributed except in accordance with any order made by the Presiding Officer concerning publication of these proceedings.

LEGEND

PO Presiding Officer – MARTIN MOYNIHAN, CHAIRPERSON
CA Counsel Assisting – JOHN ALLEN
30 **INST Instructing – SUZANNE HARBIDGE and KATE McKENNARIEY**
HRO Hearing Room Orderly – MEL LETONDEUR
W Witness – PATRICIA ANNE JONES
LR Legal Representatives - ALAN MacSPORRAN SC, with him MICHAEL NICHOLSON, instructed by KATE BRADLEY; CHRIS WATTERS, instructed by DANIEL CREEVY; TIM CARMODY SC, with him TROY SCHMIDT, instructed by CALVIN GNECH

THE HEARING RESUMED AT 10.11 AM

PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes, Mr Allen?

MR ALLEN: Good morning, Mr Chairman. I understand my learned friend Mr Carmody has a matter.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes.

10

MR CARMODY SC: Mr Chairman, regrettably I have got a complaint to make. Yesterday or late last night posted on the internet was Exhibit 116 from Senior Sergeant Dimond's evidence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Remind me what it was.

20

MR CARMODY SC: Well, the two particular documents I am concerned about are an occurrence inquiry log and the Surfers Paradise orientation booklet. Both contain privacy breaches -- or both contain personal information about people which is now on the net. The occurrence log identifies people by name who have been the subject of search warrant executions and the service of summons and such things and inquiries by police, and from the union's point of view, the more concerning thing is that the orientation booklet at page 11 identifies the private parking areas of police at the Surfers Paradise Police Station and we have had 20 phone calls from officers already this morning upset that people now know where they park their private vehicles when they are at work.

30

So I have been asked to raise it specifically with respect to those two matters and just to ask that some --

PRESIDING OFFICER: I will have a look into it. Obviously, this is the first I have known of it.

MR CARMODY SC: Yes, of course. Can I give you the two particular documents, to save you rummaging through the --

PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes, yes.

40

MR CARMODY SC: I have just identified some of the particulars that are of concern. Thanks.

PRESIDING OFFICER: I will have that looked into as quickly as I can.

MR ALLEN: It is also the first time it has been raised in any way with the CMC. I do recall that in your introductory remarks, Mr Chairman, you invited counsel if they wished to have any exhibit or document to be confidential, to raise that, and it would have been appropriate for those matters to be raised at the time the exhibit was being tendered, in my submission.

MR CARMODY SC: It is about that thick.

PRESIDING OFFICER: That's noted. I won't respond to it at the moment because obviously I need to get more information across the issues. If there are any other issues that need to be raised in that context, it can be done now, it can be done, if it is thought to be necessary, in private.

MR ALLEN: Yes.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER: But subject to any views expressed from the Bar table, my inclination is to say let's get on with today's proceedings and in the meantime I will see what I can do to have inquiries made about that.

MR ALLEN: Mr Chairman, I call Patricia Anne Jones and ask that Ms Jones be sworn.

PATRICIA ANNE JONES, SWORN

20 MR ALLEN: Is your full name Patricia Anne Jones?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

MR ALLEN: You are here pursuant to an attendance notice. And can I ask you if you recognise this as being a copy of the attendance notice that was served on you?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

MR ALLEN: I tender that attendance notice and the oath of service.

30 PRESIDING OFFICER: Exhibit 124.

ADMITTED AND MARKED "EXHIBIT 124"

MR ALLEN: Have you signed a 20-page statement, which I will put in front of you?

PRESIDING OFFICER: That has some annexures to it, by the look of it.

40 MR ALLEN: It does.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.

MR ALLEN: And you also recognise the annexures which are referred to in that statement?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

MR ALLEN: Is there any need for any of the contents of the statement or any of the annexures to be confidential?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR ALLEN: And not available for public perusal?

THE WITNESS: No, there is not.

MR ALLEN: I tender the statement and annexures.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER: Exhibit 125.

ADMITTED AND MARKED "EXHIBIT 125"

MR ALLEN: Do you have a copy of your statement to refer to?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

MR ALLEN: Are you the director of the human resources division of the Queensland Police Service?

20

THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.

MR ALLEN: And prior to holding that position, have you held specialist human resource positions within the Northern Territory government?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.

MR ALLEN: And since the early 1990s, other positions within the Queensland Police Service including business manager corporate services and also a human resources manager in both regional and specialist areas?

30

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.

MR ALLEN: The human resources division, of which you are a director, comprises four branches.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR ALLEN: Which you have referred to at page 2 of your statement.

40

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR ALLEN: If I could move firstly to the topic of supervision and how officers are prepared for supervisory roles, you begin dealing with that topic at page 11 of your statement.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: You refer to training that is available within the QPS and firstly refer

to the constable development program.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: You say that that's compulsory for progression, so is that for progression from a constable to a senior constable?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.

10 MR ALLEN: And it currently has a take-up rate of the vast majority of eligible constables.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, about 96 per cent, yes.

MR ALLEN: And once a senior constable wishes to progress further, is there another program?

THE WITNESS: Yes, they then complete our management development program for progression or for merit appointment to the rank of sergeant.

20

MR ALLEN: I see. Before we leave page 11, at the last paragraph you say that the training for police supervisors and managers is offered primarily by the Queensland Police Service Academy.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR ALLEN: Through the senior leadership and professional development program.

30 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR ALLEN: So is that another course or is that some type of program which exists to provide various courses of education?

THE WITNESS: The senior leadership and professional development program is a component of our academy. So it deals with developing curriculum and delivering training for a range of management programs for the rank of sergeant, senior sergeant and commissioned officers.

40 MR ALLEN: I see. So over the page, you refer to several units within that program which provide supervisory and management training.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: Those units you refer to, are they subunits of the program that exists to provide various courses of education?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR ALLEN: I see. And one of those is the supervisor development unit?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: And that provides -- does that provide the management development program for senior constables progressing to sergeant and sergeants progressing higher?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes, they provide the program. It is not progression. You actually have to apply for a job on merit.

MR ALLEN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: It is a prequalifying component before you can be eligible to apply for positions on merit.

MR ALLEN: I see. So you -- who really staffs the supervisor development unit in relation to providing education?

20 THE WITNESS: It is staffed by a mixture of police officers and professional civilians who are trained in the area of education. So, for example, we have facilitators at the rank of sergeant, senior sergeant and inspector. The program is headed up by a superintendent of police and we also have civilians in there as well.

MR ALLEN: You have a table at page 12 which sets out completion of participation rates for current officers.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

30 MR ALLEN: And you provide numbers and percentages with respect to the Police Service generally.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: The south-east region and the Gold Coast district. And you provide those within those areas with respect to senior constable, sergeant and senior sergeant.

40 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR ALLEN: If I could just clarify what this table conveys, the senior constable participation rate for, say, the Gold Coast district --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: -- when it refers to a number of officers who are qualified, say, for example, on the Gold Coast district it says senior constable level 175 officers qualified.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Does that mean that there are 175 constables who have qualified so as to seek appointment on merit as a senior constable?

THE WITNESS: No, no, that --

MR ALLEN: It means that there are 175 senior constable who have completed the course so that they can be eligible for appointment as a sergeant?

10

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR ALLEN: Okay. So the figure at the -- of 22 senior sergeants then for the Gold Coast district who are qualified, are they qualified and therefore eligible to seek appointment as an inspector?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

20

MR ALLEN: Right. If we look at, I guess, the whole -- either looking at Queensland Police Service level, south-east region level or Gold Coast district level, the same picture emerges, does it not, that there is a fairly high completion and, therefore, qualification rate of senior constables completing the management development program so as to be eligible for appointment to senior sergeant.

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's --

MR ALLEN: So about two thirds?

30

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: And, likewise, there is about a two third proportion of senior sergeants who have completed the program and are, therefore, eligible to seek appointment as an inspector?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

40

MR ALLEN: But there is a significantly lower rate, about 40 per cent, at least in the Gold Coast district, of sergeants who have completed the program and are therefore eligible for appointment to senior sergeant positions?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that would be correct. I wouldn't say significant. I'd say that there is certainly a lower completion rate on the Gold Coast as compared to the Queensland -- the entire service. Certainly.

MR ALLEN: But even if one looks at the south-east region and the Queensland Police Service overall, a similar picture emerges that there is a significantly lower number of senior sergeants, or a lower proportion of sergeants who have completed the program.

THE WITNESS: I would say 3 per cent is not significant. There is a difference of 3 per cent between the south-east region and the whole of the service. I don't believe that would be significant.

MR ALLEN: Okay. I haven't made myself clear. Let's just look firstly at the Gold Coast district. We've got about two thirds of senior constables completing the course.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

10

MR ALLEN: About two thirds of senior sergeants completing the course.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: But only about 40 per cent of sergeants completing the course.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

20

MR ALLEN: And a similar difference between completion by senior constables and senior sergeants on one hand and sergeants on the other is seen, if one looks at the figures for the region or the service overall.

THE WITNESS: That's --

MR ALLEN: So it is that difference that I am really asking you to comment on.

30

THE WITNESS: I think you have also got to look at the fact that the organisation is a pyramid organisation. The number of vacancies for senior sergeant diminish. There is a lot more vacancies at sergeant, so you have got the pyramid. Therefore, a lot more officers will compete and a lot more officers will say, "I am not competitive to be at that level." So I am not overly concerned about the completion rate because of the much less vacancies that appear at the senior sergeant rank than they do at sergeant rank.

MR ALLEN: But if that was the explanation, the pyramidal structure, wouldn't it now again, in relation to the senior sergeants completing the course to be eligible for appointment as inspector and that doesn't seem to be the case?

40

THE WITNESS: No, it is not the case but I would also argue that as they get higher, there is an attraction to go to commissioned officer which far outweighs, because of superannuation entitlements. What you have got to remember is to go to senior sergeant you generally lose what we call the operational shift allowance, which is a significant amount of money that you lose because senior sergeant positions tend to be administrative jobs or management type jobs that don't require shift work. So there is a significant loss of income to move from a sergeant to -- in a lot of areas -- to move to a senior sergeant.

MR ALLEN: Well, that provides perhaps a more understandable reason why there is that difference --

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

MR ALLEN: -- rather than just a pyramidal structure, isn't it?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR ALLEN: There are financial disincentives, really, in some cases, or at least not as much financial incentive for a sergeant to seek progression to a senior sergeant level.

THE WITNESS: In the short term. But in the long term, no, because what you have got is -- certainly in the short term if you are looking at the immediate financial situation, operational shift allowance is an additional 20 per cent. But in terms of their long-term career, there is an incentive to do it because of superannuation. There is an incentive to progress because the operational shift allowance is not included for superannuation purposes. So whilst some people may choose to take their time to progress, others look for immediate progression for that reason.

MR ALLEN: The management development program is compulsory in the sense of you have to complete it if you want to be eligible for promotion.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR ALLEN: Are there any programs or courses of continued education that are compulsory if one is to remain within and retain a rank?

THE WITNESS: No, there is not. What we -- MDP is the only compulsory course or training that is required for a promotion. What we have acknowledged and we acknowledged back in 2008 as part of a survey that we did of the service, that there was a distinct lack of supervision education and skill -- up skilling for that. As a consequence we have engaged with Griffith University in a very in-depth program which is lasting for three years where we are actually developing face-to-face training for all of our supervisors. It has so far been rolled out in southern region. It is currently being rolled out in the north coast region and the far northern region and it starts on the Gold Coast in November. And that is actually a program where we've partnered with a number of external consultants, together with Griffith University, and that is face-to-face training.

