



Report No.

44

May 2007

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

REPORT OF AN ANNOUNCED INSPECTION OF
GREENOUGH REGIONAL PRISON



**Report of an Announced Inspection of
Greenough Regional Prison**

Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services
Level 27, 197 St George's Terrace, Perth WA 6000

www.custodialinspector.wa.gov.au

May 2007

ISSN 1445-3134



This document uses environmentally friendly paper, comprising
50% recycled & 50% totally chlorine free plantation pulp.

Contents

THE INSPECTOR'S OVERVIEW:

GREENOUGH'S KEY ROLE IN REGIONAL CORRECTIONAL POLICY..	iii
--	-----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: THE MANY FUNCTIONS OF GREENOUGH REGIONAL PRISON	1
Findings from the first inspection in 2003	2
Inspection activities and methodology	2

CHAPTER 2

CUSTODY	5
Personal safety	5
Cell safety	7
Security	8

CHAPTER 3

CARE AND WELLBEING	14
Aboriginal issues	14
Reception and orientation	15
Accommodation	17
Food, diet and the canteen	18
Prisoner health services	20
Recreation	24
Complaints and grievances	25
Prisoner support services	27
Visits and other contacts	28
Foreign nationals	30

CHAPTER 4

REHABILITATION	31
Assessment and case management	31
Education	33
Offender treatment programs	36
Re-entry and release	40

CHAPTER 5

REPARATION	42
------------	----

CHAPTER 6

WOMEN PRISONERS.....	49
Custody.....	49
Care and wellbeing.....	50
Rehabilitation and reparation.....	50
Conclusion.....	52

CHAPTER 7

RESOURCES AND SYSTEMS	54
Staffing.....	54
Occupational safety and health	58
Resources	59

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	62
Greenough Regional Prison – adding value to corrective services	62
Conclusion.....	64
Recommendations	65

APPENDIX 1

The Department’s response to the 2006 recommendations.....	68
--	----

APPENDIX 2

Scorecard Assessment of the Progress against the 2003 recommendations	81
---	----

APPENDIX 3

The Inspection Team	85
---------------------------	----

APPENDIX 4

Key dates.....	86
----------------	----

Inspector's Overview

GREENOUGH'S KEY ROLE IN REGIONAL CORRECTIONAL POLICY

This Office has always had a clear vision about regional prisons and other correctional services. Prisoners, particularly Aboriginals, should be able to serve the bulk of their sentences “in country”, close to family and friends. That way the chances of some degree of rehabilitation and a structured re-entry to the community are enhanced. Apart from that it is a simple matter of equity that, even with the experience of imprisonment, some citizens should not be unduly disadvantaged in relation to others.

Of course, in such a huge state with a widely dispersed population apart from the Metropolitan area, there are economic constraints upon the full implementation of this policy. Full-service prisons covering all security needs and both sexes cannot be constructed or managed everywhere that they are needed. But associated services that hang off prisons – such as work camps – are more feasible. And if every corner of the State cannot be covered, at least full-service prisons can be located a little closer to the remote regions.

It is in this context that this Office has argued strongly for full-service prisons and associated correctional services to be established in both the West and the East Kimberley and the Eastern Goldfields. With the April 2007 announcement of a new prison at Derby, the first of these objectives has been agreed by Government. This has been fortified with the promise of a major new work camp/pre-release centre in the Halls Creek area.

However, these things will all take time and in any case leave vast areas of the North insufficiently serviced. Consequently, the endless caravan of custodial transports down south – to Hakea, Casuarina and Acacia or even further afield – will continue for the foreseeable future.

It is on that account that we have argued in this Report for Greenough to be developed so that it becomes, in effect, the Northern Assessment Centre. That would both take the pressure off Hakea and mean that northern prisoners would not have to take the full journey south before being assigned to a prison. That prison might be Greenough itself – for a related matter that we have recommended is that the Department must put a greater emphasis on the program delivery capacity of this medium security prison.

