

---

---

# **2015 Annual Report on Justices of Peace Visits**

**Administration Wing  
of the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office**

---

---

# **JUSTICES OF THE PEACE VISITS**

## **2015 Annual Report**

This Annual Report provides an account of the work of Justices of the Peace (JPs) in the year 2015 in visiting designated institutions under the JP visit programme, handling complaints from prisoners, inmates and detainees, and making suggestions and comments to institutions arising from their visits.

### **THE JP SYSTEM**

2. The Justices of the Peace Ordinance (the Ordinance) (Cap. 510) provides the statutory basis for the operation of the JP system, including the appointment, functions, resignation and removal of JPs, and for matters incidental thereto or connected therewith. JPs are appointed by the Chief Executive under section 3(1) of the Ordinance. For administrative purpose, JPs appointed by virtue of their holding of certain offices in the public service are often referred to as Official JPs while others as Non-official JPs.

3. In 2015, 50 and 20 persons were appointed as Non-official and Official JPs respectively. As at 31 December 2015, there were 330 Official JPs and 1 302 Non-official JPs. An up-to-date list of JPs is available at the JP website (<http://www.info.gov.hk/jp>).

### **FUNCTIONS OF JPs**

4. The main functions of JPs, as provided for in section 5 of the Ordinance, are as follows –

- (a) to visit custodial institutions and detained persons;
- (b) to take and receive declarations and to perform any other functions under the Oaths and Declarations Ordinance (Cap. 11);
- (c) in the case of a Non-official JP, to serve as a member of any advisory panel; and
- (d) to perform such other functions as may be conferred or imposed on him/her from time to time by the Chief Executive.

5. The primary role of a JP is to visit various institutions, such as prisons, detention centres, hospitals and remand/probation homes. The objective of the visits is to ensure that the rights of the inmates in the institutions are safeguarded through a system of regular visits by independent visitors.

## **JP VISIT PROGRAMME**

6. In 2015, there were 112<sup>(1)</sup> institutions under the JP visit programme. Of these 112 institutions, two institutions for drug abusers (i.e. Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre and Au Tau Youth Centre of the Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers) have been newly added under the JP visit programme since August 2015. Statutory visits to 40 institutions were conducted on a fortnightly, monthly or quarterly basis while visits to 72 institutions were arranged on an administrative basis once every quarter or every six months. The list of institutions under JP visit programme in 2015 is at **Annex A**.

7. In 2015, JPs conducted 722 visits to 110 institutions. Two institutions, Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind<sup>(2)</sup> and New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home<sup>(3)</sup> were under renovation and JP visits have been temporarily suspended since July 2010 and May 2015 respectively. On average, each Non-official JP<sup>(4)</sup> conducts one visit per annum while each Official JP conducts three to four visits each year.

## **VISIT ARRANGEMENTS**

8. JP visits to custodial institutions are conducted under the respective legislation. For example, visits to prisons of the Correctional Services Department (CSD) are provided under the Prison Rules (Cap. 234A), visits to psychiatric hospitals are provided under the Mental Health Ordinance (Cap. 136), visits to detention centres of ICAC and Immigration

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Including Ma Hang Prison which was closed in late January 2015 and is currently not subject to JP visits. In order to provide suitable custodial and rehabilitation arrangements for elderly persons in custody (most being accommodated at Ma Hang Prison) and to better utilise correctional facilities, CSD completed a facility improvement project in Tai Lam Correctional Institution in late 2014 for the intake of suitable elderly persons in custody. Subsequently, all elderly persons in custody at Ma Hang Prison were relocated to Tai Lam Correctional Institution in late January 2015. Ma Hang Prison is redeployed for staff training and no JP visit has been arranged thereat since then.

<sup>(2)</sup> Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind was re-opened for JP visits in August 2016.

<sup>(3)</sup> New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home is planned tentatively to be re-opened for JP visits in January 2017.

<sup>(4)</sup> Excluding those who are exempted from visiting duties because of old age, health or other reasons.

Department are provided under the Independent Commission Against Corruption (Treatment of Detained Persons) Order (Cap. 204A) and Immigration (Treatment of Detainees) Order (Cap. 115E) respectively and visits to remand/probation homes of Social Welfare Department (SWD) are provided under the Probation of Offenders Ordinance (Cap. 298) and Juvenile Offenders Ordinance (Cap. 226). Statutory visits are conducted on a fortnightly, monthly or quarterly basis. For visits to general hospitals of the Hospital Authority (HA), institutions for drug abusers operated by Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) under the purview of Department of Health (DH), welfare institutions under the purview of SWD and NGOs, or charitable organisation providing social services under the purview of Home Affairs Department (HAD), they are arranged on an administrative basis on a quarterly or half-yearly interval.

9. To ensure effective monitoring of the management of institutions under the JP visit programme, all JP visits are unannounced. The exact date and time are not made known to the institutions beforehand and JPs may conduct their visits at any reasonable time during their tour of duty. They may request to pay additional visits outside their tour of duty to follow up on or look into specific complaints if they so wish. Usually, two JPs are appointed to visit each institution according to the prescribed frequency. Non-official JPs may choose to pair with either an Official JP or a Non-official JP for the purpose of JP visits.

10. To facilitate JPs to focus on issues that require their attention during the visits, they are provided, before their visits, with checklists drawn up by the concerned departments, to highlight the key areas that JPs may wish to cover in visiting different types of institutions. In addition, the JP Secretariat provides the visiting JPs with reports on those outstanding complaint cases made by inmates of the institutions concerned so that the JPs may follow up on these complaints or other issues during their visits.

11. Each year, the JP Secretariat organises a briefing to help newly appointed JPs familiarise themselves with the JP visit system as well as functions and duties of JPs. The briefing was held in October 2015. 53 newly appointed JPs attended the briefing during which representatives of CSD, SWD and HA were present to explain the responsibility of visiting JPs at institutions under their management.

## HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS/REQUESTS/ENQUIRIES

12. One of the important functions of JPs conducting visits to institutions is to ensure that complaints lodged by inmates are handled in a fair and transparent manner. In the interest of privacy, visiting JPs may choose to speak to inmates in private if they so wish. If JPs prefer to interview an inmate in private, the institution management will make necessary arrangements to facilitate the interview and render assistance to JPs when required. The visiting JPs may either initiate investigative actions by making personal inquiries into the complaints (such as seeking background information from staff of the institutions and examining relevant records and documents) made by inmates of the institutions or refer the cases to the institutions concerned for follow-up actions. In the latter cases, the departments concerned will carry out investigations and report to JPs the outcome of their investigations in writing. Requests or enquires made to JPs by inmates of the institutions are normally referred to the management of the institutions for consideration and JPs are then informed of the actions taken by the management.

13. JPs are at liberty to conduct any further investigation personally as they consider necessary and encouraged to discuss with the institution management and staff members and inspect the complaint registers as appropriate to satisfy themselves that the management have handled the previous complaints/requests/enquiries properly.

14. Detailed statistics on the number of complaints, requests/enquiries received by JPs for the past three years are at **Annex B**. Detailed information showing how the complaints/requests/enquiries received by JPs have been followed up are set out in **Annex C**.

## COMPLAINTS RECEIVED

15. In 2015, 138 complaints were received during JPs visits, as compared with 154 received in 2014. Majority of the complaints were related to services provided by the institution (36%) and staff attitude and conduct (28%). Amongst the 138 complaints received, no follow-up action was required for 37 of them. As for the remaining 101 complaints, 74 cases (73%) were followed up within one month (as compared to 85% in 2014)<sup>(5)</sup>. A summary of the statistics is at Table 1 below.

---

<sup>(5)</sup> In view of the nature and complication involved in 27 complaints (representing 27% of the 101 cases that required follow-up action) received during JP visits in 2015 (some relating to detainees' claims for non-refoulement protection and some on the conduct of staff), the departments have to seek inputs from various parties to conduct investigation. Hence, they have taken more than one month to follow up the complaints.