MR ALLEN: Okay. And who will undergo such training?

THE WITNESS: All supervisors. It is a program that is being offered from senior constable up to Assistant Commissioner. So everybody is involved in it. Different levels obviously will get different sorts of skills. We have a consultant that is actually offering one-on-one mentoring and coaching to senior sergeants and above. There is a consultant delivering a program called Practical People Management, which is a well-known program across the public sector, and that is being delivered to senior constables and sergeants.

MR ALLEN: And will that be compulsory for persons at those levels?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

MR ALLEN: At page 16 of your statement, in the second last paragraph, you state that, "Officers who undertake MDP are seeking promotion. Therefore those that are disengaged are not likely to freely participate in management or supervisory training." What do you mean by officers being disengaged?

10

THE WITNESS: Well, that came out, as I said previously, about our survey that we conducted in 2008 where we found that a degree of -- a number of senior constables and sergeants were disengaged from the organisation in terms of carrying out the full range of functions such as supervision. From that survey is where we have developed this program to address those people.

MR ALLEN: It might be a management term I am not familiar with from my background.

20 THE WITNESS: Disengaged?

MR ALLEN: Disengaged.

THE WITNESS: Disengaged means that they are likely to be people that come to work. There is not an issue about attendance but they may be people that see it more as a job than as a vocation or a career. So they may not be actively engaged in doing everything that -- that we would expect of them in their role.

30 MR ALLEN: Is the roll-out of the new training a recognition by way of review that the management development program has not been optimal in preparing officers for supervisory roles?

THE WITNESS: I don't know if you would say that. The MDP has always been a program that is about training. It is not about skills. We're an organisation of fourteen and a half thousand people and to deliver training in a very diverse organisation that covers from Coolangatta to the Cape, like any organisation of our size, most organisations deliver it by distance education because there is actually -- that's the best way in rolling out training, but we have acknowledged that it doesn't necessarily develop skills. So what we've done is we have said that the MDP is important in about teaching theoretical and teaching the principles of good management. What we're now doing, as part of this other roll-out of the program, is embedding those behaviours and teaching better behaviours in terms of management supervision.

40

MR ALLEN: I see. So it is really complementary to the other training?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Can you tell me the difference between "training" and

"skills".

THE WITNESS: Yes. Training is more of an academic type component where you do assignments, you do exercises but they are actually done by distance education, Mr Chairman. What we're talking about here with skills is actually teaching them. So, for example, one of the things that we're looking at is actually employing people like coaches that will actually sit down with supervisors and not solve their problem for them but if they have got to have a difficult conversation with someone, teaching them skills of how to have that conversation in terms of that. That's the difference.

PRESIDING OFFICER: The survey that you mentioned, is it intended to replicate that at some stage?

THE WITNESS: We have actually run it in 2010 again. We have yet to get the full results from Griffith, yeah.

PRESIDING OFFICER: That will be interesting.

20 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it will be.

MR ALLEN: And that program, is that the one that you refer to in the first half of page 13 of your statement, the senior leadership training in conjunction with Griffith University?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes. That's right.

MR ALLEN: Does it have a particular name, that particular course?

30 THE WITNESS: "Healthy Workplaces", it is called.

MR ALLEN: On page 14 of your statement, you talk about some recommendations that have flowed from a review of the human resource development branch.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: And you detail recommendations 39 to 41.

40 THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Are you able to tell us whether there has been any calculation of a time-frame for implementation of those particular recommendations?

THE WITNESS: Well, a number of them have already been concluded. As part of the Grinspoon report, we actually reviewed all of our managerial components of our training at the academy about ethics and leadership. So all of our curriculum has been reviewed with a stronger focus on ethics and leadership as part of it. But obviously that's an ongoing process and we continue to do that. The HRDB review

that's referred to there is part of a review -- of a broader review of our business practices prior to us moving to our new academy in 2014, but it is actually putting in place a curriculum review process where you are continuously changing, updating, and improving curriculum.

MR ALLEN: And are these recommendations as outlined by you there directed at all ranks?

THE WITNESS: Yes, they are.

10

MR ALLEN: Right. And in recommendation 41, there is consideration of extending the officer-in-charge program model.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: What's the officer-in-charge program?

20

THE WITNESS: That's a program that's dedicated only to officers-in-charge and it teaches them a range of skills. It is a residential component and I think that's what the attraction is. We provide residential components for our senior sergeants. They have a three-week residential. The OC has -- the OC program has a residential component and that is very attractive to police because it is about that adult learning principle of experiential learning where you actually sit down and discuss cases, experiences. So what we're doing -- and that's part of our acknowledgement that we need to look at these things, apart from the Healthy Workplaces program, we're also looking at introducing either a one- or two-week residential course for sergeants who are part of the MDP program. So extending that experiential learning so they can actually get together with peers to discuss cases, discuss shared experiences.

30

MR ALLEN: Okay. So if that occurs, the one- to two-week residential for sergeants, will that be part of the MDP?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: So it will be really compulsory for those sergeants who want to progress to senior sergeant?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

40

MR ALLEN: Where does the officer-in-charge program fit in with the MDP or other courses? Is it separate, additional?

THE WITNESS: It is separate. It is within that supervisory management area but it is a separate program targeted specifically at officer-in-charge.

MR ALLEN: All right. And that would be -- would that include senior constables or --

THE WITNESS: No, no, that's senior sergeants.

MR ALLEN: Senior sergeants?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Okay. So it is offered to senior sergeants?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

10

MR ALLEN: And -- but it is not part of the MDP for eligibility to progress to inspector?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR ALLEN: It has a residential nature?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.

20

MR ALLEN: And has it -- has there been an enthusiastic take up or --

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. Again it is that residential component that they are very --

MR ALLEN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

30

MR ALLEN: And are there other strategies that you refer to in your statement which are designed at improving the supervisory capability of officers?

THE WITNESS: I think what's probably not explored in my statement is what they are doing at regional levels. There are a number of regions which have taken active interest in developing their own local programs to assist in developing supervisors. I think that we have all acknowledged that it is an area we can do better in. So a lot of regions have taken up that gauntlet and said, well, we will start working locally as well as the academy in delivering it because in my view the development of supervisors is not just an academy issue, it is a service issue and we must work in partnership with our regions to help them develop locally as well, mmm.

40

MR ALLEN: And I believe that we heard some evidence yesterday of a program that's being trialled in the south-east region. You don't have any further --

THE WITNESS: No, not that I am aware of. That may be one of those local programs where they are trying locally to try and help officers, yes.

MR ALLEN: Okay. If I could ask you about some matters which have been flagged for the purposes of this hearing as under general topic of workforce and human resource management issues.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: And if I could deal firstly with an issue which has arisen during the course of the Operation Tesco regarding use by serving police officers of steroids.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

10 MR ALLEN: If I could just outline to you the background and context for my questions on that topic?

THE WITNESS: Certainly.

MR ALLEN: In the course of Operation Tesco, the CMC identified six police officers, most of whom were attached to the Surfers Paradise division, who had been prescribed and then subsequently used anabolic steroids in both injectable and tablet forms. None of those police officers were suffering from any disease or other medical event that would normally justify the prescription of such a drug. These officers were healthy, they gave varying reasons for needing the steroids including feeling tired, lethargic or just wanting to be bigger. Each sought this treatment from a doctor, the same doctor who was prepared to assist them. The steroids were prescribed off label, which means not for the specific purposes the drugs were manufactured. Unless prescribed, the steroids would have been unlawful to possess as schedule 2 drugs for the purposes of the Drugs Misuse Act. The CMC's recently interviewed a Professor Handlesman, H-A-N-D-L-E-S-M-A-N, who is a medical practitioner and specialist in endocrinology who has worked in the area of andrology, male reproductive health and medicine biology for about 30 years and who has an interest and expertise in amongst other things the occupational and non-medical use of androgens and anabolic steroids. He has informed the CMC that when these types of drugs, anabolic steroids, are used for medically justifiable purposes and at the proper dose, they are perfectly safe. However, there may be a number of risks associated with their use if that is not the case. For example, there can be a tendency in an illicit user to use high doses of the drug particularly by supplementing prescription doses with illicit or black market product with the prescription use covering for the illicit use. Further, there can be a tendency in that type of user to mix the drug with other drugs. And there is research to suggest that in a small proportion of cases, up to 5 per cent, the user will experience a hypermanic episode; that is they can get anxious, have sleep difficulties, become agitated, irritable, angry, and they can overreact to situations and their judgment may not be as balanced as it might normally be. Now, obviously those matters can be of concern, I'd suggest, if the -- a person who might be abusing those drugs is an operational police officer.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

MR ALLEN: Entrusted not only with weapons but generally with the ability to use force in carrying out their duties. Given that background that I have explained to you, are you aware of any research or consideration that's occurred within the Police Service as to the issue of steroid use or abuse by police officers?

10 THE WITNESS: I am not aware of any research but our alcohol and drug awareness unit does actually carry out awareness sessions about medication. In fact, I believe in my attachments to my statement there are a number of posters that are distributed and posted at every police station which talks about taking new medication, the risks associated with taking new medication, what we expect them to do. About talking to their doctors about side effects of medication. So I believe that in terms of raising awareness, we are doing a significant body of work. There is also the provision under the Police Service Administration Act that we can place a person before an independent medical practitioner if we believe that that person is impaired. It has got nothing to do with a person being off sick for extended periods, but if we believe a person is showing impairment, there is a legitimate reason then to place them before a medical practitioner for an independent examination.

MR ALLEN: So they can be directed to attend a health practitioner --

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.

20 MR ALLEN: -- for examination?

THE WITNESS: If we believe that a person -- if you like I will quote: "If the Commissioner suspects on reasonable grounds that an officer by reason of physical or mental infirmity is incapable of or for any other purpose pertaining to the officer's health or condition is unfit for the purpose of performing the duties of office." So there is a provision that allows us, if we believe that an officer is incapable or is impaired, of putting them before an independent doctor.

30 MR ALLEN: Are there any powers to -- that are wider than that? For example, to have random testing of police officers directed, amongst other things, to steroid use?

40 THE WITNESS: We don't have random drug testing, we have targeted drug testing. So there is -- if we believe or an officer or a supervisor or a manager believes that there is a person that they believe is misusing steroids or any other drugs, there is the ability to do that. Can I say, though, that, you know, we have conducted -- and I will just give -- if it is all right I will quote some stats to you -- since 2005, we have conducted over 13,400 tests of both alcohol and drug tests of recruits and officers. We have had one positive drug test of a recruit who was immediately sacked. We have had three positive tests for alcohol out of those thirteen and a half thousand tests.

MR ALLEN: Uh-huh.

THE WITNESS: We have had nine what we call reasonable suspicion tests for alcohol. That's where a supervisor has perhaps raised a concern that someone has come on duty and they may be under the influence of alcohol. There has been nine of those. Five of them were negative, four of them were positive. We have had three reasonable suspicion tests of drugs. None were positive. And there have

been no positive tests relating to any incident involved in a critical incident where we were obliged to test officers involved with critical incident.

MR ALLEN: All right. So in relation to the 13,400 tests of recruits and officers --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: -- how many of those related to drugs and how many to alcohol?

