

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
1.	Page 2, para 10	When was the Misuse of Drugs Act 1981 last reviewed?	The <i>Misuse of Drugs Act 1981</i> is administered through the Western Australia Police Force. The WA Police Force has advised that the Act itself has not been subject to a review since it came into effect. While there have been new provisions inserted over time, and some of those have been subject to review, or soon will be, the main structure of the Act itself has not been reviewed. The Department of Justice recommends that this question is redirected to the Western Australia Police Force.
2.	Page 3, para 2	Does anything come to mind of any outstanding issues with the Misuse of Drugs Act that require addressing?	As the <i>Misuse of Drugs Act 1981</i> is administered through the Western Australia Police Force, the Department of Justice recommends that this question is redirected to them.
3.	Page 3, para 4	Update on what has happened with the justice health program (received information that it had stalled)?	The Report regarding the proposal to transfer the delivery of prison health services to the Department of Health is being considered by Government and is subject to Cabinet in Confidence.
4.	Page 3, para 10	Are you able to indicate whether it is likely that the delivery of health, mental health and AOD services will be retained by Corrective Services? I understand that the various options were looking at potentially Health taking that over. Are you confirming that it is likely to stay where it is?	See the answer to question (3) above.

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
5.	Page 4, para 6	What does Corrective Services do at the moment for prisoners on remand to ensure that when they exit, if they need it, they are able to access appropriate AOD services?	There are limited resources to ensure remand prisoners receive access to appropriate AOD services when they exit custody. Remand prisoners are not assessed and are only referred to reintegration providers if an area of concern is identified at intake stage. Upon release remand prisoners are not provided information regarding AOD services in the community. This has been identified as an area for improvement and a release website has been developed to provide information to prisoners regarding help and support in the community upon release, this is due to go live imminently.
6.	Page 5, para 1/2	Please provide detail of the five programs being considered in the submission to the Justice Planning and Reform Committee because as a parliamentary inquiry, we need to have this information as well.	The Justice Planning and Reform Committee has lodged a submission with the Expenditure Review Committee. As the submission is being considered by Government it is subject to Cabinet in Confidence.
7.	Page 5, para 5/6	We are looking at the increase in outstanding IMPs over the last several months as identified by the Inspector of Custodial Services, where there has been, I think, a doubling since before Christmas sometime until now. What has caused that? Is it the lack of resources or what?	See <b>Table 1 in Attachment 1</b> for available data.
8.	Page 5, para 7	Backlog in IMPs - exact figure today, and broken down by facility.	The exact figure at today's date is not available as it takes time to extract this data.  See <b>Table 2 in Attachment 2</b> for available data.
9.	Page 5, para 8/9	What is the timeframe for Serco starting the Acacia backlog?	Approximately three months. This will provide the necessary time to finalise the arrangements between the Department and Serco, for Serco to recruit the additional staff and for on boarding and training of the new staff to be completed.