*Table 1 – Number and category of complaints received in 2015*

<b>Category of complaints</b>	<b>Number of complaints in 2015</b>	<b>(%)</b>
(i) Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	50	(36%)
(ii) Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. unnecessary or excessive use of force, use of impolite language, etc.)	38	(28%)
(iii) Treatment and welfare (e.g. unfair assignment of work, improper handling of complaints/requests, etc.)	26	(19%)
(iv) Complaints against other departments/organisations	10	(7%)
(v) Disciplinary action (e.g. unfair disciplinary proceedings, improper award of punishments, etc.)	7	(5%)
(vi) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate toilet facilities, poor maintenance of equipment, etc.)	4	(3%)
(vii) Others	3	(2%)
<b>Total :</b>	<b>138</b>	

## **REQUESTS/ENQUIRIES RECEIVED**

16. In 2015, 257 requests/enquiries were received during JPs visits, as compared with 373 received in 2014. Majority of them were related to requests for early discharge (35%) and improvement on services provided by the institution (19%). 95% of requests/enquiries (as compared to 81% in 2014) were followed up within one month. A summary of the statistics is at Table 2 below.

*Table 2 – Number and category of requests/enquiries received in 2015*

Category of requests/enquiries	Number of requests/enquiries in 2015	(%)
(i) Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	89	(35%)
(ii) Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	50	(19%)
(iii) Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for more recreational facilities, etc.)	39	(15%)
(iv) Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for making additional phone calls, change of work assignment, transfer to another institution, etc.)	35	(14%)
(v) Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application for legal aid, application for disabilities allowances, request for provision of housing after discharge, etc.)	30	(12%)
(vi) Others	14	(5%)
<b>Total :</b>	<b>257</b>	

## **SUGGESTIONS/COMMENTS MADE BY JPs**

17. In addition to receiving complaints/requests/enquiries, the visiting JPs are required to record in the JP Visit Logbook their assessments as well as their suggestions/comments on the facilities and services provided at the institutions concerned at the end of each visit. Their suggestions/comments mainly focused on physical environment, facilities and equipment, and service quality of the institutions. JPs' assessments, suggestions and comments made in the JP Visit Logbooks help institutions focus on areas requiring improvement and keep track of the general conditions of the facilities and improvements made.

18. As reflected in the Visit Logbooks, JPs were generally satisfied with the overall facilities and services provided by the institutions. In 2015, JPs have made 144 suggestions/comments, as compared with 155 in 2014. 73% of suggestions/comments (as compared to 80% in 2014)<sup>(6)</sup> were followed up within one month. A summary of the statistics is at Table 3 below.

*Table 3 – Number and category of suggestions/comments made in 2015*

Category of suggestions/comments	Number of suggestions/comments in 2015	(%)
(i) Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	62	(43%)
(ii) Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	37	(26%)
(iii) Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	18	(12%)
(iv) Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	12	(8%)
(v) Channels of complaints and handling of complaints	1	(1%)
(vi) Others	14	(10%)
<b>Total :</b>	<b>144</b>	

19. Detailed statistics on the number of visits, complaints, requests/enquiries received by JPs and suggestions/comments made by JPs for the past three years are at **Annex B**.

20. Detailed statistics and information by groups of institutions, including those showing the effectiveness of the recommendations made by JPs, are set out at **Annex C**.

<sup>(6)</sup> More JPs have made suggestions/comments relating to the redevelopment of institutions. In view of the scale of renovation work involved, the departments have taken more than one month to follow up with some of the suggestions/comments.



## **CONCLUSION**

21. The Government attaches great importance to the JP visit system which serves as an effective channel, in addition to other established mechanisms, for inmates of custodial and other institutions to lodge their complaints and requests. The rights of the inmates are safeguarded through this system of independent regular visits by JPs. In addition to ensuring that complaints lodged by inmates are handled in a fair and transparent manner, the JP visit system also provides a forum for JPs to make comments and suggestions on ways to improve the management on facilities and services provided by the institutions. The Government will continue to keep the JP visit system under review and ensure its effectiveness.

Administration Wing  
Chief Secretary for Administration's Office  
September 2016

## List of Institutions under JP Visit Programme in 2015

### I. Statutory Visits

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
<b>A. Prisons/correctional institutions for adults</b>			
1.	Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital <sup>(1)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
2.	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital <sup>(2)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
3.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution <sup>(3)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
4.	Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre <sup>(1)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
5.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
6.	Ma Hang Prison <sup>(4)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
7.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
8.	Pelican House <sup>(5)</sup>	Monthly	CSD
9.	Pik Uk Prison	Fortnightly	CSD
10.	Shek Pik Prison	Fortnightly	CSD
11.	Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre	Fortnightly	CSD
12.	Stanley Prison	Fortnightly	CSD
13.	Tai Lam Centre for Women <sup>(6)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
14.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
15.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
16.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
<b>B. Correctional institutions for young offenders</b>			
17.	Bauhinia House <sup>(6)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
18.	Cape Collinson Correctional Institution	Monthly	CSD
19.	Lai King Correctional Institution <sup>(7)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
20.	Phoenix House <sup>(5)</sup>	Monthly	CSD
21.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	Fortnightly	CSD
22.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution <sup>(8)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
23.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution <sup>(2)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
	<b>C. Institution for drug addicts</b>		
24.	Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre <sup>(3)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
25.	Lai Sun Correctional Institution <sup>(9)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
26.	Nei Kwu Correctional Institution <sup>(9)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
	<b>D. Rehabilitation centres</b>		
27.	Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre <sup>(7)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
28.	Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre <sup>(8)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
29.	Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre <sup>(5)</sup>	Monthly	CSD
30.	Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre <sup>(6)</sup>	Fortnightly	CSD
	<b>E. Detention centres of ICAC &amp; Imm D</b>		
31.	Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre	Fortnightly	Imm D
32.	Independent Commission Against Corruption Detention Centre	Fortnightly	ICAC
33.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	Quarterly	Imm D
	<b>F. Psychiatric hospitals</b>		
34.	Castle Peak Hospital	Monthly	HA
35.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	Monthly	HA
36.	Kwai Chung Hospital	Monthly	HA
37.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	Monthly	HA
38.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of the Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	Monthly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
	<b>G. Remand homes, places of refuge, probation homes and reformatory school of SWD</b>		
39.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	Quarterly	SWD
40.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	Monthly	SWD

Notes:

- (1) Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital (No. 1) and Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre (No. 4) are to be jointly visited.
- (2) Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital (No. 2) and Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution (No. 23) are to be jointly visited.
- (3) Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution (No. 3) and Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre (No. 24) are to be jointly visited.
- (4) Ma Hang Prison (No. 6) was closed in late January 2015 and is currently not subject to JP visits. In order to provide suitable custodial and rehabilitation arrangements for elderly persons in custody (most being accommodated at Ma Hang Prison) and to better utilise correctional facilities, CSD completed a facility improvement project in Tai Lam Correctional Institution in late 2014 for the intake of suitable elderly persons in custody. Subsequently, all elderly persons in custody at Ma Hang Prison were relocated to Tai Lam Correctional Institution in late January 2015. Ma Hang Prison is redeployed for staff training and no JP visit has been arranged thereat since then.
- (5) Pelican House (No. 8), Phoenix House (No. 20) and Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre (No. 29) are to be jointly visited.
- (6) Tai Lam Centre for Women (No. 13), Bauhinia House (No. 17) and Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre (No. 30) are to be jointly visited.
- (7) Lai King Correctional Institution (No. 19) and Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre (No. 27) are to be jointly visited.
- (8) Sha Tsui Correctional Institution (No.22) and Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre (No.28) are to be jointly visited.
- (9) Lai Sun Correctional Institution (No. 25) and Nei Kwu Correctional Institution (No. 26) are to be jointly visited.