10 THE WITNESS: The only ones that we do for drugs are for recruits and that was -- 2,900 drug tests were undertaken of recruits of which there was one positive.

MR ALLEN: Okay. So none of the other, what, 10,500 tests from that 13,400 were for drugs?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR ALLEN: They were all for alcohol?

20 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: Okay. And would they have included the nine reasonable suspicion tests for alcohol?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR ALLEN: They were in addition?

30 THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Okay. So the 10,500 tests for alcohol, were they random?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: I see.

THE WITNESS: Sorry, can I correct that? 10,000 of them were random. We had -- 4,600 of them were random breath tests of recruits.

40 MR ALLEN: Oh, okay.

THE WITNESS: 2,900 --

MR ALLEN: Oh that included recruits?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, that included recruits. So of officers, there were 9,500-odd that were for police officers.

MR ALLEN: Right, okay. The three reasonable suspicion tests for drugs with no

positives --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: -- how up-to-date are those figures?

THE WITNESS: They would have been up-to-date as at the -- I think -- I couldn't tell you categorically but I believe it was up to the last month or so.

10 MR ALLEN: Oh, okay, all right. Would they include any directions or any reasonable suspicion tests which may have been directed by police attached to the CMC?

THE WITNESS: I have -- I am sorry, I can't comment. I don't know.

MR ALLEN: Just moving back briefly to steroid use --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 MR ALLEN: -- you say at page 18 of your statement that, "When steroids are being prescribed by medical practitioner there is no obligation for an officer to disclose use."

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: Likewise, medication for illnesses or chronic conditions.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

30 MR ALLEN: Should it be incumbent upon an officer to disclose the use of a drug that could have the potential to affect their operational capacity?

THE WITNESS: In my view, no. I believe that that is a discussion that is best made between a medical practitioner and his patient. I am of the view that a medical practitioner has an ethical obligation to discuss with them the impact that it is likely to have on their duties. Whatever it be, whether it is a police officer or railway worker, whatever the case may be. And I would have a concern that if a medical practitioner was prescribing drugs which they know are likely to impact on a person's ability to perform their job, that they continue to prescribe and not put
40 that person on some form of sick leave whilst there are likely to be any impacts on that person.

MR ALLEN: But there are public safety issues if a police officer is taking some medication which could impact upon their ability to control aggression, their safety in handling weapons or --

THE WITNESS: I'd also raise the point that there is also doctor/patient confidentiality, there are privacy provisions because there are -- undoubtedly we have numbers in our organisation that are prescribed medication for very serious

illnesses that is absolutely no business of the Queensland Police Service in terms of that. So I think it is a difficult debate. I acknowledge it is very difficult but it is a matter of balancing the privacy of an individual against that public interest.

MR ALLEN: So, essentially, as you have set out at pages 17 to 18, the efforts to address an issue such as inappropriate steroid use are really limited to education?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

10 MR ALLEN: And raising awareness on the part of officers of the issue?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: Are there any organisational or behavioural issues which can undermine that sort of approach to information and awareness?

THE WITNESS: I don't believe so. I think the alcohol and drug awareness unit is staffed entirely by civilians. There are no police in that unit. I think that they have an extraordinarily good reputation. We have self-reporting of alcohol issues where
20 we enter into agreements with those officers for treatment, which the service pays for. I think that it is about balancing those health issues where we are encouraging people to come forward to us, so that we can assist them in managing them in a -- from a health perspective.

MR ALLEN: Are there any arguments for having a more proactive drug testing program?

THE WITNESS: I-- I think, again, it is a balance. We costed, as part of a
30 previous discussion, what it would cost us to implement random drug testing, and an initial cost is in the vicinity of half a million dollars a year. I suppose, again, if you look at what success is in other jurisdictions, and I am not privy to what that is, but anecdotally I am aware that there hasn't been major positive results in those areas, and I suppose the balance is that for half a million dollars, I could possibly employ four to five more police officers. So the question becomes what's the balance? You know, what's the cost benefit of putting in place a program at that cost and for what benefit would it achieve?

MR ALLEN: Has there been a cost benefit analysis?

40 THE WITNESS: No, there hasn't.

MR ALLEN: Are there any plans that there will be one?

THE WITNESS: Not at this stage.

MR ALLEN: If I could move to the topic of recruitment.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: In particular, the screening processes that are associated with it. I think you deal with that earlier in your statement from page 2.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: You refer in the second last paragraph on that page to the fact that, "The police recruitment standards and practices act as a critical gatekeeper."

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

10

MR ALLEN: And why is that? Why is it so important to try and exclude inappropriate persons at the recruitment phase rather than simply pick them up later?

20

THE WITNESS: I -- I am a great believer that screening out, there is a cost benefit to us, it costs us somewhere in the vicinity of \$80,000-odd to train a recruit. I see absolutely no point putting someone through an intensive training program that we're going to terminate them at some stage. And I also am a firm believer that it goes to the values of our organisation, that the culture of the organisation doesn't accept that these people are good people to be in our organisation, and I think that's indicative of some of the young people that we are seeing coming through who have very strong values in terms of why they joined the organisation and I really think that it is incumbent upon us at the beginning of the process to prevent those people from joining the organisation as much as we can.

MR ALLEN: What sort of persons?

30

THE WITNESS: They are persons -- we have a range of guidelines in terms of the people that are excluded. There are -- you can be excluded for a range of reasons. Education, health, integrity, which is a big issue. We exclude between 10 to 15 per cent of applicants on the basis of integrity.

MR ALLEN: For what sort of reasons?

40

THE WITNESS: For what -- the sort of reasons can be a range. We have guidelines that talk about exclusion periods. You can still join the Queensland Police Service if you have had a minor offence a number of years ago. So we have guidelines for exclusion. So you can be permanently excluded or you can be excluded for -- have an exclusion period applied to you for traffic matters, say, for example, if you have had a number of traffic tickets, we can exclude you for a certain period. During that period you are advised that you are not to have any more speeding tickets otherwise your application won't be considered. So we have those sorts of guidelines.

MR ALLEN: What other sort of integrity issues have led to exclusion of 10 to 15 per cent of applicants?

THE WITNESS: Well, they can be terms of imprisonment. People apply who have had terms of imprisonment.

MR ALLEN: So not only traffic history but criminal history?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. Criminal history, yes.

MR ALLEN: Any other matters by way of integrity issues that have led to exclusion apart from criminal history?

10 THE WITNESS: It tends to be criminal history. We can do other checks as part of our ability to do checks and that can be through our intelligence systems that we have within the Police Service. They can be excluded by information that comes that way.

MR ALLEN: I see, so, what, mentions -- adverse mentions in QPRIME?

20 THE WITNESS: Those sorts of -- oh, it would depend. You know, like, I mean, it is very easy to say that but it depends what the mention is. You can sometimes get people who happen to live in a house that was previously occupied by a criminal and that house will come up. So you immediately do further inquiries to say is that person -- was that the person that was living there at the time. So, you know, it is not that simple to say that it is just because you have got a criminal history or you have got this or that, it is not that simple, mmm.

PRESIDING OFFICER: I suppose associations would be a critical issue, couldn't it?

30 THE WITNESS: Yeah, and unfortunately we don't have association legislation so we can't -- we don't check families. We can't under our legislation. So that is an impediment to us at the moment.

MR ALLEN: Can you explain that, the legislative impediment to checking on family, for example.

THE WITNESS: Sure. Well, we don't have what we would call association. So you can't check people known to that person. So you couldn't check family for a privacy reason. You can't check those sorts of things.

MR ALLEN: Not even criminal history?

40 THE WITNESS: Why would I check a criminal history of a cousin of that person? I mean, I have no right to do so because we're checking the veracity of an applicant for that job. So their parents or whoever. Yeah, so that's what we're talking about, that we can't do that. Sometimes it can be picked up through BCI checks which is our intelligence holdings and we will find ways of including that information but, yeah, it is very difficult at the moment because basically -- the recruiting process is a process that tests the veracity of an application and we do that through a range of things. We do that through referee reports, we do that through, you know, psychometric testing. We do that through an interview which has community members. We actually have community members on our selection panels. So we

try to test the veracity of applications through a range of measures.

MR ALLEN: Is one of the reasons why the recruitment is a critical gate keeper also that it is much easier and more cost effective to exclude someone at that point than to try to remove them later, for various reasons?

10 THE WITNESS: Not at all. We are subject to -- our Act prescribes that even as an applicant to join the Queensland Police Service, we must do it by merit. Now, we would be one of the few organisations that actually has merit as a principle for what we call base grade entry. I doubt there would be too many organisations, whether public or private, that has restrictive practices that says if you apply for a position, I can exclude you but I have to justify that exclusion to whether it's a judicial review or through equal opportunity or for discrimination grounds. We have those grounds, so we have to make sure that our processes are rigorous but they can withstand scrutiny. But, as a recruit, you are not employed as a police officer, you are employed as a recruit on a contract of employment. That contract can be terminated for any reason by the superintendent in charge of that program, and that is the reason we have them on contract for seven months.

20 MR ALLEN: Are you saying that Queensland is somewhat unique in that unsuccessful applicants for recruitment can actually challenge those decisions?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.

MR ALLEN: Just making a comparison of the jurisdictions, you have attached as attachment A to your statement quite a detailed table.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

30 MR ALLEN: Do you have a copy of that in front of you?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't.

MR ALLEN: I will ask you to look at a copy.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: What is this document designed to be?

40 THE WITNESS: It's designed to be a comparison of a range of issues across all jurisdictions in Australia, about entry standards, about our age and education standards, about what our requirements are in terms of medical, prior offence history, the applications process, so it does comparisons across all of our jurisdictions.

MR ALLEN: Does that difference between Queensland and other states of the application for review appear in there?

THE WITNESS: No, it doesn't. But it has recently been identified as a -- we have

recently engaged a consultant to do an external review of our recruiting processes. He delivered his final report only yesterday and I have briefly had a chance to look through it, and he has as well identified that as an issue; that, unlike other jurisdictions -- other jurisdictions have the right to just say no, with no review process. One other jurisdiction, the Northern Territory, gives people -- notifies them that they have been excluded, for whatever reason, but does not give them time or the benefit of an actual review.

10 MR ALLEN: Whereas, I suppose, in Queensland there has been some publicity as to repeated applications for review of refusals by two particular brothers?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR ALLEN: You are saying that that sort of litigation wouldn't occur in other states?

THE WITNESS: No.

20 MR ALLEN: Are there any aspects exemplified in this table which show that the Queensland Police Service recruitment or screening practices are less effective than any other states?

30 THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe so. I believe you need to look at the process as a whole. What I argue is that we actually have something like a minimum, a 23-month selection process. You have a minimum of four months to get an application processed, minimum, absolute minimum to get an application processed. You then have seven months as a recruit, where they are on a contract, where they are again continuously assessed. You then have another 12 months when they are on probation. Throughout that 23 months there is an opportunity to look at the suitability of officers and recruits to determine whether or not their employment should continue or be terminated.

MR ALLEN: So the four months is from the time they put the application in, and then there's a process of consideration. The seven months -- is it seven months in the academy?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

40 MR ALLEN: Then the 12 months on probation, is that what you would refer to as a first-year constable?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR ALLEN: And the appointment is not confirmed until after they have finished that first 12 months?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR ALLEN: So when you say that they can be terminated at any point in that 23

months, I assume that if there's provision to have your refusal to be accepted as a recruit reviewed, there's probably a process of review available for termination?

