

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

Question No. 319

Senator Ludwig asked the following question on 2 December 2004:

Is a subscription fee charged to stakeholders for access to the secure website? If yes, how much is this fee?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

No subscription fee is charged to stakeholders for access to the secure website.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

Question No. 320

Senator Ludwig asked the following question on 2 December 2004:

- a) Is the report of the 2002 National Police Custody survey available?
- b) If not, why not?
- c) If yes, please provide a copy?
- d) Further, please provide a copy of the manual data collection form.

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) No.
- b) The report is currently being prepared for publication in the near future.
- c) Not applicable.
- d) A copy of the manual data collection form is below.

NATIONAL POLICE CUSTODY SURVEY

This form is to be completed for all persons lodged in police cells for any period of time during the month of October 2002

1. Name of the Police Station or Watchhouse:

..... Postcode _____

2. Age: _____ **3. Gender:** Male ___ Female ___

4. Aboriginal ___ **Torres Strait Islander** ___ **Other** ___

5. When lodged in cells:

Date _____ Time _____ (24 hour clock)

6. Reason for being lodged in cells:

*Arrest ___ *Warrant ___

*Most serious offence.....

Other ___ (please specify; includes people in transit)

7. When released from cells (if applicable):

Date _____ Time _____ (24 hour clock)

8. Still in police cells at the end of the survey period? (ie: 31. August 2002)

Yes ___ No ___

9. Reason for release from cells (if applicable):

To court, prison, juvenile shelter or other police custody ___

To bail ___

Sentenced served ___

Other (please specify) ___

.....
Completed forms are to be returned to:
Official Use Only

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

Question No. 321

Senator Ludwig asked the following question on 2 December 2004:

- a) Which jurisdictions used manual data collection forms and which jurisdictions used electronic datasets and why was there a discrepancy between methods of data collection between jurisdictions?
- b) Furthermore, is the AIC aware of any potential statistical problems that may occur by using different methods of data collection and, if so, what provisions has it made to account for them?
- c) What information was lodged by police when they manually completed the data form?
- d) Are there any measures in place to ensure accurate manual reporting by police?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

- a) Manual data collection forms were used by police in the ACT, South Australia and Victoria while electronic data was provided by New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia, Northern Territory and Tasmania. The method of data collection was negotiated separately with each police jurisdiction to determine the best way for data to be collected within that jurisdiction. Some jurisdictions did not have a mechanism in place for electronic data collection and so opted to use manual data collection forms. Others preferred the method of electronic data collection.
- b) The main problem relating to electronic data provision is that it is time-consuming to identify the information required in the data set. The primary statistical issue relates to missing data, however missing data occurred in both manual and electronic forms of data collection. Missing data was addressed in the analysis through weighting the data to ensure it matched the original numbers of custody incidents for each jurisdiction. This issue of manual versus electronic data collection will be revisited prior to commencement of the next national police custody survey, to try and see if one method of data collection can be used by all jurisdictions.
- c) No additional information other than that required by the survey.
- d) Written instructions on how to complete the survey were provided to police stations across the country.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

Question No. 322

Senator Ludwig asked the following question on 2 December 2004:

Regarding the national juveniles in detention monitoring program, what method is used to conduct the census count of persons in juvenile detention centres and what is the present juvenile population of detention centres?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

The data provided by each of the juvenile justice agencies contain information on the number of young people in the custody of the juvenile justice agency on the last day of each quarter in the year; that is, March, June, September and December. Therefore the census count taken on each of these dates reflects only the number of juveniles in each jurisdiction at that time, and is not necessarily representative of the actual daily average of juvenile detainees in each state or territory.

The number of juveniles in detention across Australia as at the census count of 30 June 2003 was 640.

SENATE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

Question No. 323

Senator Ludwig asked the following question on 2 December 2004:

Why were the criteria of jurisdiction, year, Indigenous status, sex, age and remand status chosen as points of comparison for the national juveniles in detention centre monitoring program?

The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

These are the variables that were considered to be the most relevant and reliably available across all jurisdictions.