We have also recommended that a low/medium security wing for women prisoners be quickly and inexpensively built outside the main perimeter. Bandyup is bursting at the seams, with overcrowding that is starting to approach hazardous levels. Boronia is deemed not secure enough or too socially challenging for many of the Bandyup minimum-security population. So these prisoners remain at Bandyup, stretching its capacity. There needs to be a circuit-breaker, and Greenough could provide it. I say this bearing in mind its previous experience as an overflow prison for women when Bandyup was being internally rebuilt, a role it coped with even without purpose-built accommodation and amenities.

Why do we contemplate an enhanced role for what is, by our own definition, an “Aboriginal prison”? The answer is perfectly simple: it is performing its core tasks well, racism is minimal and staff morale is good. It is by far the most successful of the State’s “Aboriginal prisons”. Greenough would certainly cope with additional challenges, as long as these were properly planned and resourced.

GREENOUGH'S KEY ROLE IN REGIONAL CORRECTIONAL POLICY

The Department in its responses to our recommendations has rejected the proposal about women prisoners and is at best lukewarm about the notion of Greenough becoming the “hub” for northern male prisoners. However, the inexorable march of overcrowding is likely to mean that these matters will have to be re-visited.

Otherwise, this Report contains many detailed recommendations that have mostly been met with sensible responses. Greenough continues to perform satisfactorily, not without some stresses but certainly with some examples of best practice.

Richard Harding
Inspector of Custodial Services
4th May 2007.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION: THE MANY FUNCTIONS OF GREENOUGH REGIONAL PRISON

- 1.1 At the time of the inspection, Greenough Regional Prison consisted of a medium-security compound within a secure perimeter, including a maximum-security unit and a women's unit, plus an external minimum-security section. The prison was located 15 kilometres out of Geraldton town, on a plot of 57 hectares in a rural setting. Originally the prison was built with a capacity of 139 prisoners; however with additional works inside the perimeter and the establishment of the external minimum-security section in 1998, the prison's total bed capacity increased to 217 including special purpose beds.
- 1.2 Like other regional prisons in Western Australia, the prison fulfilled a variety of roles, and consequently held a varied prisoner population mix. While it was designated a medium-security prison, it held male and female prisoners across all security ratings. It served as the remand and reception prison for prisoners from the mid-west region of the state (a region covering nearly one-fifth of Western Australia's geographical size), and was the main transit station for prisoners moving between northern and southern prisons.¹
- 1.3 Greenough Regional Prison was previously identified as one of the state's 'Aboriginal prisons' by the Inspector, to highlight the inequitable conditions and regimes present in those prisons whose population was predominantly Aboriginal.² However, it must be stated that the prison's Aboriginal population was not homogenous – many were held 'out-of-country' hailing from the Kimberley, the Pilbara, the Lands to the east and from Perth and the southern regions. Even those prisoners from within the prison's notional catchment area were often held hundreds of kilometres away from home, given the sheer geographical size of the region.
- 1.4 The prison held remote, regional, urban and metropolitan prisoners on a regular basis. These diverse groups each had different cultural backgrounds and issues, and did not always mix well in the closed environment. Additionally, men and women were held within the main compound of the prison. As a smaller group with a requirement for segregation from male prisoners, female prisoners at Greenough were disadvantaged by limitations on access to services, work and skilling opportunities, and experienced more restricted movement and less time out of their unit compared to the general male population in the prison.
- 1.5 The distance away from home for many of Greenough's prisoners had reduced their ability to maintain meaningful contact with their families and communities, or to prepare for release. Limited access to regular visits, the cost of long-distance phone calls and difficulties arranging transport home upon release, accommodation in the community and other services to assist re-entry into the community were experienced.
- 1.6 While considered a regional prison in most respects, it was not as isolated as those prisons further north (Broome and Roebourne) or east (Eastern Goldfields) and was close enough to the Perth metropolitan area for Greenough's staff to be ineligible for regional allowances. While not experiencing the difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff that other more

1 Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services (OICS), *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 21 (February 2004).

2 See for example OICS, *Annual Report 2000 – 2001* and OICS, *Directed Review of the Management of Offenders in Custody*, Report No. 30 (November 2005).

remote prisons faced, the prison still experienced some isolation. In particular, the distance from the metropolitan area impacted on staff access to training and other opportunities.