Key :

CSD	–	Correctional Services Department
Imm D	–	Immigration Department
ICAC	–	Independent Commission Against Corruption
HA	–	Hospital Authority
SWD	–	Social Welfare Department

## II. Non-statutory Visits

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
	<b>A. Institutions for drug abusers of Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs)</b>		
1.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre <sup>(10)</sup>	Half-yearly	DH
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre <sup>(11)</sup>	Half-yearly	DH
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	Quarterly	DH
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	Quarterly	DH
	<b>B. General acute hospitals with 24-hour A&amp;E services and hospitals with a mix of acute &amp; non-acute services</b>		
5.	Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
6.	Caritas Medical Centre	Quarterly	HA
7.	Haven of Hope Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
8.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
9.	Kowloon Hospital	Quarterly	HA
10.	Kwong Wah Hospital	Quarterly	HA
11.	North District Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
12.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	Quarterly	HA
13.	Pok Oi Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
14.	Prince of Wales Hospital	Quarterly	HA
15.	Princess Margaret Hospital	Quarterly	HA
16.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	Quarterly	HA
17.	Queen Mary Hospital	Quarterly	HA
18.	Ruttonjee Hospital <sup>(12)</sup>	Half-yearly	HA
19.	Shatin Hospital	Half-yearly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
20.	Tai Po Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
21.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
22.	Tuen Mun Hospital	Quarterly	HA
23.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
24.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
25.	Tung Wah Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
26.	United Christian Hospital	Quarterly	HA
27.	Yan Chai Hospital	Quarterly	HA
	<b>C. Psychiatric hospital</b>		
28.	Siu Lam Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
	<b>D. Non-acute or infirmery hospitals</b>		
29.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	Half-yearly	HA
30.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	Half-yearly	HA
31.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	HA
32.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
33.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
	<b>E. Acute hospitals of special nature</b>		
34.	Bradbury Hospice	Half-yearly	HA
35.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	Half-yearly	HA
36.	Grantham Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
37.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
38.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
39.	St. John Hospital	Half-yearly	HA
40.	Tang Shiu Kin Hospital <sup>(12)</sup>	Half-yearly	HA

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
	<b>F. Children's homes of NGOs</b>		
41.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall	Half-yearly	SWD
42.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
43.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
44.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
45.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
46.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
47.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
48.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
49.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
50.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
	<b>G. Day and residential units for people with disabilities of SWD/NGOs</b>		
51.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Jockey Club Lai King Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
52.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
53.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
54.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled	Half-yearly	SWD
55.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind	Half-yearly	SWD
56.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind <sup>(13)</sup>	Half-yearly	SWD
57.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home	Half-yearly	SWD



No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
58.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home <sup>(14)</sup>	Half-yearly	SWD
59.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre	Half-yearly	SWD
60.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building	Half-yearly	SWD
61.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service	Half-yearly	SWD
62.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel	Half-yearly	SWD
63.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex	Half-yearly	SWD
64.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel <sup>(15)</sup>	Half-yearly	SWD
<b>H. Residential care homes for the elderly of NGOs</b>			
65.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home	Half-yearly	SWD
66.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
67.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women	Half-yearly	SWD
68.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
69.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	Half-yearly	SWD
70.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home <sup>(15)</sup>	Half-yearly	SWD
71.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home	Half-yearly	SWD

No.	Name of institution	Frequency of JP visit	Responsible department/organisation
	<b>I. Charitable organisation providing social services</b>		
72.	Po Leung Kuk	Quarterly	HAD

Notes:

- (10) The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre (No. 1) was included under the JP visit programme since August 2015.
- (11) The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre (No. 2) was included under the JP visit programme since August 2015.
- (12) Ruttonjee Hospital (No. 18) and Tang Shiu Kin Hospital (No. 40) are to be jointly visited.
- (13) JP visits to the Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind (No. 56) have been temporarily suspended since July 2010 due to renovation at the Home. The Home was re-opened for JP visits in August 2016.
- (14) JP visits to the New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home (No. 58) have been temporarily suspended since May 2015 due to renovation at the Home. The Home is planned tentatively to be re-opened for JP visits in January 2017.
- (15) Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel (No. 64) and Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home (No. 70) are to be jointly visited.

Key :

DH – Department of Health  
 HA – Hospital Authority  
 HAD – Home Affairs Department  
 SWD – Social Welfare Department

**Statistics on Complaints, Requests/Enquiries Received and  
Suggestions/Comments Made by JPs  
from 2013 to 2015**

Institutions	No. of institutions under JP visit programme			No. of JP visits conducted			No. of complaints made to JPs			No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs			No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs		
	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015	2013	2014	2015
Institutions of Correctional Services Department	29	30	30 <sup>(1)</sup>	442	450	431	137	133	115	87	85	65	44	28	23
Hospitals of Hospital Authority	41	41	41	148	152	154	13	21	20	191	134	150	47	50	49
ICAC Detention Centre	1	1	1	24	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Centres of Immigration Department	2	2	2	28	28	28	0	0	3	72	153	42	4	3	5
Po Leung Kuk	1	1	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Institutions for Drug Abusers operated by Non-governmental Organisations under the purview of Department of Health	2	2	4 <sup>(2)</sup>	8	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	10
Institutions of Social Welfare Department/ Non-governmental Organisations	33	33	33 <sup>(3)</sup>	74	74	70	1	0	0	8	1	0	60	68	57
<b>Total :</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>144</b>

(1) Including Ma Hang Prison which was closed in late January 2015 and is currently not subject to JP visits. In order to provide suitable custodial and rehabilitation arrangements for elderly persons in custody (most being accommodated at Ma Hang Prison) and to better utilise correctional facilities, CSD completed a facility improvement project in Tai Lam Correctional Institution in late 2014 for the intake of suitable elderly persons in custody. Subsequently, all elderly persons in custody at Ma Hang Prison were relocated to Tai Lam Correctional Institution in late January 2015. Ma Hang Prison is redeployed for staff training and no JP visit has been arranged thereat since then.

(2) Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre and Au Tau Youth Centre of the Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers were included under the JP visit programme since August 2015.

(3) JP visits to Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind and New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home have been temporarily suspended since July 2010 and May 2015 respectively due to renovation at the Homes. The former was re-opened for JP visits in August 2016 and the latter is planned tentatively to be re-opened for JP visits in January 2017.

**Detailed Information on JP Visits to Individual Institutions**

( from 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2015)

**I. Institutions of the Correctional Services Department*****A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments***

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	Cape Collinson Correctional Institution	12	0	0	1
2.	Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital/Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre <sup>♦</sup>	24	11	6	3
3.	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital <sup>^</sup>	3	0	0	0
4.	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital/Ma Hang Prison <sup>♦^</sup>	1	0	0	0
5.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution/Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre <sup>♦</sup>	22	0	0	1
6.	Lai King Correctional Institution/Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre <sup>♦</sup>	24	0	0	0
7.	Lai Sun Correctional Institution/Nei Kwu Correctional Institution <sup>♦</sup>	22	0	0	0
8.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	24	14	12	1
9.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution	24	2	9	1
10.	Phoenix House/Pelican House/Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre <sup>○</sup>	12	0	0	3
11.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	24	0	0	2
12.	Pik Uk Prison	24	0	0	1
13.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution/Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre <sup>♦</sup>	23	0	0	0
14.	Shek Pik Prison	23	2	7	0
15.	Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre	24	39	1	2
16.	Stanley Prison	24	47	26	2

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

○ Denotes visits covering three institutions.

^ Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital and Ma Hang Prison were to be jointly visited. Due to the closure of Ma Hang Prison since late January 2015, no JP visit has been arranged thereat. JPs have been conducting joint visits to Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital and Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution since March 2015.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
17.	Tai Lam Centre for Women/Bauhinia House/Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre <sup>○</sup>	25	0	1	0
18.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	24	0	0	3
19.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution	4	0	0	0
20.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution/Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital <sup>♦^</sup>	20	0	0	1
21.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	24	0	2	0
22.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	24	0	1	2
	<b>Total :</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>23</b>

***B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided\****

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
			S	U	S	U
1.	Cape Collinson Correctional Institution	12	12	0	12	0
2.	Custodial Ward of Queen Elizabeth Hospital <sup>△</sup>	24	24	0	24	0
	Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre <sup>△</sup>		24	0	24	0
3.	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital <sup>^</sup>	3	3	0	3	0
4.	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital <sup>△^</sup>	1	1	0	1	0
	Ma Hang Prison <sup>△^</sup>		1	0	1	0

**Key :** S – Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

- 
- ♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.
  - Denotes visits covering three institutions.
  - ^ Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital and Ma Hang Prison were to be jointly visited. Due to the closure of Ma Hang Prison since late January 2015, no JP visit has been arranged thereat. JPs have been conducting joint visits to Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital and Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution since March 2015.
  - \* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as facilities of the hospital, living accommodation, kitchen and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including training programmes, recreational activities and management services) provided by the institutions concerned.
  - △ Separate reports were completed by JPs for the specific institution.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
			S	U	S	U
5.	Hei Ling Chau Correctional Institution <sup>△</sup>	22	22	0	22	0
	Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre <sup>△</sup>		22	0	22	0
6.	Lai King Correctional Institution/ Chi Lan Rehabilitation Centre	24	24	0	24	0
7.	Lai Sun Correctional Institution <sup>△</sup>	22	22	0	22	0
	Nei Kwu Correctional Institution <sup>△</sup>		22	0	22	0
8.	Lo Wu Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
9.	Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
10.	Phoenix House/Pelican House/ Lai Hang Rehabilitation Centre	12	12	0	12	0
11.	Pik Uk Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
12.	Pik Uk Prison	24	24	0	24	0
13.	Sha Tsui Correctional Institution/ Lai Chi Rehabilitation Centre	23	23	0	23	0
14.	Shek Pik Prison	23	23	0	23	0
15.	Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre	24	24	0	24	0
16.	Stanley Prison	24	24	0	24	0
17.	Tai Lam Centre for Women <sup>△</sup>	25	25	0	25	0
	Bauhinia House/Wai Lan Rehabilitation Centre <sup>△</sup>		25	0	25	0
18.	Tai Lam Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
19.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution	4	4	0	4	0
20.	Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution <sup>△^</sup>	20	20	0	20	0
	Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital <sup>△^</sup>		20	0	20	0
21.	Tong Fuk Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
22.	Tung Tau Correctional Institution	24	24	0	24	0
<b>Total :</b>		<b>431</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>0</b>

Key :     S – Satisfactory  
               U – Unsatisfactory

<sup>△</sup> Separate reports were completed by JPs for the specific institution.

<sup>^</sup> Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital and Ma Hang Prison were to be jointly visited. Due to the closure of Ma Hang Prison since late January 2015, no JP visit has been arranged thereat. JPs have been conducting joint visits to Custodial Ward of Queen Mary Hospital and Tai Tam Gap Correctional Institution since March 2015.

**C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of complaints made to JPs**

115 complaints<sup>1</sup> in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to institutions under the management of CSD –

Category of complaints		Number of complaints in 2015	(%)
(i)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	43	(37%)
(ii)	Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. unnecessary or excessive use of force, use of impolite language, etc.)	32	(28%)
(iii)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. unfair assignment of work, improper handling of complaints/requests, etc.)	22	(19%)
(iv)	Complaints against other departments/organisations	9	(8%)
(v)	Disciplinary action (e.g. unfair disciplinary proceedings, improper award of punishments, etc.)	7	(6%)
(vi)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate toilet facilities, poor maintenance of equipment, etc.)	2	(2%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>115</b>	

Upon receipt of complaints, JPs sought background information from individual institutions and examined the facilities, environment, services, treatment and relevant arrangements as well as the records where applicable.

Of the 115 cases, nine cases were related to category (iv): complaints against other departments/organisations, such as the Hong Kong Police Force and the Customs and Excise Department about their criminal investigations or convictions by court. Amongst these nine complaints, eight of them were related to complainants' dissatisfaction at being convicted by courts. As the complainants had either gone through the appeal channels under the current legal system or had been detained under the Hospital Order imposed by the court with unstable mental conditions, JPs directed that no further action be taken for five cases and suggested institutions providing explanations to the complainants for three cases, which the concerned institutions had done so accordingly. The institutions concerned had informed all complainants of the JPs' directions. The

<sup>1</sup> Among these 115 complaints, 69 cases were raised by three complainants accounting for 60% of all cases.

remaining case was a complaint against the retention of medicines and property by court. The case was referred to Kwun Tong Magistracy for follow up and the property was sent back to the complainant eventually. The complainant appreciated the effort made by the institution.

Apart from the nine complaints against other departments/organisations, the remaining 106 cases were complaints against CSD and they were handled according to the circumstances of each case. Of the 106 complaints, 16 of them required no further action from CSD. Amongst these 16 cases, JPs found that 15 were lodged by three persons in custody in Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre. Considering that the complaints were repeatedly made by persons with unstable mental conditions, JPs directed that no further action were required. The remaining one case was against the attitude and conduct of CSD staff. Given that the case had already been referred to the Police for investigation, JPs directed that no further action from CSD was required.

For the remaining 90 complaints against CSD, 58 were of minor or operational nature, which were relating to meals, clothing, earnings and medical treatment, etc. They were handled by individual institutions as directed by JPs. JPs had requested the individual institutions to explain the relevant procedures, arrangements and established mechanisms to each complainant, where applicable. As regards those complaints related to medical treatment, CSD had subsequently arranged medical consultations provided by the institutional Medical Officers (MO) for the complainants. The complainants showed their understanding without making further complaints and JPs were informed of the actions taken.

32 out of the above 90 complaints were referred by JPs to the Complaints Investigation Unit (CIU) of CSD for action. The allegations normally involved more complicated circumstances such as staff misconduct and use of excessive force, etc. The complaints were handled according to the established complaints handling mechanism. After investigation, all complaints were found not substantiated. JPs and the complainants were duly informed of the outcomes of the investigations. JPs were satisfied with no further action directed.



**D. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of requests/enquiries made to JPs**

65 requests/enquiries in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to institutions under the management of CSD –

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2015	(%)
(i)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for making additional phone calls, change of work assignment, transfer to another institution, etc.)	26	(40%)
(ii)	Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application for legal aid, application for disabilities allowances, request for provision of housing after discharge, etc.)	18	(28%)
(iii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	17	(26%)
(iv)	Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	4	(6%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>65</b>	

The 43 requests made under category (i): treatment and welfare and category (iii): services provided by the institution were related to specialists consultation at outside clinics/hospitals, transfer to other institutions, making of additional phone calls to relatives and friends, and meals arrangements, etc. Having examined the nature of the requests, JPs directed the institutions to provide explanations and/or assistance to the persons in custody as appropriate. For requests related to medical treatment, persons in custody had been referred to MO for consultation. JPs and the persons in custody concerned were duly informed of the actions taken. JPs were satisfied with no further action directed.

The 18 requests under category (ii): matters in relation to other departments/organisations were about the decisions made or services provided by other departments/organisations. Examples include the implementation of deportation order by the Immigration Department, the handling of the legal aid application by the Legal Aid Department, the returning of the property by other law enforcement agencies or transfer to home countries for serving the remaining sentence. The four requests under category (iv) were about request for early discharge. These requests had been referred to the relevant authorities for actions according to JPs' suggestions.

***E. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs***

JPs made 23 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits to institutions under the management of CSD –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2015	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	17	(74%)
(ii)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	3	(13%)
(iii)	Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	2	(9%)
(iv)	Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	1	(4%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>23</b>	

Majority of the suggestions were made under category (i): physical environment, facilities and equipment (74%), recommending institutions to carry out renovation for old facilities. As some of the correctional institutions were not purpose-built and had been established for decades, parts of their facilities were ageing. CSD has been adopting different measures to improve these facilities. In terms of short-term measures, CSD has regularly inspected, maintained and repaired relevant facilities. In the long-run, CSD has planned and implemented improvement and redevelopment projects of correctional institutions, having regard to the actual needs. In response to JPs' recommendation on enhancing the coverage of the Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Systems at Stanley Prison, for example, CSD would implement suitable upgrading projects not only at Stanley Prison, but also at Siu Lam Psychiatric Centre and Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institution in phases.