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
10.	Page 6, para 1/2	Assuming this all comes to fruition, how long are you hoping it would take for Acacia backlog to be addressed?	After Acacia commence completing IMPs it will take approximately six months to address the current backlog. During this time it is likely that further prisoners will be transferred to Acacia without having initial IMPs completed. The arrangements with Serco will include capacity for Acacia to complete IMPs for these prisoners also.
11.	Page 6, para 13	I just want to be really, really clear. At the moment, we have prisoners who are kept on remand who do not have access to the specialised drug services and now we have prisoners who are sentenced for less than six months and who, presumably even if their sentence is directly as a result of their drug addiction, are also not able to be independently assessed for drug services.	<p>Prisoners on remand or with an effective sentence of less than six months do not receive criminogenic interventions delivered by the Department.</p> <p>Part of the reintegration services contracts however, includes the delivery of brief AOD intervention which involves up to 5 individual skill based sessions and referrals where required to community based services which this cohort of prisoners is eligible for.</p>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
12.	Page 7, para 11/12/13	When you say that the backlog of IMPs is not a resource issue, that may be right, but in the last couple of years, certainly since you became acting Commissioner, have there been extra assessors hired or have they been dispensed with? How many people are involved in doing this assessment program across the prison system? I would be interested to know just how many people of different calibres—different qualifications—are involved in these assessment programs and what the minimum requirement is to be able to deal with not only the backlog, but also, leaving the backlog to one side, the continuing prison population, given that even if it stabilises, you still have a significant number of people to get through.	<p>Hakea Assessment team are responsible for the completion of Initial Individual Management Plans (IMPS) for prisoners at Hakea, Casuarina and Acacia Prisons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hakea Assessment Team's approved staffing is of 4 x Education Vocational Training Assessors. This team was reduced to 3 staff due to one staff member retirement to VTSS.</li> <li>• The Programme Treatment Assessment team is 6 this is reduced to 5 following the VTSS.</li> <li>• Assessment Writers remain consistent at 8.</li> <li>• Prison Officers are used to fill the writer positions, however writers can be and are redeployed to operational duties.</li> </ul> <p>Each regional prison are resourced with Assessment Writers, Education Assessors and Programmes staff who conduct the necessary assessments to formulate the IMP. As regional locations are not inundated with the equivalent numbers in comparison to the Hakea assessment team, regional prisons generally are not experiencing the same level of delay in development of the IMP.</p> <p>In January 2015, the Department implemented a new Treatment Assessment Tool to assess a prisoners treatment needs. Whilst the new tool is more comprehensive it does take approximately 50% longer to complete the assessment compared to the previous method, resulting in delays in completion of IMPs.</p> <p>The Department is currently reviewing the assessment process to address the identified shortfalls.</p>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response															
13.	Page 9, para 4	Can the department provide the number of people who applied for parole in 2017-18 who were identified as having a drug problem?	The Prisoners Review Board does not keep data on the number of offenders applying for parole who have a drug problem.															
14.	Page 10, para 19	How many Drug Court participants have successfully completed their programs? (I would be interested both in number of human beings as well as a general percentage of success.)	<p>The Department of Justice does not keep successful completion rates for Drug Court participants.</p> <p>The total number of participants accessing treatment services through diversion programs run by the Courts was 1,063 offenders in 2017/18 and 1,330 offenders in 2016/17.</p> <p>Information from the Mental Health Commission indicates the following in relation to the number of diversion episodes for the Children's Court Drug Court and the Drug Court:</p> <table><tr><th>Referrals From</th><th>2016/17</th><th>2017/18</th></tr><tr><td>Children's Court - Drug Court</td><td>30</td><td>27</td></tr><tr><td>Children's Court - Drug Court YSTIR</td><td>10</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>Drug Court (DCR)</td><td>161</td><td>171</td></tr><tr><td><b>Total</b></td><td><b>201</b></td><td><b>205</b></td></tr></table> <p>These numbers represent the number of treatment episodes (not individuals and some may be referred/counted more than once) i.e. closed episodes from the Drug Court for AOD treatment, and the date the treatment episode was closed may not be the same as the date that the participant was sentenced in the Drug Court. Also these numbers do not provide the average duration of treatment episode and are therefore not a reflection of the success of the program based on longevity.</p>	Referrals From	2016/17	2017/18	Children's Court - Drug Court	30	27	Children's Court - Drug Court YSTIR	10	7	Drug Court (DCR)	161	171	<b>Total</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>205</b>
Referrals From	2016/17	2017/18																
Children's Court - Drug Court	30	27																
Children's Court - Drug Court YSTIR	10	7																
Drug Court (DCR)	161	171																
<b>Total</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>205</b>																