THE WITNESS: Not for recruits. Recruits are on a contract of employment and they are not covered by the Industrial Relations Act, so that's a contract of employment which you can terminate. Once they are sworn in and they are on probation for that 12 months, yes, there are avenues for them to appeal a decision of dismissal, yes.

10 MR ALLEN: Going back to page 3 of your statement, you detail there the process?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Including criminal history check, traffic history check, previous employer check. Previous employer check, is that simply reviewing some type of document that's been signed by a previous employer, or is that some type of actual contact with the previous employer?

20 THE WITNESS: It's not verbal contact. We actually write to that -- as part of the process they must provide us with their current supervisor, the name of their current supervisor. So we physically write to that person and ask them to complete a referee component of that, which talks about their leadership -- sorry, their supervisor, their integrity, it talks about their commitment, their communication skills, all of those sorts of issues. There is also a question asked of them, sick leave and was that leave appropriate, and those sorts of things, yes.

MR ALLEN: Present residence check, what does that involve?

30 THE WITNESS: That's about whether or not you're an Australian citizen.

MR ALLEN: Employer and referee checks, with the application do applicants submit references?

THE WITNESS: No. No, they can if they choose, but we actually send forms to the nominated referee checks with our questions.

MR ALLEN: Are they contacted verbally?

40 THE WITNESS: No, they are not.

MR ALLEN: Police referee checks, is an applicant supposed to nominate a police officer who knows them?

THE WITNESS: No, not at all. We just ask them if they know anybody in the police service and if they would like to nominate those people as referee. If they tell us that they know a person then we will contact that police officer for any -- not as a referee but as a contact as to what their knowledge is of the individual who has made the application.

MR ALLEN: What are the police referee checks?

THE WITNESS: As I said, that's if they nominate a referee, they nominate a contact, we make contact with that police officer.

MR ALLEN: Is that by writing?

THE WITNESS: Writing or email, or can be personal contact if some issues come up, yes.

10

MR ALLEN: Then there's a panel interview, of course.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Psychological testing and interview?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

20

MR ALLEN: Just in relation to that, on page 4, you deal with psychometric testing?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: You say that there have been some changes made to that?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: From 2008?

30

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: When you say in the second full paragraph that, "The previous set of psychometric tests to select police recruits was only a very narrow measure of normal personality," what does that mean?

40

THE WITNESS: What it means is -- and can I preface this by saying I'm not a psychologist, but what it is is that you test for a range of attributes as part of personality testing, but it was quite narrow. So we have expanded that test to look at behaviours that would not be conducive to being what we would term a valued member of the organisation. I think I go into some detail there about antisocial features, you know, we would actually question them and test them in terms of what their views are or what their attitude is to some of these things, and it comes out of the testing. They have in the testing what they call false positives. Whilst people can lie on tests, you have built in what they call false positives, so that if you lie you can be caught, because they will ask a question in a different way at different parts of the test. So that can raise.

If a person comes up with suboptimal answers, they are then individually interviewed by the occupational psychologist. We have a team of occupational

psychologists, that's their job. They actually sit down with these individuals that come outside of the norm or show elevated answers, where they actually sit down -- they then provide written recommendations to the selection committee as to whether or not people should be excluded, and on the basis of that, that forms part of the assessment.

10

MR ALLEN: So those factors, starting at real consciousness, and going over the page and concluding with aggression, they are personality factors which were introduced with the new process in 2008?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Obviously that would enhance, I suppose, the utility of the psychometric testing?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.

20

MR ALLEN: Given that those features would, amongst other things, be very relevant to personality factors which might impact on integrity?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely, yes.

MR ALLEN: Were there adverse consequences for recruitment of officers because of the more narrow tests that were used prior to 2008?

THE WITNESS: I couldn't say.

30

MR ALLEN: On page 5, second last paragraph, you note that, "A large percentage of younger persons who have experimented with or taken illicit drugs are screened out of the selection process."

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: How is that done?

THE WITNESS: It's part of the psychometric test. They are actually asked the question, "Have you in the past experimented with drugs?" That is a question that is part of the psychometric test, and if they say "yes" they are excluded.

40

MR ALLEN: Because you note that there's no specific question on drug taking in the application form?

THE WITNESS: No, that's correct, yes.

MR ALLEN: Do you know if that question as to whether they have previously taken illicit drugs was part of any questioning including health or psychometric testing before 2008?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it was. We used to put it on the application form, the actual

application form itself, and it was only changed when we introduced the new testing regime, that it was taken off the actual application form and was put into the psychometric testing.

MR ALLEN: So it used to be on the application form?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Up until?

10

THE WITNESS: I suspect around about 2008.

MR ALLEN: You don't know when it 2008?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry no, but I can ascertain that information if you require.

MR ALLEN: Since 2008 it's been part of the psychometric testing?

20

THE WITNESS: That's correct. It's also part of the health questionnaire when they go before a medical practitioner for assessment, as to their suitability, those issues are -- that's covered in the health questionnaire with a doctor.

MR ALLEN: You have mentioned too, I think, earlier, that there's also some mandatory testing of recruits?

THE WITNESS: Yes. We mandatory test recruits for drugs on the second day that they commence with us. As I said, I think we've had since 2005 one positive response, and that person was sacked.

30

MR ALLEN: So that's one out of?

THE WITNESS: 2,900, I think it was. Yes.

MR ALLEN: I'll try to explore that a little bit further, and you may be able to assist us as to what relevant documentation would have applied in relation to some particular recruits. Unrelated to Operation Tesco, a general duties officer performing duty at the Surfers Paradise Police Station of some five years' experience came to the attention of the CMC and two weeks ago was apprehended in possession of cannabis and exhibiting indicia indicative of recent drug use.
40 During an interview with the CMC that police officer admitted to consuming cannabis not only during the course of his five years with the Queensland Police Service but also prior to that. So, would he have, if he was being sworn in five years ago, as part of his recruitment process, been subject to any questioning as to whether or not he used illicit drugs?

THE WITNESS: Well, if he was sworn in -- the drug testing commenced in 2005, so I'm not sure who the individual was and when he was sworn in, so I couldn't comment. But we have introduced drug testing of recruits since 2005.

MR ALLEN: So if he was recruited before the date in 2005 when the drug testing commenced, he wouldn't have been subject to it, obviously?

THE WITNESS: Because it depended upon legislation, obviously.

MR ALLEN: What about any questions as part of his recruitment process, would he have been asked if he was using illicit drugs?

10 THE WITNESS: I can't tell you. I wouldn't know without looking at that individual's file, and going back and checking the recruitment records.

MR ALLEN: I suppose one of the concerning aspects of that example is that not only does a person who is using drugs at the time of recruitment become a police officer, but there doesn't seem to have been anything in his training or experience as a police officer which has led to him changing that.

THE WITNESS: I don't suppose I can comment, no, I don't know.

20 MR ALLEN: If I can ask you about another case study, and this relates to an officer who has been referred to as officer G7. He applied for employment with the Queensland Police Service in late 2002. He had very supportive references, both from police officers and nonpolice officers. He had a traffic history of two offences of speeding, one using a mobile phone, and one hooning offence, by the sound of it, wilfully starting or driving a vehicle in a way that makes unnecessary noise or smoke. Obviously, that minor traffic history wouldn't have disqualified him from being a recruit, especially as the offences were between 2001 and 2003. Even though they were recent?

30 THE WITNESS: It depends. We do have exclusion -- as I said previously, we do exclude people for certain periods on traffic matters. As I said, unless I can look at the case, I can't form an opinion whether that person was excluded for a certain period and then allowed to reapply, I can't tell you.

MR ALLEN: He wasn't. What are the rules for, say, traffic offences? How many do you have to have before you are excluded for a period?

THE WITNESS: I don't have that information in front of me. We have guidelines for it and it's about recency and it's about the nature of the traffic offence, yes.

40 MR ALLEN: He was in the academy in 2003, and on New Year's Day 2004 he received a traffic infringement notice for exceeding the speed limit by more than 40km/h. Now, that actually led to him being suspended from the academy.

THE WITNESS: Right.

MR ALLEN: And he was required to be suspended for at least 12 months, and then to be readmitted, he had to show an exemplary criminal and traffic history, had to show that he had maintained health and other eligibility criteria, and essentially satisfy a review panel that he should be readmitted.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: And he did. I think there are many members of the Queensland Police Service who regret that he did. There has been an opinion expressed by at least one police officer in this hearing that there should be a zero tolerance policy for recruits who commit any offence while they are in training or on probation, I expect. Do you think that's realistic or do you need to take into account the nature of the offence as to whether exclusion for a period might be more appropriate, or is the process of recruitment such a critical gate keeper that there should be that one strike and you're out?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't agree with one strike and you're out in the recruitment process. As part of the academy process, which is the training process, I think that that's the appropriate place for it to be dealt with. But I think to arbitrarily say that you have one thing happen and you're excluded, I think is not realistic. I think you need to look at each situation as it arises. I think hindsight is always a great thing, but perhaps now, maybe that case -- maybe that wouldn't have happened now. But at that time that person was dealt with undoubtedly appropriately, but yes, it may have been an error of judgment at that time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Some of those histories we have heard show a pattern of behaviour, don't they? And I take it the suspension, if you like, for a period is designed to see whether that pattern will reoccur?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Mr Chairman, that's correct. In some cases -- we very rarely these days suspend recruits, they are usually terminated. The only time we tend now to suspend contracts is if people voluntarily pull out because of family issues or they are not meeting the academic --

PRESIDING OFFICER: Beyond their control, as it were?

THE WITNESS: That's exactly right, yes.

MR ALLEN: Can I ask you about one other case study relating to an officer who has been referred to as G5. As it turned out, prior to being recruited by the Queensland Police Service, that particular individual had been employed by Queensland Health and during her employment by Queensland Health had been on extended sick leave for a substantial period, well in excess of six months, possibly up to 12 months. Subsequently, as it turned out, she was suffering medical conditions which she at least claimed that prevented her from carrying out her duties as an employee of Queensland Health. She had apparently undergone psychiatric treatment, including electroconvulsive therapy -- shock treatment. Obviously she was dishonest in ticking all the nos on a health questionnaire in July 2007, including questions such as: "Have you ever suffered from mental illness, depression, anxiety or stress?" "Have you ever consulted a psychiatrist or psychologist?" "Have you ever claimed workers compensation for any injuries?" "Are you currently receiving treatment for any health conditions?" Essentially all the nos were ticked.

Now, how would the system be expected to pick up such falsity on the part of a recruit on matters which, of course, would be of great significance as to whether they are an appropriate recruit?

THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, I'm aware of the particular case, and we actually checked with her immediate supervisor, and the question was asked about sick leave, and that --

10 MR ALLEN: How did you check?

THE WITNESS: Well, I checked -- well, we wrote to the supervisor, obviously.

MR ALLEN: Did you actually send them a document to complete?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes. And if I recall, the supervisor said that the sick leave was appropriate. There was no indication, the supervisor gave her glowing referee comments in terms of her work ethic, in terms of her work commitment. There were no indicators in my view, when I reviewed the file, that
20 would in any way cause us to have any concerns about that application. It would appear that the person has lied throughout their application, they have lied to the medical practitioner that examined them, and I don't know what we could have done more to -- because there were no indicators for us for any concern.

MR ALLEN: Because in fact, although she had been on sick leave from Queensland Health from 9 August 2006 through to, it seems at least, 4 June 2007, you received an employer referee report from, obviously, someone in Queensland Health?