For category (ii): training programmes and recreational activities, some JPs suggested CSD allocating resources to provide more rehabilitation programmes for persons in custody, particularly youngsters to facilitate their re-integration into the society after release. CSD is committed to providing diversified and appropriate rehabilitation programmes to persons in custody. 20 vocational training courses were provided for young persons in custody in 2015

including courses on electrical installation, building services, graphic design, food and beverages services; while more than 40 market-oriented courses were available for adult in custody. These courses included decorative waterproof renovation, florist and floriculture as well as coffee house operations. CSD would continue to design and arrange more suitable training courses for persons in custody.

For category (iii): manpower planning, some JPs recommended providing additional resources including specialised training for staff to promote anti-smoking in CSD institutions. To actively respond to this suggestion, CSD had set up a “Steering Committee on Smoking Control Measures in Correctional Facilities” to implement tobacco control measures. Educational talks and individual counselling sessions had been arranged for persons in custody to encourage them to quit smoking. Nicotine patches had been provided to those who participated in the quit-smoking courses. To arouse the awareness of the persons in custody on the harmfulness of smoking, CSD had displayed publicity posters, organised poster design competitions and smoking cessation courses in the institutions. Apart from Tung Tau Correctional Institution and Pak Sha Wan Correctional Institutions which were officially designated as “No Smoking Correctional Facility” in January 2013 and December 2014 respectively to accommodate only non-smoking persons in custody, CSD had also set up “Smoke-free Prison Zone” in the designated areas of Shek Pik Prison and Lo Wu Correctional Institution. CSD would continue to promote the non-smoking initiative in their institutions.

For category (iv): service quality, some JPs recommended implementing measures to support the initiative of reducing intake of salt and sugar by persons in custody. CSD has all along been providing plain and wholesome food to persons in custody. All of the existing dietary scale provided to persons in custody are designed by qualified dieticians with reference to the prevailing international dietary guidelines and supported by the Department of Health. To further implement the initiative of reducing intake of salt and sugar by persons in custody, CSD had arranged staff to attend the “International Symposium on Reduction of Salt and Sugar in Food” organised by the Centre for Food Safety in May 2015. Since then, CSD had organised a healthy eating slogan competition for promoting low salt, low sugar and low fat diet for persons in custody in August 2015 and two training workshops for the Catering Instructors in October 2015. In the revision exercise of dietary scale for 2017-2020, CSD had taken into consideration the latest World Health Organisation’s recommendations on salt and sugar levels.

## II. Hospitals of the Hospital Authority

### A. *Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments*

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital	2	0	0	0
2.	Bradbury Hospice	2	0	0	2
3.	Caritas Medical Centre	4	0	0	3
4.	Castle Peak Hospital	12	0	3	3
5.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	2	0	0	0
6.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	2	0	0	1
7.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	2	0	0	1
8.	Grantham Hospital	2	0	0	0
9.	Haven of Hope Hospital	3	0	0	2
10.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	2	0	0	0
11.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	2	0	0	0
12.	Kowloon Hospital	4	0	0	0
13.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	12	6	39	6
14.	Kwai Chung Hospital	12	2	6	8
15.	Kwong Wah Hospital	4	0	0	1
16.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	2	0	0	1
17.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	12	7	66	3
18.	North District Hospital	2	0	0	0
19.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	2	0	0	2
20.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	4	0	0	1
21.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	12	5	36	1
22.	Pok Oi Hospital	2	0	0	1
23.	Prince of Wales Hospital	5	0	0	2
24.	Princess Margaret Hospital	4	0	0	0
25.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	4	0	0	3

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
26.	Queen Mary Hospital	4	0	0	1
27.	Ruttonjee Hospital/Tang Shiu Kin Hospital♦	2	0	0	3
28.	Shatin Hospital	2	0	0	0
29.	Siu Lam Hospital	2	0	0	0
30.	St. John Hospital	2	0	0	1
31.	Tai Po Hospital	2	0	0	0
32.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	2	0	0	1
33.	Tuen Mun Hospital	4	0	0	0
34.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	2	0	0	0
35.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	2	0	0	0
36.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	2	0	0	0
37.	Tung Wah Hospital	2	0	0	1
38.	United Christian Hospital	4	0	0	1
39.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	2	0	0	0
40.	Yan Chai Hospital	4	0	0	0
	<b>Total :</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>49</b>

---

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

***B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided\****

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities✦		Overall grading on services✦	
			S	U	S	U
1.	Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
2.	Bradbury Hospice	2	1	0	2	0
3.	Caritas Medical Centre	4	4	0	3	0
4.	Castle Peak Hospital	12	7	0	11	0
5.	Cheshire Home, Chung Hom Kok	2	2	0	2	0
6.	Cheshire Home, Shatin	2	2	0	1	0
7.	The Duchess of Kent Children's Hospital at Sandy Bay	2	1	0	2	0
8.	Grantham Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
9.	Haven of Hope Hospital	3	3	0	3	0
10.	Hong Kong Buddhist Hospital	2	1	0	1	0
11.	Hong Kong Eye Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
12.	Kowloon Hospital	4	2	0	2	0
13.	Kowloon Psychiatric Observation Unit of Kowloon Hospital	12	7	0	10	0
14.	Kwai Chung Hospital	12	9	0	11	0
15.	Kwong Wah Hospital	4	3	0	2	0
16.	MacLehose Medical Rehabilitation Centre	2	1	0	1	0
17.	New Territories East Psychiatric Observation Unit of Tai Po Hospital	12	10	0	11	0
18.	North District Hospital	2	1	0	2	0
19.	Our Lady of Maryknoll Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
20.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	4	3	0	3	0

**Key :** S – Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

- 
- \* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as facilities of the ward, outpatient department and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including patient care and catering/supporting/management services) provided by the institution concerned.
- ✦ The total number of overall grading on facilities or services may not add up to the total number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services during a particular visit.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities✦		Overall grading on services✦	
			S	U	S	U
21.	Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Psychiatric Observation Unit of Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital	12	9	0	12	0
22.	Pok Oi Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
23.	Prince of Wales Hospital	5	5	0	5	0
24.	Princess Margaret Hospital	4	4	0	3	0
25.	Queen Elizabeth Hospital	4	2	0	3	0
26.	Queen Mary Hospital	4	1	1 <sup>@</sup>	2	0
27.	Ruttonjee Hospital/Tang Shiu Kin Hospital ♦	2	2	0	2	0
28.	Shatin Hospital	2	2	0	1	0
29.	Siu Lam Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
30.	St. John Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
31.	Tai Po Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
32.	Tseung Kwan O Hospital	2	2	0	0	0
33.	Tuen Mun Hospital	4	1	0	2	0
34.	Tung Wah Eastern Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
35.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Fung Yiu King Hospital	2	1	0	2	0
36.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Wong Tai Sin Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
37.	Tung Wah Hospital	2	0	0	2	0
38.	United Christian Hospital	4	2	0	4	0
39.	Wong Chuk Hang Hospital	2	2	0	2	0
40.	Yan Chai Hospital	4	2	0	3	0
<b>Total :</b>		<b>154</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>0</b>

**Key :** S – Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

✦ The total number of overall gradings on facilities or services may not add up to the total number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services during a particular visit.

@ The visiting JPs considered the facilities were a bit overcrowded and expected that the situation would improve with Queen Mary Hospital's redevelopment plan, which is targeted to commence in 2017.

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.

**C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of complaints made to JPs**

20 complaints in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to hospitals –

Category of complaints		Number of complaints in 2015	(%)
(i)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	6	(30%)
(ii)	Staff attitude and conduct (e.g. unnecessary or excessive use of force, use of impolite language, etc.)	6	(30%)
(iii)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate toilet facilities, poor maintenance of equipment, etc.)	2	(10%)
(iv)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. unfair assignment of work, improper handling of complaints/requests etc.)	2	(10%)
(v)	Complaints against other departments/organisations	1	(5%)
(vi)	Others	3	(15%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>20</b>	

All the 20 complaints were lodged by psychiatric patients. 15 were found unsubstantiated and related to patients' hallucination and unstable mental condition. Most of the patients complained against prolonged restraint. HA responded that restraint would only be applied when necessary and all related details were logged on patient records. Some unsubstantiated cases were related to medical treatment. Some complaints related to medical treatment were found unsubstantiated after review by respective healthcare professionals.