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
			<p><i>Disclaimer: Data was extracted from the DTAD database on 28/3/19. Whilst the data is considered to be true and correct at the date of publication, changes in circumstances after the time of publication may impact upon the accuracy of the data. The DTAD is an active database and the data may change without notice. Changes may relate to a number of issues including amendments made to the database and variations in syntax used to perform the individual queries. MHC is not in any way liable for the accuracy or repeat reliability of any information printed and stored by a user.</i></p>
15.	Page 11, para 9	Have you got the average cost per person going through the Drug Court?	<p>The Department of Justice does not have access to all relevant cost information across the Justice Sector to be able to provide the average cost per Drug Court participant. Full costs would include Police Prosecutors, Community Correction Officers (Courts Assessment and Treatment Services) and Legal Aid WA.</p> <p>The Drug Court has a dedicated Magistrate and one Judicial Support Officer at an annual cost \$580,000.</p> <p>The Children's Court magistrate and support staff are provided from within existing resources.</p>
16.	Page 11, para 13	Of course, we have figures about rates of recidivist behaviour, have we not?	<p>There is no information available on recidivism in the Drug Court or the courts in general. This is in part due to a lack of an accepted definition as to what constitutes recidivist behaviour.</p>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
			Court and Tribunal Services are planning to build capability to measure ' <b>return to court</b> ', however this work is not planned to commence until late 2020.
17.	Page 11, para 17	Could you please find out whether there is any data available since 2006 as to the recidivism rates arising from participants who have gone through the Drug Court and how that is comparing to people who are going through the regular court system?	There is no information available on recidivism in the Drug Court or the courts in general (refer to response to question 16).
18.	Page 12, para 5	It would be useful for the committee if we could know which sort of offences would completely preclude someone from being able to access the Drug Court. Also, generally, how well represented are Aboriginal people within the Drug Court client group, especially considering that the Drug Court is not available in the regions? I would like to get information as to both numbers and percentage of Aboriginal clientele, and how that compares to the general numbers within the broader court system.	<p>(1) Ineligible Offenders:</p> <p>Offenders who are facing any of the following charges may be ineligible for consideration for a Drug Court Program:</p> <p><i>Criminal Code:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S68 Going armed in public so as to cause terror.</li> <li>• CH28 Homicide</li> <li>• S294 Act intended to cause Grievous Bodily Harm or prevent arrest</li> <li>• S297 Grievous Bodily Harm</li> <li>• S281 Unlawful assault causing death</li> <li>• S338 Threat to kill</li> <li>• S338E Stalking</li> <li>• S401 The following circumstances for aggravated burglary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(iv) cause bodily harm to any person;</li> <li>(v) threatens to kill or injure any person; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
			<p style="text-align: center;">(vi) detains any person.</p> <p>Any other circumstances of aggravation for aggravated burglary may be referred.</p> <p><i>Road Traffic Act:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S59 Dangerous driving causing grievous bodily harm/death.</li> </ul> <p>Offenders in the following circumstances are also ineligible for consideration in a Drug Court Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Declared drug traffickers</li> <li>• Facing a declaration as a declared drug trafficker</li> <li>• Being a member or a nominee of an outlaw motorcycle gang</li> <li>• Facing mandatory imprisonment; or</li> <li>• In breach of a Higher Court Conditional Suspended Imprisonment Order or a Suspended Imprisonment Order</li> </ul> <p>There are restrictions to the Perth Drug Court program for safety reasons, primarily on people entering residential facilities and patient services, which require the Perth Drug Court to have a list of precluded offences.</p> <p>There is however discretion with the court to still make the referral despite the commission of one or more of the precluded offences. However, given the concerns of the treating agencies, it may be difficult to access an appropriate program where there is demonstrated violence in the offending behaviour.</p>



**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
			<p><i>The above information has been extracted from the Perth Drug Court Guidelines which are available at:</i></p> <p><i><a href="https://www.magistratescourt.wa.gov.au/_files/Perth_Drug_Court_Guidelines.pdf">https://www.magistratescourt.wa.gov.au/_files/Perth_Drug_Court_Guidelines.pdf</a>.</i></p> <p>(2) See <b>Tables 3 to 14 in Attachment 3</b> for available data.</p>
19.	Page 12, para 11/12	How many people convicted as drug traffickers are enrolled in some kind of drug treatment program while in prison? Would that kind of data be available?	See <b>Table 15 in Attachment 4</b> for available data.
20.	Page 12, para 13	Confirm this if I have it right: there is nothing in place for someone who is a drug user who has a large quantity of drugs for personal use perhaps, but is not engaged in any sort of commercial activity with their drug use, merely possession, but is caught with the right quantity of drugs to be convicted as a drug trafficker. They would not have access to diversionary programs; they would merely be looking at custodial sentences instead.	<p>There are restrictions to the Perth Drug Court program for safety reasons, primarily on people entering residential facilities and patient services, which require the Perth Drug Court to have a list of precluded offences.</p> <p>There is however discretion with the court to still make the referral despite the commission of one or more of the precluded offences. However, given the concerns of the treating agencies, it may be difficult to access an appropriate program where there is demonstrated violence in the offending behaviour.</p>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
21.	Page 13, para 6-11	<p>In a regional context: Are services and pathways-type programs delivered reasonably, what prisons are they available in, what is the uptake like, and also the individual management programs and again, the numbers of prisoners who have been able to get an IMP created for them?</p> <p><i>I brought some information about regional services, if you could just bear with me. In April 2018, there was a whole suite of contracts let by the department; pathways in the south west and great southern regions. I have some data here that I am happy to table, if that is acceptable, on some of the program numbers that we run. It may not be in the detail that you require, but I am certainly happy to take that on notice, if that is okay.</i></p> <p><i>If you could, that will be fantastic. Specifically chasing the numbers of prisoners without IMPs or waiting to have IMPs in regional areas, similar to what we have.</i></p> <p>Breakdown by facility.</p>	See <b>Table 2 in Attachment 2</b> for available data.