- 1.7 Greenough was well-positioned to take on a role as more than an overnight transit stop on the journey transferring prisoners between the northern regions to the metropolitan or southern prisons. It was close enough to Perth to attract and retain staff, close enough to service providers for support services to access to the prison, and on a large enough plot of land for expansion and development to be a viable option. With appropriate forward planning, resourcing and capital works the prison could grow beyond its current stature to become a correctional hub, incorporating a variety of assessment and service tasks for northern regional prisoners, reducing the need to send so many to the metropolitan area further away from home.³ This theme will be further developed later in this report.

FINDINGS FROM THE FIRST INSPECTION IN 2003

- 1.8 The first inspection of Greenough Regional Prison was undertaken in May 2003, with an overall finding that the prison was performing well. Daily prison operations were working well, with a strong and stable senior officer group in place. There was good attention to prisoner safety, appropriate management of the diverse prisoner population mix, good security measures to ensure community protection, and overall good local community relations. Prisoner work opportunities were supported with good outputs from prison industries and an active Section 94 work program,⁴ plus efforts towards training and skilling of prisoners in these areas.
- 1.9 Points of improvement were outlined in the recommendations of the last report, which can be found in full in this Report's Appendix 2 within the 'Scorecard Assessment of the Progress Against the 2003 Recommendations'. Some recommendations were aimed at the local level, while some identified broader issues to be addressed by the Department with possible impacts on other areas of the state's prison service. Overall, progress in some areas in the prison had been good, some areas had progressed little and some problems were apparent during the current inspection. These will be further explored in the following chapters.

INSPECTION ACTIVITIES AND METHODOLOGY

- 1.10 As a second-round inspection, the scope of this inspection differed somewhat to the initial baseline inspection conducted in 2003. Then, the prison had been assessed as a generally well-performing prison during the planning stage of the inspection, so the Office contemplated

3 While accepting that prisoners are still held out-of-country at Greenough if originating from other regions (with the resultant issues mentioned in paragraph 1.5), it is preferable that regional prisoners be kept in a regional setting. In an environment smaller than the larger metropolitan prisons, such prisoners are kept away from the urbanised prisoner population they would not normally be faced with in their home regions. Also, some prisoners at Greenough, while hailing from further north, had some family connections with the local area, but did not have similar connections in the metropolitan area.

4 Section 94 of the *Prisons Act 1981*(WA) is the legal basis for prisoner work and other activities undertaken outside the prison.

running the current inspection from a 'light touch' methodology.⁵ However, given the complex nature of the prison's population, including male and female prisoners and a high percentage of Aboriginal prisoners from a variety of regions, the decision was made to run a full comprehensive inspection.

- 1.11 Key aspects of service delivery for review during the inspection process included:
- the current and future role of Greenough Regional Prison within the prison service;
 - the management of women prisoners at Greenough;
 - program delivery, particularly regarding the Aboriginal programs run locally;
 - family and community contact for prisoners; and
 - prisoners' preparation for release and re-entry into their communities.
- 1.12 The on-site inspection week commenced on 6 August 2006 and concluded on 11 August 2006. Inspection activities included pre-inspection surveys of staff and prisoners and pre-inspection focus groups undertaken about a month prior to the inspection week, community consultations prior to and during the inspection, direct observation of prison activities, and interviews with management, custodial and non-custodial staff as well as visiting service providers.
- 1.13 In addition to a daily presence in the prison during the inspection week, the inspection included a weekend visit to view social visits and recreation activities, plus a night shift visit. The inspection team received a head office departmental briefing prior to inspection, followed by an on-site management team briefing, including some self-assessment on progress against recommendations of last inspection and overall functioning of the prison. Other activities included gathering of documentation and evidence to support inspection findings, random sampling of prisoner records and focus groups of prisoners and staff conducted on-site during the inspection week.
- 1.14 The inspection team included external expert advisers from the Department of Health, Drug and Alcohol Office and the Department of Education and Training. The team also included a representative from the Victorian State Ombudsman's office, to examine the complaints and grievances processes available to prisoners.
- 1.15 The inspection was informed also by the history of Inspectorate liaison visits to the prison since the first inspection in 2003, independent visitor reports and other contacts in the period between inspections. In addition to examining progress against the recommendations of the previous report, the inspection team used the cornerstones of 'custody', 'care and wellbeing', 'rehabilitation', 'reparation' and 'resources and systems'⁶ as a starting point for inspection activities. This Report of the inspection has been structured using chapters based on these cornerstones. While the Inspectorate utilises the cornerstones as a framework for inspection