30 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: Indeed, the Gold Coast Hospital?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR ALLEN: And in response to a query as to level of punctuality or sick leave, you received the answer, "Always punctual, appropriate leave as required."

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

40

MR ALLEN: That's just completely misleading, isn't it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: Mr Allen, it's difficult, isn't it? People more cynical than I might think that the employer of such a person might be relieved at the thought that someone else is going to employ them.

MR ALLEN: Exactly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: If you are going to check every referee from the

perspective that they might well not be frank with you because they are happy to see the back of the person, well, you would have a vast industry of checking then, wouldn't you?

MR ALLEN: Yes. This referee said, in relation to the person's physical ability to perform their workplace duties effectively, "Always very fit, has a keen interest in physical fitness and nutrition."

PRESIDING OFFICER: I rest my case.

10

MR ALLEN: Could we consider, perhaps at least, in relation to a form such as that, requiring it to be made by way of a statutory declaration?

THE WITNESS: I suppose you could. But, I mean, I suppose if a person is prepared to lie, they are prepared to lie on a statutory declaration as well.

MR ALLEN: One would hope perhaps that the consequence of a false declaration might at least give them pause.

20

THE WITNESS: I'm certainly happy to consider anything that's likely to improve the truthfulness on applications. We were talking about whether or not they need to make a statement on the application form that, "All of the information provided above is true and correct." But I'm certainly open to any recommendations where we can improve the process.

PRESIDING OFFICER: There's a cost involved every time, isn't there?

30

THE WITNESS: If you look, Mr Chairman, we received last year 1,700 applications. So to do the amount of additional checking is an impost that would require more staff, for a start.

MR ALLEN: The application form doesn't currently require the applicant to certify as to the truth?

THE WITNESS: I think it says, "The above information is correct." But I'm talking more about the integrity side of it, providing a statement in terms of the integrity.

40

MR ALLEN: That's something that is under consideration?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: You spoke before about the legislative limitations on checking associations?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: If there were to be a change to that, that would require a legislative change?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR ALLEN: Not policy change --

THE WITNESS: Not policy change.

MR ALLEN: -- at QPS level?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Or perhaps requiring a recruit to waive privacy rights?

THE WITNESS: I don't know whether you can waive privacy rights, I'm not sure.

MR ALLEN: Are there any problems with jurisdictions -- for instance, other states -- sharing information which is relevant to background checks?

20 THE WITNESS: There are some concerns at the moment which we are now just having some discussions about, where other jurisdictions have spent convictions legislation, which means that they are not legally able to give us information about applicants who may have offences in other states that are what are considered spent.

MR ALLEN: Are there any steps being taken to address that?

30 THE WITNESS: Yes, we are currently in the process of developing a memorandum of understanding with other commissioners in other states about the sharing of information. The discussion at the moment is actually looking at the legislation in other states to see whether or not it is the legislation that precludes it or whether in fact it is policy in the other states that precludes it. That is where we currently are at the moment in relation to that.

MR ALLEN: On page 7 of your statement you say that another barrier to comprehensive screening is that some companies have policies that prevent detailed employer or referee reports being provided?

40 THE WITNESS: That is quite common at the moment. Where we make contact with referees, particularly immediate supervisors, generally now one of the more common questions is, "Will the person have access to this information?" If we quite rightly respond that they may access it under right to information, they will say, "Well, I'm not providing it." That to us immediately causes a flag to go up for us to do other checks, but there is a great deal of reluctance by people to be honest in their communications about work performance because of that particular piece of legislation where they feel that they may be subject to some litigation if they actually provide some information that hasn't obviously been previously discussed with that person.

MR ALLEN: You refer then to the fact that access to an applicant's social

networking sites is limited as applicant's permission is currently required?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Can you request an applicant's permission?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes, and we are currently in the process of changing our application form. As I said, we have recently had this review, and a couple of the recommendations that have come out that we will be putting in place is, one, asking them to give us their social networking addresses so we can check them. The other one is to put in place a test that they can apply themselves through the web, as part of our recruiting process, so they can actually do an initial test of their own integrity. They can go through a process and answer a series of questions on the web which would allow them to make a determination as to whether or not they are an appropriate person to proceed to application. So it's basically a self-assessment test.

MR ALLEN: The last factor you mentioned in the barriers to comprehensive screening, you refer to DNA testing of applicants?

20

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: What were you meaning to convey there?

30 THE WITNESS: DNA testing is mainly for exclusion purposes, in terms of once you become a police officer, it allows us to exclude you from a crime scene. The unfortunate, I suppose, downside of DNA testing is that you can actually pick up people who are actually wanted for offences. We have had a number of applicants who have lodged applications who have got warrants out for their arrest for a number of offences. So our legislation -- there is nothing that precludes us from taking DNA if they volunteer to take DNA as part of the application process, but the legislation prohibits us from doing anything with it or in terms of that DNA.

MR ALLEN: Have they been found by other means to have had warrants out or committed offences?

40 THE WITNESS: Yes. What's happening is we take fingerprints, so they might have been found through a fingerprints check, or criminal history checks, where they have been wanted for questioning in relation to particular offences.

MR ALLEN: So it's not the case that recruits have been screened out because they have volunteered DNA and that has been compared to a database?

THE WITNESS: No, we don't do that.

MR ALLEN: So why are you saying that DNA testing of applicants prevents a barrier to screening?

THE WITNESS: Well, it's just an additional barrier. What we are saying is that

DNA testing gives us another tool. It's about giving us tools in which to test the veracity of applications across the most broadest construct that we can find, and that's just one of many.

MR ALLEN: Are you saying that the barrier to comprehensive screening is your inability to use the DNA testing to screen applicants?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

10 MR ALLEN: You then go on, at the bottom of page 7, to refer to recruitment quotas.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: That is, firstly, to address attrition?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Plus a growth of approximately 200 per year?

20

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Are there sometimes higher quotas?

30

THE WITNESS: They are not quotas, no. It's purely attrition plus our growth. That's all we recruit for. Attrition -- our attrition is very, very low, our attrition is around 3 per cent, which -- I think suggest most organisations would love to have an attrition rate that low. An attrition rate, when you are talking 10,000, that's still around 300 people. So we do that plus our growth. So you are looking at an average of around 600 to 700 a year that we put through the academy.

MR ALLEN: So it's not the case that there are ever spikes in the quota that you have to try to meet because of, say, a pre-election promise to provide 500 extra officers in a certain time?

40

THE WITNESS: No, the Government has given us very generous growth every year, which I suspect a lot of agencies would welcome. We get growth of 200 a year, so that's been going on for a number of years. So we factor that in as part of our normal -- the 200 has been in place -- per year has been in place for a few years, so we know it's there, so we factor our recruiting practices into meeting the fact we have to replace people leaving plus what our growth is.

MR ALLEN: It's not the case that there are any organisational impacts from government or any adverse consequences to the organisation from government if you don't meet a recruitment quota?

THE WITNESS: I can assure you that in my career with Queensland I have never come across any threats to me that if I don't meet a quota of police that there's some action to be taken, no.

MR ALLEN: So there is no perceived pressure at all to get recruits in to meet a quota which could impact adversely on the recruitment or screening of the quality of the recruits?

10 THE WITNESS: No. I mean, we have, as I said in my statement, we have standards, we rate people from A to E. We have never, in my view, dropped those standards to take people that would be considered unsuitable. We have ratings, as I've said in my statement, from the people that we take are between A and C. Like any sort of ratings system, C is you meet the standards. A is your best, obviously, they are your top applicants. In the last couple of years, with the global financial crisis, we have been very, very lucky to have a pool of applicants in that A to B range. When I talk about quality, I'm talking about people who are -- we've had veterinary surgeons, we have had people who have -- we have had lawyers. We have had a range of people joining the organisation who we would rate very highly. Now, what happens is we're about to reach a position where we have total employment in Australia. Now, obviously we are going to struggle --

20 PRESIDING OFFICER: That's what I was going to ask you, how vulnerable are you to changes in the job market?

THE WITNESS: We are vulnerable, but never to the extent that we would take people that we would classify as unsuitable.

PRESIDING OFFICER: That would not satisfy the classification?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely, yes.

30 MR ALLEN: What is the effective difference between categories A and E?

THE WITNESS: If you look at an A applicant, they have very high educational standard, they would have flown through their medical, they would have flown through what we call their physical requirements. They would have the top medical -- so it would be all that. They would be what you would refer to as a clean skin in terms of integrity, they would have nothing. So that's the A. A C person would have the minimum requirement, which is 200 hours of tertiary qualification, they would be in the mid range of physical fitness. They would meet medical requirements, because there's no -- you either meet it or you don't meet it for medical. You would have integrity, but you might have a couple of traffic
40 offences, but you are still considered suitable.

MR ALLEN: Is it possible in the course of the recruitment process to in fact offer category C applicants recruitment offers before category A or B applicants, because they are part of a particular target group?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.

MR ALLEN: Can you explain how that works?

THE WITNESS: If we -- we obviously encourage Queensland should represent the community, so if we have people from differing backgrounds, non English-speaking backgrounds or Aboriginal and Torres Strait islanders, if they are in that group but still are suitable, then I'm a firm believer that we should be offering those people opportunities. We also offer, particularly for our indigenous applicants, what we call a JEP, a justice entry program, where we train them for six months at the academy before they enter into the Proof program to allow them to develop the skills to be able to get through that Proof program. But absolutely, yes, we will encourage diversity within the organisation.

10

MR ALLEN: What about gender balance, does that relate to perhaps preferring some B or C over an A applicant?

THE WITNESS: Certainly we strive to have a balance in our recruits in terms of gender. We tend to have around about, I think it's around about 30 per cent females in our recruits as a balance as representative of the organisation. So yes, we do.

MR ALLEN: So the A to E really scores quality but it's not -- it doesn't define the order of recruitment?

20

THE WITNESS: No, that's correct.

MR ALLEN: What about if an applicant is prepared to move to Townsville to go to the academy there, rather than Brisbane?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we also do that. Like most organisations, we are challenged by trying to get officers into remote and northern centres. Our applicant pool tends to be from the south-east corner, because that's where most of our population is. What tends to happen is that if you're not an A or B, if you're a C applicant, for example, and you're prepared to serve from Rockhampton north, then we will send you -- we will make the offer to you to say, you can start immediately by going to the Townsville academy, you will be stationed in the northern areas for the first three years of your career. If, however, you want to wait to go to the Brisbane academy, you can do so but you will be -- you may not get the offer as quickly as you would if we can offer you a position now.

30

MR ALLEN: I understand. On page 9 of your statement in the third last paragraph, after dealing with certain examples in relation to the system of transfers and promotions on merit, you say, "From a HR perspective, apart from those examples, there are no strategies currently in place for identifying establishments or officers at risk"?

40

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: Should there be?

THE WITNESS: I think -- well, I'll allow Mr Martin tomorrow to talk about where they do it from the perspective of the Ethical Standards Command, but I'm talking from an HR perspective. We have facilities in place that allow both management

and the officer to apply for transfers, given certain circumstances, and one of those circumstances is management of staffing levels, from a management perspective. So, for example, one of them is that if we believe that there has been a loss of -- a breakdown in the relationship between an officer and his supervisor or an officer and the community, then we can transfer that officer. There is a process for allowing that officer to be transferred out of that area. It has been exercised. I personally have exercised it in one of my areas, where there has been, in my view, a breakdown and I have transferred that person. That person has reviewed the decision, with the review commissioner, and I have won. So there is precedent that says that it can occur, and it does occur.