For the remaining five cases, two were related to hospital facilities (i.e. inadequate toilet cubicles due to temporary breakdown). The Hospital Facility Management Department had followed up the cases and arranged repair works accordingly. One partially substantiated complaint was a near-miss (i.e. an unplanned event that did not result in injury, illness, or damage – but had the potential to do so) related to medication administration. Although the patient did not take the wrong medication, the case, as usual practice for quality improvement, was reported to the internal monitoring system. Similar cases had been reviewed to identify potential risks and related improvements. The Department Operation



Manager had also reminded all ward staff to strictly reinforce the 5-rights checking principle<sup>2</sup> in medication administration. The fourth case was related to the patient's previous hospitalisation episode and was concluded by JPs as no follow-up action required. The last case was related to the alleged excessive force used by Police during hospitalisation and the case had been referred to the Independent Police Complaints Council for follow-up.

**D. *Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of requests/enquiries made to JPs***

150 requests/enquiries in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to hospitals, all of which came from psychiatric patients –

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2015	(%)
(i)	Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	49	(33%)
(ii)	Facilities and equipment provided by the institution (e.g. request for more recreational facilities, etc.)	39	(26%)
(iii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	31	(21%)
(iv)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. request for making additional phone calls, change of work assignment, transfer to another institution, etc.)	9	(6%)
(v)	Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application for legal aid, application for disabilities allowances, request for provision of housing after discharge, etc.)	8	(5%)
(vi)	Others	14	(9%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>150</b>	

<sup>2</sup> The right patient, the right drug, the right dose, the right route, and the right time.

The 49 requests for early discharge in category (i) were lodged by psychiatric patients. The case doctors and senior clinical staff had reviewed all requests. Patients considered clinically unsuitable for discharge had been handled in accordance with the relevant provision of the Mental Health Ordinance (Cap. 136). They had also been advised of the rights to raise their concerns with the Mental Health Review Tribunal.

For category (ii): facilities and equipment provided by the institution, 12 requests were related to the provision of extra recreational facilities and permission to visit garden. Eight were related to toilet facilities and water leakage at ward area. The remaining 19 were related to the request for provision of other facilities such as fridge, extra pillow, linen, trousers, warm tap water, etc. All cases had been followed up by the Hospital Facility Management Department or ward administration staff.

For requests under category (iii): services provided by the institution, over 20 requests were related to meal provided by the hospital, including requests for soup, fruit and night snacks. Some patients requested stronger tea and bringing in bottled drinks and cooked food and the requests were followed up by the Hospital Catering Department. Some other patients requested more medical attention from doctor/dietician/nurses.

For category (iv): treatment and welfare, three patients requested to keep personal belongings such as mobile phone and Identity Card at ward which was not allowed at present due to security reasons. Other requests included increasing meal and bath time, reducing physical constraint and arranging evening visit time-slots. The hospitals concerned had considered the requests and acceded to patients' requests as far as practicable.

For category (v) which concerns matters in relation to other departments/organisations, some patients requested the provision of housing and Comprehensive Social Security Assistance after discharge, and the requests were referred to medical social workers. Four patients also enquired about finding a job after discharge. Counselling had been provided to the patients as appropriate.

For category (vi): others, some patients shared their view on health system and manpower issues with JPs. A patient requested to visit a private dental clinic and the visit was arranged subsequently. Another patient requested to hang clothes at ward and one requested for hair treatment. The ward staff had explained the related rules and regulations to the patients and offered possible alternatives to them. Two patients raised their concerns on environmental

protection and were assured of the appropriate use of air-conditioning at ward areas.

All JPs concerned had been informed of the follow-up actions taken by the institutions.

***E. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs***

JPs made 49 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits to hospitals –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2015	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	23	(47%)
(ii)	Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	9	(18%)
(iii)	Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	9	(18%)
(iv)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	2	(4%)
(v)	Others	6	(13%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>49</b>	

Concerning JPs' suggestions and comments on category (i): physical environment, facilities and equipment, funding had been secured for repair/renovation/redevelopment in some hospitals. HA would continue to ensure all hospital premises are maintained properly. In response to the suggestions by some JPs on minor improvement works, such as playing soft music at ward, installing bells and queuing system at Out-patient Department, the hospitals concerned had included the improvement works under the 2016/17 works list. They would also take into consideration privacy of patients and need for secured open space for ward renovation.

A significant number of positive comments were made by JPs under category (ii): service quality. JPs were highly impressed by the enthusiasm and professionalism of the staff. They reflected that they were glad to see the dedicated nursing team providing quality care for infirm and rehabilitation patients, and were committed to accord a good environment and caring atmosphere for residents. Some JPs suggested HA planning ahead for the increasing ageing and increasing population. All comments had been conveyed to the management for planning purpose.

Regarding category (iii): manpower planning, some JPs expressed concerns about the problem of staff shortage for meeting services demand. While staff recruitment would be an on-going process, HA had made efforts to review the remuneration package and streamline working procedures to maintain service quality.

As regards category (iv): training programmes and recreational activities, one JP expressed concern on a psychiatric patient sitting in the room without participating in any activity. The hospital management explained the situation to that JP and reassured him that other patients with stable psychological condition had been actively participating in the activities. Besides, one JP appreciated the pre-discharge occupational training provided to psychiatric patients and reiterated the importance to provide such services.

Comments under category (v): others were largely related to the transportation services provided to remote hospitals. HA had referred such comments to Transportation Department for follow-up action. Some JPs made suggestions relating to the arrangement of JP visits including conducting structured briefing before touring around the hospital and informing JPs of the visit route in advance. HA responded that they would ensure that this arrangement was extended to all hospitals. As regards the route of JP visits, the hospital staff would suggest the route with reference to the operation of the hospital on the day of visit. Nevertheless, JPs are welcome to suggest areas that they wish to inspect during the visits.

### III. ICAC Detention Centre

#### A. *Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments*

Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
ICAC Detention Centre	25	0	0	0

#### B. *Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided\**

Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities		Overall grading on services	
		S	U	S	U
ICAC Detention Centre	25	25	0	25	0

Key :    S - Satisfactory  
          U - Unsatisfactory

- 
- \* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as cells, interview room, search/medical/charge room and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including food, bedding and management services) provided by the institution concerned.

#### **IV. Centres of the Immigration Department**

##### ***A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments***

<b>Serial no.</b>	<b>Name of institution</b>	<b>No. of JP visits</b>	<b>No. of complaints made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs</b>
1.	Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre	24	3	42	4
2.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	4	0	0	1
	<b>Total :</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5</b>

##### ***B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided\****

<b>Serial no.</b>	<b>Name of institution</b>	<b>No. of JP visits</b>	<b>Overall grading on facilities</b>		<b>Overall grading on services</b>	
			<b>S</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>U</b>
1.	Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre	24	24	0	24	0
2.	Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre	4	4	0	4	0
	<b>Total :</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>

**Key :** S - Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

---

\* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as dormitories, sanitation and hygiene, security and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including meal/medical treatment arrangements, custody of detainees' properties and management services) provided by the institution concerned.

### ***C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of complaints made to JPs***

Three complaints in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre (CIC) –

<b>Category of complaints</b>		<b>Number of complaints in 2015</b>	<b>(%)</b>
(i)	Treatment and welfare (e.g. unfair assignment of work, improper handling of complaints/requests, etc.)	2	(67%)
(ii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. inadequate medical care, insufficient daily necessities, poor quality of food/catering services, etc.)	1	(33%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>3</b>	

One of the two complaints under category (i): treatment and welfare was related to excessive charges of long distance calls and inappropriate arrangement for making appointment with solicitor. The case officer had explained to the detainee that the telephone service was provided by a local telephone service provider and same charging rate of long distance call had been applied to all detainees. As for the allegation on inappropriate arrangement for making appointment with solicitor, all detainees had been clearly informed of their rights to make private telephone calls to, or communicate by writing or in person with, a solicitor or barrister. According to the record of the centre, the detainee had been arranged to have appointment and telephone communication with his legal representative. There was no record indicating any impediment of such communications. Another detainee complained that he was not treated as a “refugee” but a “criminal” and that there was no observation of international treaties on human rights. The detainee was interviewed by the case officer who explained to him the rights of detainees at CIC.