5 The light touch methodology was introduced by the Office in early 2006, and may be used at those prisons identified prior to inspection as performing strongly. Inspection involves a higher expectation of self-assessment from prison management to identify strengths and weaknesses in the prison and ways to further progress. See OICS, *Annual Report 2005 – 2006*, or the Inspector's Overview in OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Albany Regional Prison*, Report No. 38 (November 2006) for more information on light touch inspections.

6 These cornerstones derive from the *Standard Guidelines for Corrections in Australia* (Revised, 2004).

throughout the second round of inspections, each of the cornerstones is afforded equal weight in the inspection process. Therefore, the order of findings within this Report does not reflect order of importance; chapters should be read as having equal priority.

- 1.16 Issues affecting women prisoners have been reported separately in Chapter 6, although these are also referred to throughout the Report. Appendices include the Department's response to the recommendations from the current inspection, a scorecard of performance against the recommendations of the previous inspection, and key dates and team information for this inspection.

Chapter 2

CUSTODY

The ‘custody’ cornerstone broadly covers issues of safety, security and prisoner management within prisons. The inspection examined physical security, in terms of perimeter security systems and structures, procedural security in terms of policies and procedures implemented to maintain good order and safety in the prison, and dynamic security – staff patrols and intelligence gathering, for example.

As a whole, Greenough regional prison was found to be performing satisfactorily in regards to these broad areas. Positively, most staff and prisoners felt safe in the prison. However, some areas of previous good performance had slipped and there were some areas identified as requiring improvement.

PERSONAL SAFETY

- 2.1 Generally, prisoners and staff felt safe in the prison. Responses from the pre-inspection surveys regarding safety were positive, with 87 per cent of prisoners, 75 per cent of custodial staff and 83 per cent of non-custodial staff reporting that they felt safe in the prison most of the time. A majority of staff respondents reported that staff-prisoner interaction was either very good or good, and most prisoner respondents rated staff-prisoner relations as okay or better. These attitudes were confirmed in interviews and focus groups held during the inspection.
- 2.2 The incidence of assaults within a prison environment can be an indicator of the level of order and safety in that prison. While Greenough’s rate of assaults on prisoners was slightly higher than the average rate across the prison system as a whole, there were no ‘serious assaults’ recorded on prisoners or staff for the 2005–2006 year, nor was there a significant increase in assaults recorded at the prison from the previous year. Most assaults recorded at Greenough for the 2005–2006 year were categorised as ‘other assaults’, indicating relatively minor incidents.⁷
- 2.3 Unfortunately, the Department’s performance measures only take into account those reported cases of assaults that lead to a charge, with no central record of incidents involving racism, bullying, verbal abuse or threats. While some of these incidents may be recorded in daily situation reports or unit logs at the local level, there was no easy way to track them at a systemic level. The inspection team heard accounts from several prisoners describing incidents involving racist or inappropriate behaviour (by other prisoners and by staff); these prisoners stated they had not lodged official complaints regarding these events, due to the view either that nothing would happen or worse for fear of retaliation. Despite these anecdotes, the inspection found no evidence of systematic bullying or intimidation of prisoners at Greenough.
- 2.4 During the inspection, some prison staff described occasions where external staff and service providers were sent to the prison with little or no induction and no experience of working in prisons. This placed pressure on the prison’s staff to monitor the safety of these external service

7 Department of Corrective Services, *Prisons Monthly Performance Report – June 2006*. The document defines three categories of assault: ‘other assault’ – one which does not result in bodily harm or need for medical intervention; ‘assault’ – one resulting in minor physical injury; and ‘serious assault’, including those physical assaults resulting in serious injury and all acts of sexual assault.

CUSTODY

staff, and created potentially unsafe situations for service staff who were not aware how to act or dress appropriate to a correctional setting. The Department's plan to introduce a standard non-custodial staff induction package to all prisons should address this issue, but care must be taken to ensure that adequate interim arrangements for induction for all staff working in the prison are in place.