10

MR ALLEN: Should there be any other strategies in place to try and assess officers, apart from when they are seeking promotion?

THE WITNESS: Well, if you look at what we are doing with performance management at the moment, there is a rather large project being done on improving our performance management, which is monitoring behaviour. That's about performance. We anticipate that there will be a paper delivered by the end of the year to our senior executives for consideration of implementing a system that will look at performance. But focusing not just on performance but the behaviours associated with that performance. What we are anticipating is that that will be introduced toward the middle of next year. I think that is just another tool for us to be able to look at people's performance, officers' performance and whether or not there are any indicators that show that there needs to be something addressed in their performance.

20

MR ALLEN: There seems to be some emphasis on psychometric testing at the recruitment stage. Would there be any benefit at all in any testing at any later stages in an officer's career?

30

THE WITNESS: We actually do test in what we call our special units, child protection, some of our other more, I suppose, specialist areas, we do psychometric testing on an annual basis. That's testing stress levels, it's testing whether or not they should remain in those particular environments. Again, our senior executive board of management has approved in principle a roll-out of that program to other areas, with the ultimate aim that eventually every police officer will be tested on an annual basis. But that's not for some years, because of the cost.

MR ALLEN: How are decisions made about where first-year constables are posted?

40

THE WITNESS: A range of reasons. One, the most critical one is the availability of field training officers. Field training officers are trained officers with at least two years of service, who mentor first-year constables. They are trained. They go through a training program. So the determination of where they are placed is one -- one of the critical component is the availability of those field training officers, and what we can do in terms of making sure we have enough FYCs together to support each other, because, again, it's a really important thing that we don't send them off in isolation. It's important that they be trained together and they develop

relationships together, so that they have got that peer support. So we have major training centres across Queensland.

MR ALLEN: Does the nature of the policing environment, and in particular any sort of integrity risks that might be associated with it, feature at all in deciding whether first-year constables are posted to a particular station, for example Surfers Paradise?

10 THE WITNESS: No, but what we do is we regularly audit what training has been provided in all of our training stations. There was a recent audit actually of Surfers
Paradise, where there was one particular situation that caused us concern, which
has been addressed, and it was about the fact that a particular first-year constable
had three or four field training officers over a period of eight weeks. That's a
concern because there was no continuity. But that's based on resourcing and that's
now been corrected. We actually audit regularly, in terms of what training has
been developed, and been delivered. We actually bring the first-year constables
back, periodically back to the academy, so they are taken out of their environment
and they are put into an environment where they are encouraged to talk about
issues, about anything that is likely to concern them where they are stationed. My
20 advice from the academy is that there have been no issues identified in relation to
the Gold Coast.

MR ALLEN: Field training officers, are they operational police who take on that role?

THE WITNESS: Yes, they are.

MR ALLEN: At a particular rank?

30 THE WITNESS: No, no. It's usually constable but it can be up to senior constable.

MR ALLEN: In relation to Surfers Paradise officers, we have heard that they work in teams, there's a six-team structure of operational uniformed officers. So would the field training officer be a senior constable or constable in the first-year constable's team?

THE WITNESS: I couldn't comment, that's a local area.

40 MR ALLEN: There does seem to be a very high level of first-year constables in the Surfers Paradise division compared to others. Are you able to agree or disagree with that?

THE WITNESS: I would say it's comparable to other areas. If you look at other busy areas, like Fortitude Valley and the city and Cairns, they also have high numbers of first-year constables. But I think the perspective has to be that they are sworn officers, they are officers. Yes, they are still learning but they are sworn officers. So I think that it's a matter of, we put them where we can provide the best avenue for training. Can I say, I think probably down on the Gold Coast, and places like the Valley, are seen as terrific grounding for developing skills.

MR ALLEN: The fact that they are busy areas, I suppose, leads inevitably to the fact that there are quite a lot of first-year constables there because you need a sufficient number of field training officers and a critical mass for first-year constables?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. And I think the other issue is, what I find most admirable about these people is that they are probably the most enthusiastic people you will come across, because for them it's the beginning of their career and they are enormously enthusiastic about getting in and doing the work.

MR ALLEN: You mentioned your ability to transfer an officer if there's that intractable problem in the relationship with the supervisor. Are there any impediments to human resource management by way of transfer of police officers because of the current structure, or any industrial constraints?

THE WITNESS: Obviously the industrial constraints are that they do have rights of review, so you would have to have the grounds to do it in our -- under our Act and our provisions. So you wouldn't -- you can't just transfer people because it seems like a good idea. You have to actually have grounds to transfer people. Because I think the adage that because you work in a place for a long time, that suddenly you have to be moved is not necessarily valid. We have police throughout Queensland who have served in some of those areas for a very long time and have enormous connection with the community, and it's very strong, and it's very valid and it's very important. So I think you have to look at individual cases to say: is that person still performing appropriately? Is their performance suitable? If it's not, that's when you take action.

MR ALLEN: What about just the operational requirements of the service, that you actually need more police in a particular area and you can't fill that particular position with a recruit; is that a valid reason for transferring someone from one district to another?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I think there's two things there. One is, once first-year constables get confirmed, that's when they get their permanent allocation. Now, we have moved in probably the last three or four months, or probably in the last six months, 60 what we call second-year constables, so upon confirmation, we have moved them out of the south-east corner to areas up north because we have difficulty getting people into those areas. We have taken them out of the Gold Coast, we have taken them out of Brisbane.

MR ALLEN: Sorry, what point are they?

THE WITNESS: They are when they get confirmed, so we call them second year, so upon confirmation of their first year.

MR ALLEN: So they have been confirmed somewhere else?

THE WITNESS: Yes, they get confirmed, say, for example, on Surfers Paradise,

they then get told, "Your permanent allocation is now to Mount Isa." So we move them at that point. But under the lateral transfer provisions, yes, there is still the ability that if we were in a dire situation in a particular area, there is the ability to direct transfers. Providing you do the advertising and you haven't been able to achieve anyone to get their voluntarily, there is the ability to do it.

10 MR ALLEN: Do you think the system should be less restrictive as to the ability of the service to transfer officers from one station to another? I think the process is there. I think you have to have frameworks for it and you have to have guardrails around things to protect what is correct within an organisation of our size. But one of the things that we are also doing as part of our current EB negotiations is we are actually discussing the issue of district appointments, where officers are appointed to a district as opposed to the individual station, which will allow for more flexibility.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Can I just ask you a question: you mentioned before about performance management.

20 THE WITNESS: Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: What is the impact of that on resource? How resource demanding is it?

30 THE WITNESS: My personal view is that if you do it properly it is not resource intensive. It's about having that discussion with an officer once or twice a year and saying, "This is my expectations of behaviour, this is what we're going to assess you on." I don't personally believe that that should be resource intensive. So whatever processes that we put in place, that is one of the considerations, is that the last thing you want to do is put more work on to busy supervisors. So it's got to be something that is not going to be that resource intensive for them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Does that work most times?

THE WITNESS: Our current process, I'd be the first to admit, hasn't been successful. But it's been more based on outputs, in terms of what am I as an officer going to deliver. The process that we are looking at at the moment looks more at behavioural type stuff, which I think is --

40 PRESIDING OFFICER: Better.

THE WITNESS: Yes, which I think is much better.

MR ALLEN: When can you expect to see something concrete come out of that process?

THE WITNESS: I believe that there is a paper going to our senior executive conference in November, for them to consider the implementation and what we are going to do. I am hopeful from talking to the project officer that we would have it implemented by mid next year.

PRESIDING OFFICER: I wouldn't mind if you would keep us informed on that.

THE WITNESS: Certainly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: I have experienced at other organisations where performance management has become a very significant resource demander, and you have to worry about where you draw the line, how much you shift the resources into performance management.

10

THE WITNESS: The system that we are looking at is based on the Queensland Government system of capability leadership. It's also in place in the Federal Government and it's also been introduced into a number of other police jurisdictions. So we think it's got fluidity in terms of it.

MR ALLEN: Would you be the appropriate contact point for the CMC if they wish to get more information about that process?

20

THE WITNESS: I'm not, but I'm happy to act as a point of contact for them to refer to the project officer.

MR ALLEN: Thank you. And thank you very much for your evidence.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Thank you, your Honour. Ms Jones, if I could ask you something about recruitment? You have told us -- you have set out at page 7 of your statement there are significant barriers in the path of conducting appropriate vetting of applicants, is that so?

30

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Many of those are beyond the service's control?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Interstate jurisdictions, for instance, can be less than forthcoming?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

40

MR MACSPORRAN SC: For their own good reasons for information that would help you vet an applicant?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: That's a problem. The next problem you have is you are required under your legislation to select applicants based on merit?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And that decision, as to whether someone is a successful applicant or not, is itself subject to review?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Now, does that soak up a significant amount of resources?

10 THE WITNESS: Oh, absolutely because what you have got to do, obviously, is work on the basis that every applicant is likely to review your decision. So you actually have to make sure that your processes are very sound and can withstand scrutiny. So instead of probably just when applicants come in and just say, "No, you know, that person is unsuitable", you actually do a degree of process to make sure that you can withstand scrutiny if that decision is questioned.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: In fact, are there a significant number of reviews that take place?

20 THE WITNESS: Not significant -- sorry, in terms of internal review, because the first point of review is to the chief superintendent at the academy. The second point of review is to me. So they can review the chief superintendent's decision to exclude a person on integrity to me. The next point of review after that is the judicial review.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Yes.

THE WITNESS: So you have really got to make sure that your processes are very sound and can withstand that scrutiny, yes.

30 MR MACSPORRAN SC: If those reviews are undertaken the service has to respond, there is no choice.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. I would probably consider up to half a dozen, at least, maybe a fortnight of people who have written in and are appealing an exclusion.

40 MR MACSPORRAN SC: Can I ask you this: if, for instance, you are unable to get certain information about someone's background through these difficulties, these barriers you have told us about, is that a legitimate reason to refuse an applicant for recruitment? When I say legitimate one that will stand up to the review process?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't think it is. I mean, the question, I suppose, is that for example, overseas jurisdictions do not now give us any history. Interpol has withdrawn from providing any information for employment purposes. Our North African applicants, we can't get any information from those jurisdictions at all. But what we've now done is working with the immigration department, because they do checks on them for them for migration. So we're working on that. But fundamentally, in some of these areas, we're relying on statutory declarations of these people in terms of testing the veracity for integrity. Now, in some cases, it

involves them, we do much greater background checks of other tools that we've got.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Yes.

THE WITNESS: To see if we can find any reason to include them or exclude them.

10 MR MACSPORRAN SC: But, effectively, you are hamstrung in this sense, that a lack of information in that respect doesn't provide you with an appropriate reason for refusal.

THE WITNESS: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And Queensland is unique in the Australian policing jurisdictions in that respect?

THE WITNESS: That is correct, yes.

20 MR MACSPORRAN SC: Completely out of step with what other jurisdictions do?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Would you like to see the Police Service Administration Act where the merit-based recruitment process is embedded change to come into line with other Australian policing jurisdictions?