The complaint under category (ii): services provided by the institution was about no internet access, provision of clock and Arabic translation service. Regarding internet access and provision of clock, the case officer had explained to the detainee that CIC had to strike a balance between the personal need of detainees and the security at CIC and the detainee did not request for further follow up. Concerning the detainee’s complaint against no Arabic translation service, the fact of the matter was that CIC had actually arranged an Arabic interpreter for the detainee in every interview with him and all the correspondences served to him had been clearly explained through the assistance of an interpreter as appropriate.

All concerned JPs had been informed of the actions taken and no further comment was received from JPs.

***D. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of requests/enquiries made to JPs***

42 requests/enquiries in the following categories were made to JPs during their visits to the CIC –

Category of requests/enquiries		Number of requests/enquiries in 2015	(%)
(i)	Request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance	36	(86%)
(ii)	Matters in relation to other departments/organisations (e.g. application for legal aid, application for disabilities allowances, request for provision of housing after discharge, etc.)	4	(9%)
(iii)	Services provided by the institution (e.g. request for more medical attention, request for more choices of food, etc.)	2	(5%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>42</b>	

The 36 requests under category (i): request for early discharge from institution/home leave/release on recognisance were mainly related to checking of case progress, requesting interview by case officers and release on recognisance. These requests had been referred to the relevant sections for follow-up.

The requests under category (ii): matters in relation to other departments/organisations were mainly related to arrangements for detainees who might have special needs about checking progress of applications with other departments/organisations. The requests had been handled by the welfare officer and referred to the relevant departments/organisations.

Two requests under category (iii): services provided by the institution related to provision of food service and medical attention had been referred to the service provider for consideration.

All concerned JPs had been informed of the actions taken.



***E. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs***

JPs made five suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits to CIC and Ma Tau Kok Detention Centre –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2015	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	3	(60%)
(ii)	Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	2	(40%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>5</b>	

For category (i), physical environment, facilities and equipment, JPs suggested enlarging the font size of the words displayed on the post boxes. In response to JPs' suggestion, the relevant font size had been enlarged accordingly and separate notes were displayed at conspicuous places of the centre. In connection with JP's suggestion on upgrading the CCTV system to digital mode, the relevant work was completed in October 2015. As regards JPs' suggestion on the implementation of energy saving measures, the centre had conducted regular reviews and implemented practical measures to save energy. Apart from routine maintenance conducted by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, guarding officers would ensure that electrical equipment not in use are properly switched off.

For category (ii): service quality, JPs made comments on the hygiene of the centre. To follow up, the centre has arranged thorough cleaning of all electrical fans. All pillows and blankets provided to detainees were sent to the in-centre laundry for cleaning and new ones were provided to detainees. In addition, daily inspection was conducted by senior officers of the centre to ensure that hygiene is maintained at a satisfactory standard. In response to JPs' suggestion of assigning toilet-cleaning tasks to detainees, JPs had been informed that cleaning work in dayroom, dormitory and ward were already performed by detainees.

## **V. Po Leung Kuk**

### **A. *Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments***

<b>Name of institution</b>	<b>No. of JP visits</b>	<b>No. of complaints made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs</b>
Po Leung Kuk	4	0	0	0

### **B. *Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided\****

<b>Name of institution</b>	<b>No. of JP visits</b>	<b>Overall grading on facilities</b>		<b>Overall grading on services</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>U</b>
Po Leung Kuk	4	4	0	4	0

Key :    S - Satisfactory  
            U – Unsatisfactory

---

\* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as dormitories, sheltered workshop and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including residential/day care/rehabilitation services) provided by the institution concerned.

**VI. Institutions for Drug Abusers operated by Non-governmental Organisations under the purview of the Department of Health (DH)**

***A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments***

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	No. of complaints made to JPs	No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs	No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs
1.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre	1	0	0	1
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre	1	0	0	3
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	4	0	0	2
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	4	0	0	4
<b>Total :</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>

***B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided\****

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities✦		Overall grading on services✦	
			S	U	S	U
1.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Adult Female Rehabilitation Centre	1	1	0	1	0
2.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Au Tau Youth Centre	1	1	0	1	0

**Key :** S - Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

\* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as facilities of the hospital, living accommodation, kitchen and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including training programmes, recreational activities and management services) provided by the institutions concerned.

✦ The total number of overall grading on facilities or services may not add up to the total number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services during a particular visit.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities✦		Overall grading on services✦	
			S	U	S	U
3.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre	4	4	0	3	0
4.	The Society for the Aid and Rehabilitation of Drug Abusers Sister Aquinas Memorial Women's Treatment Centre	4	1	1@	4	0
	<b>Total :</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>

**C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs**

JPs made ten suggestions/comments –

Category of comments/suggestions		Number of comments/suggestions in 2015	(%)
(i)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	5	(50%)
(ii)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	2	(20%)
(iii)	Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	1	(10%)
(iv)	Others	2	(20%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>10</b>	

Key : S - Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

- ✦ The total number of overall grading on facilities or services may not add up to the total number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services during a particular visit.
- @ The visiting JPs considered that the facilities at the centre need proper refurbishment and maintenance. DH would continue to render necessary assistance and support in processing funding requests of the centre for the necessary resources.

For category (i) concerning the physical environment of the centres, JPs commented that the buildings were generally old and upgrading works required. DH responded that they would continue to render necessary assistance and support in processing funding requests of the centres for the necessary resources.

Under category (ii): training programmes and recreational activities, JPs recommended the centre to more actively engage inmates in daily chores and learning so that inmates could make better use of their time and help creating a better living condition. DH responded that the centre had daily routine timetable comprising different educational and vocational classes, as well as daily chores for the inmates. JPs also recommended the inmates to participate in outdoor activities and had been informed that such activities were arranged regularly for inmates.

Under category (iii): service quality, JPs recommended strengthening the provision of medical care and counselling service from religious perspective for the inmates. DH responded that the centre had been working closely with various medical institutions and religious groups and would continue to explore collaboration opportunities with a view to further enhancing the service quality.

Under category (iv): others, the centre had taken steps to follow up JPs' suggestion to explore the possibility of using sustainable energy with private corporations. As regards JPs' comment on the size of the "Beat Drugs Fund" logo on the institution van, the centre had referred the case to the Narcotics Division of the Security Bureau for follow-up action.

## **VII. Institutions of the Social Welfare Department/Non-governmental Organisations**

### ***A. Statistics on complaints, requests/enquiries and suggestions/comments***

<b>Serial no.</b>	<b>Name of institution</b>	<b>No. of JP visits</b>	<b>No. of complaints made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs</b>
1.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Jockey Club Lai King Rehabilitation Centre	2	0	0	1
2.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home	2	0	0	0
3.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall	2	0	0	4
4.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel	2	0	0	2
5.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre	2	0	0	4
6.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled	1	0	0	1
7.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	0	0	1
8.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women	1	0	0	0
9.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel	2	0	0	0
10.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	0	0	1
11.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind	2	0	0	2
12.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind	0#	-	-	-

# JP visits to the Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind have been temporarily suspended since July 2010 due to renovation at the Home. The Home was re-opened for JP visits in August 2016.

<b>Serial no.</b>	<b>Name of institution</b>	<b>No. of JP visits</b>	<b>No. of complaints made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of requests/enquiries made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of suggestions/comments made by JPs</b>
13.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel	2	0	0	0
14.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel	2	0	0	1
15.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home	2	0	0	2
16.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home	0 <sup>^</sup>	-	-	-
17.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	4	0	0	3
18.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre	2	0	0	1
19.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	0	0	0
20.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre	2	0	0	5
21.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre	2	0	0	2
22.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel	2	0	0	0
23.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre	2	0	0	1
24.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel	2	0	0	1
25.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building	2	0	0	2
26.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service	2	0	0	4
27.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	12	0	0	4
28.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel	2	0	0	2
29.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex	2	0	0	5

<sup>^</sup> JP visits to the New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home have been temporarily suspended since May 2015 due to renovation at the Home. The Home is planned tentatively to be re-opened for JP visits in January 2017.