- 2.5 Upon examining processes for prisoner profiling during the inspection, the inspection team did not find a central register or system identifying high profile or 'dangerous' prisoners within the prison. Additionally, the process by which staff (particularly female and non-custodial staff) were made aware of newly arrived 'dangerous' prisoners was found to be inconsistent. While daily transfer lists were available, there was little way for staff to catch up on transfer information when returning off shift after a few days. There should be a more consistent effort to ensure staff awareness regarding potentially dangerous prisoners and any special conditions placed on dealing with them.
- 2.6 One area where staff (custodial) did not feel safe was regarding the night staffing arrangements for the external minimum-security section – Unit 6. The minimum-security night shift officer was stationed alone in the unit, whose prisoners were not locked into cells at night. This situation was seen as acceptable by management, given that the officer had a radio, a cordless phone, was visible on CCTV and could lock their office, and the practice was consistent with other minimum-security prison standards (a similar situation was identified during the most recent Bunbury inspection, for example).⁸ Despite these measures, staff did not feel safe in this situation, an issue raised particularly by female officers. The planned introduction of staff personal duress alarms incorporating triangulated location positioning should improve the situation, but this was not due at Greenough for some time, and in any case such duress devices provide the benefit of activating a rapid response to a duress alarm, rather than alleviate the staff feeling of being unsafe.
- 2.7 Another area staff (non-custodial) did not feel safe was the prison's medical centre. There was no custodial officer based in the medical centre at the time of inspection. Instead, the internal sally port officer, and any other officers in the vicinity, was expected to respond to any duress alarm signals from the medical centre. This was an unacceptable situation, as there was no guarantee that help would be immediately available in the event of an emergency or incident. These officers monitored for other alarms at various locations and were often engaged in other tasks, such as unlocking grilles to let prisoners or staff through the area, or processing newly-arrived prisoners in reception. Officers were stationed some distance from the medical centre entrance, and did not have a clear view into the centre from their post. There was no certainty they would even be aware an incident was underway if medical staff were unable to reach a duress alarm or call for help.
- 2.8 Given the focus on increased security in the wake of the serious assault on an education worker at Bunbury Regional Prison in 2005,⁹ the lack of a disciplinary officer in any civilian

8 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Bunbury Regional Prison*, Report No. 33 (June 2006).

9 See OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Bunbury Regional Prison*, Report No. 33 (June 2006).

CUSTODY

prison work location was surprising. A custodial officer should be posted within the centre as a matter of urgency.

Recommendation 1

That a disciplinary officer is stationed in the medical centre at Greenough Regional Prison during all times prisoners are present.

CELL SAFETY

- 2.9 Greenough had only two cells considered safe for prisoners with elevated at-risk issues, being the two observation cells in Unit 1.¹⁰ The Department was challenged on the lack of safer cells in the last inspection report which recommended the review and removal of ligature (hanging) points from all cells.¹¹ In response, the Department audited all cells throughout the state and costed a full retrofit to remove known ligature points.
- 2.10 The cost of a full retrofit was seen as prohibitively expensive, so the Department prioritised funding, some of which was directed to Greenough. This funding at Greenough was used to modify 18 cells in Unit 1. However, the project only removed a few specific points from these cells, rendering the process ineffective as no truly ligature-free cells were created.
- 2.11 In response to this problem identified after the initial retrofit, the Department allocated further funding from the 2006–2007 financial year to remove the remaining identified ligature points from the cells previously upgraded. While this was a positive response to resolve the problem, the inefficiency of the overall process is obvious and shows a lack of consideration for the operational realities for the prison.
- 2.12 The selection of cells only in Unit 1 for ligature-point removal was interesting from a prisoner management perspective. In some ways it was a logical choice, as the (maximum-security) unit held prisoners on regression, punishment and awaiting orientation who fit an elevated risk profile that justifies their accommodation in a safer cell. Nonetheless, they were not the only prisoners with such a need. The self-harm figures recorded by the Department for the 2005–2006 year indicated the majority of actual self-harm incidents (and the only suicide attempt) recorded for Greenough were by medium-security prisoners.¹²
- 2.13 Addressing cells only in Unit 1 had effectively meant prisoners with immediate risk issues could be held most safely in the most volatile, over-crowded, stressed and complex unit in the prison. Given the risk profile of Greenough's population, the lack of a wider range of accommodation for prisoners with self-harm risk (but not at the highest end of the scale) was unacceptable.