30 THE WITNESS: Yes, I would. I think you can cover people's concerns about the application process through policy, not through -- by having it embedded into legislation, it just adds more difficult constraints on us. I think obviously the intention of the legislation was for merit to be within the organisation in terms of promotion. I think what's happened is it got caught up in the legislation by including recruits. Whether that was the intent I suspect I don't know.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Once they are accepted as a recruit --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

40 MR MACSPORRAN SC: -- then there is a 23-month period when they are effectively on notice, as it were?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: If they're dismissed or their contract is terminated during that 23-month period, do they have a right of review of that decision at all?

THE WITNESS: No.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Right. But your whole system would be strengthened

by having the ability to prevent them becoming a recruit in the first place?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Now, you have heard, I think, two or maybe three examples given to you today about people that came through the recruiting process and it seemed went bad afterwards. At least in two of those cases, the system did throw up concerns about them at the recruitment stage and during their first 23-month period.

10

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: So does that give you encouragement that the system is appropriately tuned to flag issues with applicants and recruits?

THE WITNESS: I am confident that we have the tools in place to do it. I think obviously in some cases we fail, we don't do as well as we should but I am confident that if we're putting through 700 recruits a year, we have ten and a half thousand police officers, I think that the rate at which we are failing is very, very minuscule compared to what we actually achieve.

20

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And there is no -- I assume you would agree no recruitment process that's going to force an applicant to be scrupulously honest.

THE WITNESS: No, in fact at one stage there was some discussion about polygraph testing, you know, but how do you polygraph -- it is an inexact science anyway and it has been disputed. So, I mean, they were the extremes in which we were looking to try and increase the veracity of testing people's claims. When you are dealing with human beings, unfortunately that's very difficult.

30

MR MACSPORRAN SC: A couple of areas you have looked at are asking for consent of the applicant to access their social networking sites.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And testing, DNA testing?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

40

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And refusal to allow that to be done would cause the service exceeding concern about accepting them as applicants.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: To take another example of something that may be useful, for instance when lawyers are seeking admission as practitioners, they are required to state on their form any aspect -- any matters that they are aware of that may affect their suitability for admission. In other words, it places the onus on them as applicants to disclose everything that might affect character, character

assessment.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Do you think that might be a useful tool for applications for police recruits?

10 THE WITNESS: I do. I do. It is something that I will certainly take on board because I think anything that gives us -- it certainly doesn't protect us in the first instance but it certainly gives us sufficient grounds later on if a person is shown to have lied on their application process grounds for dismissal.

PRESIDING OFFICER: That's the strength of it, yes.

THE WITNESS: Yes, yes, absolutely.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: You have recourse where there has been uncovered dishonesty down the track.

20 THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: All right. Now, in terms of the steroid use, there is a basis to seek -- management to seek drug testing of an individual and that's a reasonable suspicion test?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

30 MR MACSPORRAN SC: If someone, for instance, to take an example, who was using steroids inappropriately and their body mass increased at a very rapid rate, observably over a short period of time and their behaviour changed for instance, would that qualify as a hypothetical for a basis to seek -- have a reasonable suspicion to seek a test?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that would. But additionally I think 8.3 actually gives us that --

40 MR MACSPORRAN SC: That power anyway. And if, for instance, the response was, "Well, they are prescribed steroids, I have a doctor's prescription and certificate to that effect", you could then make further inquiries of medical practitioner as well.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, you could do that. As I said, I would probably tend to send them to an independent specialist, an endocrinologist, who has expertise in that area and seek expert opinion. Because undoubtedly if we go to the medical practitioner, they will advise us that it has been prescribed for a legitimate reason, as opposed to sending them to an independent endocrinologist, a drugs expert who will then advise us from an independent point of view on the appropriateness.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: All right. Now, you talked about use of prescribed

medication and that you have a series of pamphlets that are posted in every police station?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Seeking to assist in advising and providing guidance to police officers as to the use of such medication.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

10

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Is that the material that you have annexed as attachment E, I think it is, to your statement?

THE WITNESS: That is correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: We can look at those in our own time but they are the sort of things that are posted around the State advising in a general sense that it is not enough to be prescribed the medication, you need to be careful that its use does not impact adversely upon your performance as an officer?

20

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: So in that sense you are providing an educative background?

THE WITNESS: Yes, absolutely.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: On the use of even prescribed substances.

30 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: The same posters make clear that illicit substances are not tolerated at all?

THE WITNESS: That's correct. It is a very firm message, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: There is education on use of alcohol and so forth in the same posters?

40 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: All right. Can I ask you about the staffing model with the QPS. We have heard some evidence here that it may be based, at least in part, upon the resident population of a district or region. Is that an oversimplification of the staffing model?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. I think the model is actually a distributive model. It is not an optimum model, it is a distributive model of what the resources are within the Police Service. The factors that are within the model that are considered when

we determine the allocation of positions -- and I will go through them -- is total population; youth population; ATSI population; nonresidential population, so that's your transient people; urbanisation; service delivery; specialist support; crime against the person; crime against property; crime other; domestic violence; traffic; isolation. So they are the factors that are considered when a model is run as determined. So it is not as simple as saying it is about population, no.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: So there is some science behind it?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And as much as a formula approach like that can deal with the situation you're comfortable at the moment at least that it is being used to effect?

THE WITNESS: Yes. In fact, we had it reviewed. There was a working party on the model in 2009 or 2008, I am not sure of the exact date, where representatives of the minister, both unions, the CMC were -- looked at the model and came to the conclusion that there was nothing out there that could better allocate a distributive load.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: It does take into account a wide range of features, as you've told us?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: In particular, for the Gold Coast, it would take into account what seems to be the major factor there of this large influx of transient population?

30 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Now, we have also heard evidence that it would be desirable to have an influx of a significant number of very experienced police officers on the Gold Coast for operational purposes.

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Is that ability -- does that exist already to have such officers brought into the district?

40 THE WITNESS: Well, I question the necessity for it. I mean, we did some data searches recently, and if you look at the Gold Coast district itself, in proportion of sergeants to constables, it is one to two. So for every two constables there is a sergeant in the Gold Coast district. If you go down to Surfers Paradise itself, it is one to five. So there is one sergeant for every five constables. If you include senior constables and supervisors and they are first line supervisors, that adds another 23 and it basically comes back again supervisor to constable ratio of one to two. So --

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Is that -- I am sorry.

THE WITNESS: I was just going to say, I think that how they allocate their supervisors is a local discretion, but from a whole of service perspective, that is comparable to places like the Valley, Cairns, other places. And it is certainly, in my view, not unreasonable.

10 MR MACSPORRAN SC: Certainly. We have heard about the new Coomera station being set up which resulted in the taking of five detectives, plain clothes officers, from another division within that area. But Coomera was set up within the existing south-east region boundaries.

THE WITNESS: That's correct. There was no additional boundaries added.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And was it staffed -- the net effect of setting up Coomera was to increase the overall police presence in the south-east region?

20 THE WITNESS: That's correct. What in fact happened was we gave them 35 additional police just for Coomera. So that it actually limited the amount of staff that were taken out of the Gold Coast, and yet the Gold Coast boundary was diminished because Coomera was put in place.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: I see. All right. Can you tell us a total figure of the hours of training provided by the Queensland Police Service in a 12-month period? Is there a figure?

30 THE WITNESS: Over the last 12 months, for police only, there has been in excess of 2 million hours of training provided. Now, obviously that's not all supervisory training, that's compliance training, but yes there has been delivery of over 2 million hours of training.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: That is reflective of the priority placed on training within the service.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely. As I said, that's a range of training. That is our MDP, but it is also -- a lot of that is compliance training that comes out of the use of things like Tasers and guns and physical skills type training, yes.

40 MR MACSPORRAN SC: And the training process itself, as I understand your evidence, is an ongoing process; it is reviewed regularly?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. We review our curriculum all the time. So in terms of our -- in terms of use of force training, in terms of our management training, all of our training, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: And some of the training has been in response specifically to reports generated by the CMC?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: Two examples you refer to in your statement are the Dangerous Liaisons report and the Grinspoon report itself recently.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR MACSPORRAN SC: All right. That's all I have, Thank you, Mr Chairman.

10 PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes. Who is next?

MR SCHMIDT: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Just initially, Ms Jones, could I take you to attachment C of your statement, that's the panel member selection criteria report.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR SCHMIDT: That series of questions has been used for a number of years, hasn't it?
20

THE WITNESS: No, they get modified pretty regularly.

MR SCHMIDT: Let me rephrase that. They were of a similar type?

THE WITNESS: Similar type, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: It would be likely to be detrimental to the application process for that to be published?

30 THE WITNESS: Well, I think it has probably been published, and we're probably going to change our questions this afternoon, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: Certainly. Also in respect of your evidence, you spoke about when drug testing is conducted at the academy, being the second day, and also about a particular answer on one of the psychometric tests, as to whether or not you have experimented with drug use, again, publishing that information is likely to reduce its effectiveness; would you agree with that?

40 THE WITNESS: Yes, you could probably say that, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: Thank you. I will just ask you to put to rest something that's been a rumour, I suppose, that's floated throughout the service for the last several years -- you are probably already aware of what I am going to say. There was an allegation going about the service that a number -- or one particular recruit intake consisted of a series of recruits who received or who were originally to be rejected and received the wrong letters were subsequently admitted into the academy. Are you able to put that rumour to rest?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think so because I have never heard it and I doubt very

much whether that would have ever occurred.

MR SCHMIDT: Thank you. Can I take you to your statement.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

MR SCHMIDT: Page 3 to start with.

THE WITNESS: Yep.

10

MR SCHMIDT: You talk in the third paragraph about background checks and you go on to a series of processes which are evolved. Then across page 7, where you are talking about a concern that employers have raised with regards to an ability to keep their information confidential.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

20

MR SCHMIDT: Do you think it would be effective if such an exemption existed; so employers could actually be truthful and not have a concern about that going to the subsequent applicant?

THE WITNESS: Definitely. Definitely.

MR SCHMIDT: Likewise, there is provision in there for police referee checks and also for the Police Gazette.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

30

MR SCHMIDT: Now, the Police Gazette on my understanding is the case that potential applicants -- potential recruits are advertised throughout the State and all police officers are invited to comment on them.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR SCHMIDT: Again, with respect to those sorts of comments, do you agree that should perhaps be confidential?

THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, I don't know so much about the Police Gazette because that's an internal publication.

40

MR SCHMIDT: Sorry, the comments which come as a consequence of --

THE WITNESS: I am sorry.

MR SCHMIDT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Debatable. I mean, the expectation is that police are going to -- if they know of a person that's been named in the Police Gazette it is incumbent upon them to notify recruiting of their knowledge of them. Certainly I suppose it

doesn't help the situation in terms of people being aware of our processes.

MR SCHMIDT: All right. There is also some questions about checking family members and so forth.

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

MR SCHMIDT: Would you agree at the very least there should be a process in place so that potential applicants or recruits could identify family members, close associates who live in the district?
10

THE WITNESS: Oh, definitely. We have had a couple of those situations where families have been estranged from an officer and they have not been good people. But that officer has notified us and said, "I don't want to be located in that area where that person is where those individuals are." And we have taken action to move that person to another location.

MR SCHMIDT: Now, you would agree that that would also allow the QPS to implement some strategies to prevent that officer or that future officer from falling into an inappropriate association --
20

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR SCHMIDT: -- or potential conflict of interest?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR SCHMIDT: Specifically, I mean, restricting that officer's access to QPRIME to the family member's details.
30

THE WITNESS: That's no doubt something that could be looked at, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: Excuse me for one moment. Now, with regards to DNA testing of applicants, wouldn't it be possible as part of the recruit or the applicant process to actually require them to allow their DNA or their DNA profile to be run against a national database for a prescribed purpose?