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community  
Courts – Department of Justice responses**

	Transcript page ref	Question	Response
22.	Page 13, para 17	How long do you estimate that a sentenced prisoner usually has to wait until they can actually start a drug program? That is different from the assessment.	<p>It is not possible to provide an estimate of this as the time taken varies significantly depending on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the IMP/treatment assessment is completed;</li> <li>• When the next available program is being run at a prison applicable to an individual's security rating.</li> </ul> <p>Programs are scheduled based on the location of the most demand and the available facilities to run the number of programs required. However, at least one of the Department's AOD program, Pathways, will commence at several prisons within each quarter.</p>
23.	Page 13, para 18 – Page 14, para 1-2	The numbers of prisoners who may have been denied parole because they had not completed a drug treatment program that they were required to?	The Prisoners Review Board does not keep statistics on this.
24.	Page 14, para 3 + 11	What is the cost per person per day for the Wandoo therapeutic community, and how that compares to programs in a mainstream prison?	Based on operating at full prisoner capacity, the Department is projecting a cost per day of \$51.79 for programs delivered at Wandoo. This compares with an average cost per day of \$10.87 at other public prisons.
25.	Page 15, para 7	When this evaluation for the Wandoo rehabilitation is completed will that be publicly available?	A summary of the evaluation report is likely to be made public.

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its  
Effect on the Community  
Courts**

**Attachment 1 (Question 7)**

**Table 1: Drivers for increase in outstanding IMPs**

Lack of opportunity for staff to complete assessments within the required timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The adaptive regime reduces access to prisoners for their assessments and sees prison officers redeployed to other roles, thus reducing their capacity to undertake IMPs and security classifications.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Population pressures has resulted in prisoners being moved within the 28 day timeframe requiring staff to travel to prison sites across the state to carry out assessments.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff in regional areas undertake multiple roles, which places competing demands on the assessment process.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 28 day timeframe placed on the completion of the assessment process was arbitrarily chosen without being informed by baselines.</li> </ul>
Resourcing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff resources have reduced over the years despite an increase in the prisoner population.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The funding model for staff does not address all ancillary services, such as increases to staffing for treatment assessment.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current staff qualification level places restrictions on finding suitable staff, and limits the pool of staff available to undertake assessments.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to suitable infrastructure to carry out assessments (i.e. suitable individual office space to interview prisoners).</li> </ul>
Lack of integration of systems and processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There may be inconsistent processes and standards across Corrective Services that are implemented and monitored differently across business areas.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operational policy is dated and requires updating as there have been changes to the assessment process.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment tools, whilst validated and reliable, are implemented by various levels of qualified staff and with various levels of clinical guidance.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of flow of information across assessments leads to a lack of connectivity between the community and prisons.</li> </ul>
The process is too comprehensive in the initial stages and requires streamlining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security classification is included in the comprehensive assessment process.</li> </ul>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its  
Effect on the Community  
Courts**