Recommendation 2:

That the Department address the need for safer cells within Greenough Regional Prison's standard accommodation units and, in particular, plan to retrofit multi-occupancy cells in Units 2 and 3.

10 An observation cell is one stripped back to minimise opportunities for prisoners to harm themselves. It is not suitable for long-term stay or the accommodation of prisoners not at immediate risk of suicide or self-harm.

11 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 21 (February 2004).

12 Department of Corrective Services, *Prisons Monthly Performance Report – June 2006*.

SECURITY

- 2.14 The Department undertook an internal security audit of the prison in the lead-up to the inspection, which identified some 15 items of under-performance in physical, procedural and dynamic security matters. While the full audit report had not been finalised by the Department at the time of the inspection, the inspection team were provided with a draft copy of the summary findings. Inspection of the various aspects of security in the prison concurred generally with the preliminary findings of the Department's audit, and it was pleasing to note that the prison had already identified priorities for remedial action in a draft action plan to address the audit's findings at the time of the inspection.
- 2.15 A range of safety and security risks were identified by the prison. Some were significant, such as laxity in equipment and security checks, and others were relatively simple matters such as officers not switching the cell call system to 'unattended mode' when leaving the unit, meaning control room staff would not be aware of prisoners seeking assistance. Many procedural failures could be easily rectified in the short term, through the provision of training and information to ensure staff adhered to required practices. Other issues would require longer term planning and resources to address.
- 2.16 The perimeter system for the main compound had been subject to a number of false alarms in the period leading up to the inspection, with poor camera images and ongoing problems with fence lighting noted as particular concerns within the Department's security audit. Ageing equipment made maintenance difficult and repairs of critical equipment were often delayed due to difficulties in securing local trades people. The Department's audit team had also noted there was no central maintenance register kept in the control room to systematically record faults requiring maintenance.
- 2.17 The Department's Assets branch had considered Greenough's in-ground electronic detection system to be particularly stable since an upgrade eight years previously, with few faults logged for maintenance over the years. However, in response to the recent increase in faults, the system was investigated and numerous cabling and connection points were identified as requiring replacement, which had since occurred. The Department should give consideration towards upgrading the secure perimeter and monitoring systems at Greenough Regional Prison.
- 2.18 The prison was aware of the value of information received from members of the community and had developed this confidential information source. However, there was little evidence of effective collating and sharing of intelligence, and limited evidence of effective dynamic security within the prison.
- 2.19 The fundamentals of good security practices were known and could be expressed by operational staff, although the Department's security audit found that the quality of overall performance needed to be improved. The inspection team found no effective formal reporting system operating to demonstrate performance within the prison.

CUSTODY

- 2.20 The inspection also concluded that the resources available to and in the prison were less than satisfactory. The effectiveness of the prisoner management and security strategies within the prison could be improved. There was the need to better define roles and resource the management portfolios for these areas appropriately. In particular, the security office needed a review and adequate resources to be made available to strengthen this function within the prison.
- 2.21 Greenough's security manager was largely occupied with routine and administrative functions in the prison, and as such could not devote sufficient attention to strategic planning for maintenance and improvement of safety and security in the prison. A similar situation was identified in a recent inspection of Bunbury Regional Prison, with the need identified to upgrade the security manager's position and increased resources for security work to improve the overall safety and security within that prison.¹³

Recommendation 3

That the position of Greenough Regional Prison's security manager be upgraded and the role expanded to incorporate a wider range of tasks and responsibilities related to security and safety. The management of routine security tasks could be devolved to other security staff, to give scope for a more strategic focus from the redefined security manager position.