THE WITNESS: We can collect it. They can voluntarily give us their DNA but the legislation prohibits us from testing it for recruiting purposes.
40

MR SCHMIDT: Which legislation are you talking about?

THE WITNESS: The Police Powers Responsibilities Act doesn't allow us to --

MR SCHMIDT: If I suggested to you that it was a possibility that that legislation would allow that as a prescribed purpose, if the potential officer specifically and expressly permits their DNA profile to be run for that particular purpose, it would be lawful.

THE WITNESS: I would be very pleased. If I could get the legal opinion that supports that I would be very happy.

MR SCHMIDT: Now, the 200 increase in staff each year, that's a government figure, isn't it?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

10 MR SCHMIDT: It used to be a couple of years ago 300 additional police each year.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: If I could take you to page 10, the bottom paragraph and you are referring to part of EB negotiations with the police union.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 MR SCHMIDT: Issue of district appointments has been identified as an issue for QPS.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR SCHMIDT: Effectively that the QPUE remains opposed at this time in relation to that matter. Now, I suggest that wouldn't be effective in places like Rockhampton, for example, where the Rockhampton district stretches some 3 or 400 kilometres.

30 THE WITNESS: That's quite true but that wasn't -- what we're talking about is having a facility -- you wouldn't do it for every area. We're talking about having the capacity to do it so you might do it in places like the south-east corner but you certainly wouldn't do it in places north of Rockhampton because it is just not practical, no.

MR SCHMIDT: Thank you. If I could take you to your table on page 12.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

40 MR SCHMIDT: This is talking about the number of officers qualified for progression to the next rank and who has done MDP and another one of the matters which would be a consideration for why there is 40-odd per cent of sergeants that are not completing the MDP process, would it be that sergeants traditionally get to that rank around 13 years of service?

THE WITNESS: I couldn't comment. I think you are about right but I couldn't categorically say that, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: A lot of those officers have decided to maintain a work life balance, they have put down roots in the community.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.

MR SCHMIDT: And they decide they simply don't want to progress.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, and that's particularly true of our country areas where people establish relationships in the community, absolutely, yes.

10 MR SCHMIDT: Now, if I can also take you to page 14? You are talking about the findings of the SDPC.

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

MR SCHMIDT: I assume that's the productivity commission review?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that is, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: And as a consequence of that you have modified the MDP program.

20

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

MR SCHMIDT: Okay. And you spoke earlier about MDP is training not skills.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR SCHMIDT: And introducing a healthy workplace program.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

30

MR SCHMIDT: Is there any suggestion that that's actually going to be addressed towards senior constables and to help them actually develop the skills necessary to step from being a workmate to being a supervisor.

THE WITNESS: Healthy Workplace is targeted to be taught at senior constables, sergeants and senior sergeants, so senior constable are being picked up. Now, senior constables are also being picked up in MDP1. We haven't looked at a residential yet for senior constables. The initial target is to look at sergeants but Healthy Workplaces is definitely -- and the practical people management course is picking up senior constables.

40

MR SCHMIDT: And part of that new program would also include ethical leadership.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it would.

MR SCHMIDT: A course in ethics. Just going back to the issue of recruitment, is there any reason why it is not possible to give an applicant and indication of where they are going to be stationed, for example, I will take Rockhampton again. If

there are a number of people in Rockhampton who want to remain in the area, have ties in the area and want to remain there, surely they would be in a position to say, "If I apply, will you guarantee me a position in Rockhampton?"

10 THE WITNESS: We're currently looking at -- can I assure you that if I got applicants from Rockhampton they would go back to Rockhampton. But we don't get applicants from Rockhampton but -- it would be good. But we are actually looking at trialling a program where the appointment is being offered at the point of offer. So we're actually looking at -- at the moment for the information of the hearing, that officers are not told where their permanent allocation is until they are confirmed in their position when they are then told where they are going to be transferred. What we are now looking at doing is trialling that when we make an offer for you to join the Police Service, we tell them as part of the offer that you will be -- whilst you will be trained at the police academy, your first appointment will be at Rockhampton or whatever the case may be, yes.

20 MR SCHMIDT: In respect to the vetting issues, the example that Counsel Assisting gave you of the Queensland Health employee or supervisor who, in effect, gave possibly untruthful answers, you would agree that that comes down basically to the fact that people will lie on occasions.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR SCHMIDT: There is nothing really you can do to prevent that, is there?

THE WITNESS: No, I think all we can try and do is put as many tools in place to test the veracity of their claims, but, yes, it's very difficult.

30 MR SCHMIDT: One of those tools obviously would be conducting checks with a person's neighbours.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR SCHMIDT: That no longer occurs, does it?

THE WITNESS: No, it doesn't. But one of the recommendations of the report that I received yesterday is that we do start doing it in selected cases, yes.

40 MR SCHMIDT: Would it surprise you at all that there are a number of people in this very room being listed as referees on applicants -- or applications to join the QPS who haven't received the referee check list of a person?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it would surprise me.

MR SCHMIDT: Now, also you were asked in respect of the staffing model and whether it was simply a residential population to police ratio, and you read out a list. Is that an exhaustive list of the factors you take into account?

THE WITNESS: That is the majority of the factors that are taken into account, yes.

MR SCHMIDT: One final question in relation to the project Aveo, A-V-E-O, I understand it was a report by Superintendent Condon?

THE WITNESS: I haven't been privy to that report, no.

MR SCHMIDT: Thank you. Excuse me. Thank you Mr Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes.

10

MR WATTERS: Just two short matters, Mr Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes.

MR WATTERS: Ms Jones, I undertake not to keep you much longer. You might recall some questions by Mr Allen about steroid use.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

20

MR WATTERS: And drug use or abuse by sworn officers, and, in particular, the methodology maintained by the Police Service to prevent or detect or deal with those matters. And I believe your answer in a response to a question around that -- was chiefly around education, education measures, education of officers, the work of the alcohol and drug unit, and so on.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

30

MR WATTERS: Can I just ask you some questions about recruitment and selection that the processes throughout the service, so not only at recruitment but throughout promotion, there is a system, is there not, whereby officers either applying for lateral transfer as constable or some other rank or on promotion --

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR WATTERS: -- they have to complete an application which requires them to address a range of selection criteria?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

40

MR WATTERS: And in every instance integrity is one of those, is one of the issues they have to address?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR WATTERS: In fact, it is the first instance, is it not?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR WATTERS: So for every position in the Police Service, integrity is a matter

that must be addressed by an officer applying for either movement or promotion?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes.

MR WATTERS: And tell us if you can: There are a range of examples, answers, criteria that must be met obviously at different ranks and levels when addressing that question around integrity; that's right?

THE WITNESS: Well, what happens is, it is called essential criteria 1.

10

MR WATTERS: Yes.

THE WITNESS: And you must demonstrate a level of integrity. That's one. The reason it is called "essential" is because it is nonnegotiable, you either have integrity or you don't, so it is a nonnegotiable one. What we also do is if you apply for a promotion, if you apply or you are successful in a promotion, you are nominated for a transfer on merit where you have applied for a job. If you are moving from plain clothes into a detective position, all of the applicants are vetted through the Ethical Standards Command. So what will happen is that if you are an applicant for a job and there is an outstanding investigation or there is a question on a course of conduct in terms of you, then the authorised person, which is either the Assistant Commissioner or the Director cannot -- can make a range of choices. They can put the appointment on hold until such time as the matter is resolved or they can cancel that vacancy and not appoint that person. So there is a range of dates in place to prevent that from happening.

20

MR WATTERS: All right. In effect, it is another mechanism by which continual screening --

30

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR WATTERS: -- and processes are used to assess integrity throughout the service, is that so?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR WATTERS: Including a commissioned rank?

THE WITNESS: Yes, that's right, yes.

40

MR WATTERS: Finally, can I ask you some questions around this: you might recall my learned colleague, Mr Allen, asked you some questions around vetting and screening at the recruitment phase. In particular, there were some questions around psychometric testing and what occurs at the recruitment phase, and you heard that there were some comments made yesterday in evidence in these proceedings by a commissioned officer, and he spoke of the -- perhaps the need or ability, the capacity to improve some of the screening or vetting processes or practices. Now, in fairness to you, I should say that that -- that witness is a commissioned officer. He left the police academy some two years ago in

October 2008. So there may well be -- have been some changes already that have occurred since then. You have told us already in your evidence of one, that is this movement of the practice of using suspension -- no longer using suspension primarily of moving to termination where issues are raised during the probationary or the training stage.

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

10 MR WATTERS: And as I understand your evidence -- please tell me have I got this right -- you have accepted that reforms around associations legislation and perhaps even this idea of a statutory declaration would also assist.

THE WITNESS: Yes, certainly. I think there is -- anything will assist that's going to improve our capacity, as I said, to test the veracity of an application.

MR WATTERS: Are there any others that come to mind?

THE WITNESS: Not straight to mind, no.

20 MR WATTERS: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

PRESIDING OFFICER: Mr Allen?

MR ALLEN: Just one matter. Ms Jones, you appeared to agree with a proposition voiced by my learned friend, Mr MacSporran, that in relation to those three case studies regarding recruitment that I asked you about, that in at least two it seems the system threw up concerns within that 23-month period where there is that option to take action.

30 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR ALLEN: Now, one of the case studies I asked you about was a matter unrelated to Operation Tesco and it seems that it was five years after the officer was appointed that it is first discovered that he is using illicit drugs.

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

40 MR ALLEN: So we can put that aside as being one where the system detected it. The -- there was the example of officer G7 who was suspended during the course of the program because of a speeding offence, and obviously you said that there was a quite appropriate then suspension and review of his recruitment?

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

MR ALLEN: So that's certainly one example where the system seems to have picked up on a problem. You have said that you are personally aware of the other matter, which is G5?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR ALLEN: That's where a recruit failed to disclose serious medical and workforce related issues --

THE WITNESS: Mmm.

MR ALLEN: -- which then went undetected. They went undetected throughout the whole 23 month process, didn't they?

10 THE WITNESS: Well, yes, absolutely.

MR ALLEN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Because it was the failure of that individual. The person obviously lied throughout the whole process.

MR ALLEN: Mmm.

20 THE WITNESS: And it is very difficult for us to pick up on information like that unless someone tells us, yeah.

MR ALLEN: So, in fact, after that 23 month process finished, I think within the first week of that person being actually sworn in as constable, she went off on sick leave. And remained on sick leave being a burden to the taxpayer and, indeed, the police officer's sick leave bank?

THE WITNESS: Undoubtedly, undoubtedly.

30 MR ALLEN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: I would suggest that in hindsight, that had the organisation been made aware of her lies, that you would have actually dealt with it as a misconduct issue of failing to declare. But if the service isn't aware, it is very difficult for us to -- mmm.

MR ALLEN: Yes, thank you. I have no further questions. Could Ms Jones be excused?

40 PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes, thank you very much.

WITNESS EXCUSED

MR ALLEN: And could we resume at 2 o'clock when Mr Leavers is scheduled to give evidence?

PRESIDING OFFICER: Yes, we can adjourn till 2 o'clock.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED AT 12.31 PM

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT 124	Attendance notice and oath of service	3579
EXHIBIT 125	Statement of Patricia Anne Jones	3580