<b>Serial no.</b>	<b>Name of institution</b>	<b>No. of JP visits</b>	<b>No. of complaints made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of requests/ enquiries made to JPs</b>	<b>No. of suggestions/ comments made by JPs</b>
30.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel	2	0	0	5
31.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home	2	0	0	1
	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel ♦		0	0	1
32.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home	2	0	0	1
	<b>Total :</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>

---

♦ Denotes visits covering two institutions.



***B. Statistics on satisfactory ratings given by JPs on the facilities and services provided\****

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities✦		Overall grading on services✦	
			S	U	S	U
1.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Jockey Club Lai King Rehabilitation Centre	2	2	0	2	0
2.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home	2	2	0	2	0
3.	Caritas-Hong Kong – Caritas Pelletier Hall	2	2	0	2	0
4.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong – Kwai Shing Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
5.	Fu Hong Society – Fu Hong Society Rehabilitation Centre	2	2	0	2	0
6.	Haven of Hope Christian Service – Haven of Hope Hang Hau Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled	1	1	0	1	0
7.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	1	0	2	0
8.	Heung Hoi Ching Kok Lin Association – Buddhist Po Ching Home for the Aged Women	1	1	0	1	0
9.	Hong Kong Juvenile Care Centre – Bradbury Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
10.	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council – Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	2	0	2	0

**Key :** S – Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

- 
- \* During the visits, JPs looked at the facilities (such as dormitories, kitchen/canteen, recreational facilities and general state of the premises) and assessed the services (including academic/prevocational training programmes and medical/management services) provided by the institutions concerned.
- ✦ The total number of overall grading on facilities or services may not add up to the total number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services during a particular visit.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities✦		Overall grading on services✦	
			S	U	S	U
11.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Centre for the Blind	2	2	0	2	0
12.	Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind	0 <sup>#</sup>	-	-	-	-
13.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Holland Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
14.	Hong Kong Student Aid Society – Island Hostel	2	1	0	1	0
15.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – New Life Building Long Stay Care Home	2	2	0	2	0
16.	New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home	0 <sup>^</sup>	-	-	-	-
17.	Po Leung Kuk Wing Lung Bank Golden Jubilee Sheltered Workshop and Hostel	4	4	0	4	0
18.	Po Leung Kuk – Y C Cheng Centre	2	2	0	2	0
19.	Sik Sik Yuen – Ho Yam Care and Attention Home for the Elderly	2	1	0	2	0
20.	Sisters of the Good Shepherd – Marycove Centre	2	2	0	2	0
21.	Society of Boys' Centres – Chak Yan Centre	2	0	0	1	0
22.	Society of Boys' Centres – Cheung Hong Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
23.	Society of Boys' Centres – Shing Tak Centre	2	2	0	2	0
24.	Society of Boys' Centres – Un Chau Hostel	2	2	0	2	0

**Key :** S – Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

- 
- ✦ The total number of overall grading on facilities or services may not add up to the total number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services during a particular visit.
- # JP visits to the Hong Kong Society for the Blind – Jockey Club Tuen Mun Home for the Aged Blind have been temporarily suspended since July 2010 due to renovation at the Home. The Home was re-opened for JP visits in August 2016.
- ^ JP visits to the New Life Psychiatric Rehabilitation Association – Tuen Mun Long Stay Care Home have been temporarily suspended since May 2015 due to renovation at the Home. The Home is planned tentatively to be re-opened for JP visits in January 2017.

Serial no.	Name of institution	No. of JP visits	Overall grading on facilities✦		Overall grading on services✦	
			S	U	S	U
25.	The Mental Health Association of Hong Kong – Jockey Club Building	2	2	0	2	0
26.	The Salvation Army – Cheung Hong Community Day Rehabilitation and Residential Service	2	2	0	2	0
27.	Tuen Mun Children and Juvenile Home	12	12	0	12	0
28.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ho Yuk Ching Workshop cum Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
29.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Jockey Club Rehabilitation Complex	2	2	0	2	0
30.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wing Yin Hostel	2	2	0	2	0
31.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Care and Attention Home <sup>△</sup> / Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre cum Hostel <sup>△</sup>	2	0	0	1	0
			2	0	2	0
32.	Yan Chai Hospital – Chinachem Care and Attention Home	2	2	0	2	0
	<b>Total :</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>0</b>

Key : S - Satisfactory  
U – Unsatisfactory

---

✦ The total number of overall grading on facilities or services may not add up to the total number of JP visits to an institution since some JPs may not have provided an overall grading on facilities or services during a particular visit.

△ Separate reports were completed by JPs for the specific institution.

**C. Summary of follow-up actions taken in respect of suggestions/comments made by JPs**

JPs made 57 suggestions/comments in the following categories during their visits –

Category of suggestions/comments		Number of suggestions/comments in 2015	(%)
(i)	Service quality (e.g. improvement of meal service, regular review of service need, etc.)	24	(42%)
(ii)	Physical environment, facilities and equipment (e.g. need for refurbishment of the premises, replacement of old computers, etc.)	14	(25%)
(iii)	Manpower planning (e.g. provision of staff training, measures to reduce staff wastage, etc.)	7	(12%)
(iv)	Training programmes and recreational activities (e.g. provision of market-oriented vocational training, arrangement of more activities, etc.)	5	(9%)
(v)	Channels of complaints and handling of complaints	1	(2%)
(vi)	Others	6	(10%)
<b>Total :</b>		<b>57</b>	

Concerning JPs' comments on the quality and quantity of meal under category (i): service quality, the institution concerned had conducted a survey and met with the catering service provider. They would conduct surprise checks to ensure that quality meals are provided for residents. As regards JPs' enquiries about whether precautionary measures were in place to safeguard the residents from sexual abuse/harassment by staff, the institution responded that different measures had been imposed to protect all residents from the risk of abuse/harassment, including monitoring of public areas by CCTVs, provision of round-the-clock care and supervision by social workers, supportive services rendered by other professionals such as teachers, nurses and visiting medical officers, regular visits or interviews by non-institution professionals such as referring social workers and clinical psychologists, and regular visits by parents or guardians. In case of any report of suspected child abuse, the institution management would handle the case in accordance with the "Procedural Guide for Handling Child Abuse Cases" (Procedural Guide). The existing measures and Procedural Guide have been proven effective in protecting the residents from sexual abuse/harassment by staff. For JPs' suggestion on services provided to residents' parents/guardians, the institution concerned responded that weekly visit

and festive gathering were in place to promote the communication among residents, their parents/guardians and the institution.

Concerning JPs' comments under category (ii): physical environment, facilities and equipment, institutions concerned had carried out renovation and construction works including the setting up of new sports and recreational facilities. They would continue to closely monitor the work progress. In response to JPs' concern about residents' study facilities, the institution concerned would continue to ensure the flexible use of its facilities. As regards the wear and tear of furniture and equipment, the institutions concerned had taken steps to seek funding for the required replacement accordingly.

For manpower planning under category (iii), the institution had relayed JPs' concern about the student-school social worker ratio to the school section accordingly.

For category (iv): training programmes and recreational activities, in response to JPs' suggestion of enhancing collaboration with relevant organisations from the business sectors and inviting outside speakers to host experience sharing sessions, the institution had followed up with organisations from the trade and industrial fields.

In response to JPs' concern about the channel of collecting opinions from service users under category (v), the institution concerned had taken follow-up action to conduct yearly service satisfaction survey for residents and their family members. The institution had also informed residents of the complaint channels through notices and newsletters.

For category (vi): others, in response to a suggestion of exploring the possibility of arranging medical consultation from HA for residents, the institution had arranged specialists from HA to conduct in-house talks to cater for residents' special needs on top of keeping close monitoring on their medical appointments with respective case medical officers. In response to JPs' suggestion of compiling a centralised logbook on accidents of residents, the institution concerned had met with centre supervisors to follow up the issue. Logbooks were submitted to management on a monthly basis for consideration and necessary action.