Recommendation 4

That the Department implement an appropriate action plan to address identified issues to restore Greenough Regional Prison to a level appropriate for a contemporary medium-security prison. In particular, to consider:

- a. infrastructure needs, including the technologies and systems that support perimeter security;*
- b. staffing issues, training and procedural enhancements; and*
- c. sustainable management and monitoring procedures to minimise future under-performance.*

Incidents and emergency responses

- 2.22 The prison had a fairly low rate of reported incidents. Between the first inspection in May 2003 and August 2006 there were a total of eight Greenough prisoner escapes: two from Section 94 activities; five from the minimum-security section; and one from the hospital. There were no escapes from the secure compound of the prison, nor were there any deaths in custody during this period. There were no major incidents, escapes or unlawful absences recorded for the prison during the year leading up to the inspection.
- 2.23 In the area of critical incident and emergency response, Greenough had slipped from the good standard identified at the last inspection. Inadequacies were identified regarding the prison's ability to respond to complex scenarios, especially during the night shift period. While the prison was usually very quiet during the night and staffing levels were sufficient to undertake routine duties, they were not sufficient to handle an emergency situation or incident

13 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Bunbury Regional Prison*, Report No. 33 (June 2006).

CUSTODY

during the night shift. This was the case generally across the prison system, but was further exacerbated in regional prisons where external assistance could be a significant distance away.

- 2.24 When this was raised with the prison's management during the inspection, they accepted that there could be considerable delay in attendance by emergency services and that the prison's rostered rotation of staff with specialised training may not be effective in scenarios such as in-cell violence or external fence intrusion.
- 2.25 Some efforts were made by prison management to address inadequacies in emergency responses in the lead-up to the inspection, although the subsequent actions were rudimentary and general in nature. The Department's security audit identified a number of areas for improvement, proposing actions such as amending emergency procedure manuals and tailoring the staff call-out list to better cater for after-hours situations. Positively, in response to issues raised at the last inspection, the prison had developed local service agreements with the local emergency services regarding responses to events at the prison.
- 2.26 The prison was equipping all accommodation units with breathing apparatus (BA) equipment, for evacuations in fire events. However, only 18 custodial officers had received specialist training to use this equipment at the time of the inspection. Also, there was a small percentage of custodial staff whose First Aid training was out of date. Staff untrained in BA and First Aid aggregated on a night shift roster would be an operational risk.
- 2.27 Additionally, prisoners were not aware of their obligations in emergency situations. While a number of training exercises were conducted in the lead-up to the inspection, unit compliance was found to be poor, attributed to a lack of information available in-unit and training sessions not being completed or poorly attended.
- 2.28 One issue raised by staff was the evacuation plan for the recently refurbished medical centre. This called for retreat to the staff kitchen area in the medical centre to call a gatehouse officer to unlock the external fire door from the outside. It was not possible for staff to open the door from the inside and they felt the system was too vulnerable to failure in the case of fire.

Recommendation 5

That Greenough Regional Prison undertakes a comprehensive review and update of the emergency response procedures along the lines identified by the Department's security audit. In particular there is a need to:

- a. ensure sufficient staff are trained in Breathing Apparatus (BA) and First Aid to cover all shift combinations; and*
- b. ensure safe evacuation of all staff and prisoners in the case of fire or other emergency situation.*

Searches, contraband and drugs

- 2.29 Generally, few contraband items were discovered at Greenough, and those found tended to be simple rather than complex. This was positive, as finds of complex items could indicate inadequate prisoner supervision and searches, especially in workshops where tools and raw materials were available to aid in the manufacture of weapons. However, the Department's

CUSTODY

security audit found deficiencies regarding documentation and formal processes for accounting for tools in prisoner work locations. Tool checks had been previously identified as an issue by the Inspectorate as well as the Department at a number of prisons, including Albany Regional Prison and Bunbury Regional Prison.

- 2.30 Cell and unit search targets were being met within the prison, although security staff felt resources were inadequate to cover more than the minimum requirements, and consequently security measures tended to be reactive rather than proactive.
- 2.31 The Department's security audit identified some issues with searching. Some officers were not aware of the correct prisoner person search procedures, the search room was found to be cluttered and potentially unsafe, and some staff were untrained in search procedures for visitors.¹⁴ To address this, staff training was prioritised, a quick reference manual was produced for the gatehouse for visitor searches, and some minor improvements made to the search room. However, the search room was still found to be unsatisfactory during inspection, as it was gatehouse space converted for searches rather than designed for that purpose.
- 2.32 The visits area within the secure compound had inadequate surveillance camera coverage. Camera views were only available in the gatehouse control room, not to officers stationed in the visits area. The equipment was outdated and below par for contemporary secure prisons, and was not sufficient to adequately detect and deter contraband trafficking via visits.