**Attachment 2 (Questions 8 and 21)**

**Table 2: Breakdown of Outstanding IMPs by Facility including Regional Areas**

**764 (19.37%) Outstanding**

<b>FACILITY</b>	<b>Initial IMP's Approved in the Month of February</b>	<b>Sentenced Prisoners with an effective term greater than 6 months</b>	<b>Sentenced Prisoners with an approved Initial IMP</b>	<b>*Sentenced Prisoners with Initial IMP dispensation</b>	<b>Exempt from Initial IMP process as per COB 12/18 **</b>	<b>Sentenced Prisoners who require an Initial IMP within 28 days</b>	<b>Sentenced Prisoners who have an outstanding Initial IMP Outside 28 days</b>
ACACIA	1	1386	758	130	108	28	362
ALBANY	35	334	229	24	7	15	59
BANDYUP	12	205	112	22	2	9	60
BORONIA	3	69	64	1	0	0	4
BROOME	2	43	33	4	1	3	2
BUNBURY	3	263	233	7	2	15	6
CASUARINA	1	508	299	29	19	39	122
EGRP	57	176	116	25	3	7	25
GREENOUGH	5	86	70	7	1	6	2
HAKEA	63	122	35	15	9	38	25
KARNET	0	342	281	6	20	3	32
MELALEUCA	4	32	6	14	2	7	3
PARDELUP	0	87	82	2	2	1	0
ROEBOURNE	9	110	66	14	6	12	12
WANDOO	4	63	54	0	0	1	8
WKRFP	10	114	81	11	4	7	11
WOOROLOO	0	344	242	29	39	3	31
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>4284</b>	<b>2761</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>764</b>

\* % outstanding is of the number of prisoners with an effective term greater than 6 months minus the number with a dispensation

\*\* Custodial Operations Broadcast 12/18

# Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community Courts

## Attachment 3 (Question 18)

### Magistrates Court Criminal Cases

- These are the number of criminal cases referred to Perth Drug Court.
- Case refers to an offender processed through the court with one or more charges lodged on one occasion. Eg an offender with 16 charges lodged in 14 February and the same offender with 8 new charges heard in court on 16 March counts as two cases, not one or 24 cases.
- A referral to Perth Drug Court is counted on the first date that the charge or case is listed at Perth Magistrates Court to a sitting with ICMS type of "Drug Court".
- A referral to Perth Drug Court does not necessarily mean that the offender has been accepted onto the diversion program.
- An individual may be referred to the Drug Court on multiple occasions.
- This information has been retrieved from the Integrated Courts Management System (ICMS).
- 2018/19 YTD figure is current as at 31 March 2019.

**Table 3: Indigenous Representation in the Perth Drug Court**

	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Unknown	Grand Total
<b>2016/17</b>	453	993	3	<b>1,449</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	342	904	1	<b>1,247</b>
<b>2018/19 YTD</b>	338	627		<b>965</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1133</b>	<b>2524</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3,661</b>

**Table 4: Indigenous Representation in the Perth Drug Court as a percentage of the year total**

	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Unknown	Grand Total
<b>2016/17</b>	31.3%	68.5%	0.2%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	27.4%	72.5%	0.1%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2018/19 YTD</b>	35.0%	65.0%	0.0%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	<b>68.9%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 5: Statewide Case Lodgements in the Magistrates Court (broken down by Indigenous status)**

	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Unknown	Grand Total
<b>2016/17</b>	33,276	66,329	6,794	<b>106,399</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	31,511	65,153	5,700	<b>102,364</b>
<b>2018/19 YTD</b>	23,123	48,914	4,244	<b>76,281</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>87,910</b>	<b>180,396</b>	<b>16,738</b>	<b>285,044</b>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its  
Effect on the Community  
Courts**

**Table 6: Statewide Case Lodgements in the Magistrates Court (broken down by Indigenous status) as a percentage of the year total**

	<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>2016/17</b>	31.3%	62.3%	6.4%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	30.8%	63.6%	5.6%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2018/19 YTD</b>	30.3%	64.1%	5.6%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>30.8%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Magistrates Court – Drug Court Participants**

- This is a count of the number of distinct participants that have been referred to the Perth Drug Court.
- The above figures may include duplicates where the person has been referred to the Perth Drug Court in more than one financial year.
- This information has been retrieved from ICMS.
- 2018/19 YTD figure is current as at 31 March 2019.

**Table 7: Magistrates Court – Drug Court Participants**

<b>Row Labels</b>	<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>2016/17</b>	167	424	3	<b>594</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	100	278	1	<b>379</b>
<b>2018/19 YTD</b>	93	201		<b>294</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>903</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1267</b>

**Table 8: Magistrates Court – Drug Court Participants by Percentage**

<b>Row Labels</b>	<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>2016/17</b>	28.1%	71.4%	0.5%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	26.4%	73.3%	0.3%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2018/19 YTD</b>	31.6%	68.4%		<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>71.3%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community Courts

### Children's Court Criminal Cases

- These are the number of criminal cases referred to Perth Children's Court Drug Court.
- Case refers to an offender processed through the court with one or more charges lodged on one occasion. Eg an offender with 16 charges lodged in 14 February and the same offender with 8 new charges heard in court on 16 March counts as two cases, not one or 24 cases.
- A referral to Perth Children's Court Drug Court is counted on the first date that the charge or case is listed at Perth Children's Court to a sitting with ICMS type of "Drug Court".
- A referral to Perth Children's Court Drug Court does not necessarily mean that the offender has been accepted onto the diversion program.
- An individual may be referred to the Drug Court on multiple occasions.
- This information has been retrieved from ICMS.
- 2018/19 YTD figure is current as at 31 March 2019.

**Table 9: Indigenous Representation in the Children's Court Drug Court**

	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Grand Total
2016/17	152	112	264
2017/18	111	107	218
2018/19 YTD	102	89	191
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>673</b>

**Table 10: Indigenous Representation in the Children's Court Drug Court as a percentage**

	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Grand Total
2016/17	57.6%	42.4%	100.0%
2017/18	50.9%	49.1%	100.0%
2018/19 YTD	53.4%	46.6%	100.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>45.8%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 11: Statewide Case Lodgements in the Children's Court (broken down by Indigenous status)**

	Indigenous	Non-Indigenous	Unknown	Grand Total
2016/17	4,417	2,577	137	7,131
2017/18	4,299	2,457	270	7,026
2018/19	2,794	1,905	190	4,889
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>11,510</b>	<b>6,939</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>19,046</b>



**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its  
Effect on the Community  
Courts**

**Table 12: Statewide Case Lodgements in the Children's Court (broken down by Indigenous status) as a percentage of the year total**

	<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>2016/17</b>	61.9%	36.1%	1.9%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	61.2%	35.0%	3.8%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	57.1%	39.0%	3.9%	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>60.4%</b>	<b>36.4%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Children's Court – Drug Court Participants**

This is a count of the number of distinct participants that have been referred to the Perth Children's Court Drug Court.

The above figures may include duplicates where the person has been referred to the Drug Court in more than one financial year.

This information has been retrieved from ICMS.

2018/19 YTD figure is current as at 31 March 2019.

**Table 13: Children's Court – Drug Court Participants**

	<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
2016/17	37	39	<b>76</b>
2017/18	29	37	<b>66</b>
2018/19 YTD	20	33	<b>53</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>195</b>

**Table 14: Children's Court – Drug Court Participants by Percentage**

	<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
2016/17	48.7%	51.3%	<b>100%</b>
2017/18	43.9%	56.1%	<b>100%</b>
2018/19 YTD	37.7%	62.3%	<b>100%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>44.1%</b>	<b>55.9%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and Its Effect on the Community Courts**

**Attachment 4 (Question 19)**

**Table 15: Discharges by Financial Year and Program Completion for persons with any sentenced offence relating to 'Illicit Drug Offence'**

<b>Offence Type** / Completed Program***</b>	<b>Financial Year</b>					
	<b>2016-2017</b>		<b>2017-2018</b>		<b>2018-2019*</b>	
	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Cultivate illicit drugs	64	4	44	4	51	2
Deal or traffic in illicit drugs - commercial quantity	342	195	533	200	455	112
Deal or traffic in illicit drugs - non-commercial quantity	1	0	0	1	1	0
Import illicit drugs	15	6	12	2	2	2
Manufacture illicit drugs	21	14	28	12	12	7
Other illicit drug offences, nec	246	34	264	35	202	21
Possess illicit drugs	1304	169	1294	187	1117	134
Use illicit drugs	5	0	6	0	2	0

\* 2018-2019 year to date

\*\* Discharges where the individual had any sentenced offence relating to illicit drug offences. However, it should also be noted that there will be cases where individuals have illicit drug use co-occurring with their offending, but for which they not charged or sentenced.

\*\*\* Completion of Addictions Offending programs do not include cases where an Addictions Offending need is addressed as part of another program