Recommendation 6

That multiple cameras be installed in the visits areas at Greenough Regional Prison to better prevent contraband transfer into or out of the prison via visit sessions.

- 2.33 There were 164 internal prison charges laid at Greenough during the 2005–2006 year: 52 minor and 112 aggravated, involving 139 prisoners.¹⁵ The recorded hearing outcomes for this period included a vast majority of guilty pleas, but also one case was withdrawn and three found not guilty, which indicated some fairness in the process. A further nine were referred to a higher court for determination.¹⁶ The process for finalising charges was undertaken expeditiously, with the majority of penalties imposed involving prisoner loss of privileges for a set time.
- 2.34 The proportion of minor charges to aggravated charges suggested that the prison was appropriately prosecuting matters requiring managed discipline, with the likelihood that some minor misconduct was dealt with under unit management and informal processes rather than proceeding with a formal charge. By comparison with Bunbury Prison, a regional medium-security prison of similar size (although different population mix), Greenough had a much lower proportion of minor to aggravated charges.¹⁷

14 Positively, Greenough had a well-established and supported process of staff searches.

15 'Aggravated charges' refer to those under Section 70 of the *Prisons Act 1981* (WA), including drug related offences, assaults, weapons and escape; as compared to 'minor charges' under Section 69 of the Act, which relate to less serious misconduct and misbehaviour.

16 Figures taken from Department of Corrective Services, *Prisons Monthly Performance Report – June 2006*.

17 For the 2005 – 2006 year, Bunbury recorded 110 minor charges and 109 aggravated charges.

CUSTODY

- 2.35 The majority of prison charges at Greenough related to drugs, primarily cannabis. During the six months from July to December 2005, 80.5 per cent of Greenough's aggravated charges were drug-related and a further 12.2 per cent were for refusing to supply a body sample for analysis.¹⁸
- 2.36 Greenough had one of the highest rates of positive drug tests across the system from the regular urinalysis testing program (targeted and random tests). Almost 25 per cent of all random and targeted urine tests conducted at the prison were positive for 2005–2006 year.¹⁹ These rates indicated significant levels of drug use within the prison, with implications for the adequacy of security and search measures and how they were enforced. During the same period, only Bunbury Prison returned a higher rate of positive test findings of all prisons in the state.²⁰
- 2.37 Most significantly, the prison did not have an on-site drug detection dog and handler at the time of the inspection. The initial dog and handler employed in October 2005 had left and not been replaced. Instead, the prison received intermittent visits from the metropolitan canine section, while waiting for the prison-based position to be filled.²¹ The presence of a permanent dog team was required to better deter and detect trafficking of drugs into the prison via visits and to better detect drugs within the prison by way of increased unit, cell and person searches.
- 2.38 Staff training in alcohol and other drug issues had not improved much since the last inspection.²² A priority attempt was made to provide drug awareness training to custodial staff by the prison's training officer appointed in 2006, and by June 2006 some 47 custodial staff had attended training sessions. However, during the inspection the need for drug and alcohol training was raised again by custodial and non-custodial staff, indicating that the training delivered was not sufficiently effective or widespread.
- 2.39 In spite of the lack of training, 87 per cent of custodial staff self-assessed as being competent in dealing with drug offenders in the pre-inspection survey. This most likely reflected confidence in their knowledge of security procedures rather than an understanding of the use of drugs, their effects and the impacts on prisoner behaviour. In contrast, 58 per cent of non-custodial staff did not feel competent in dealing with drug offenders.²³ The broader issue of access to training opportunities for regional non-custodial staff is explored further in Chapter 7 of this Report.

18 Department of Corrective Services, *Drug Strategy Monitoring: July – December 2005*.

19 Department of Corrective Services, *Prisons Monthly Performance Report – June 2006*.

20 Positive rates varied from 2.73 per cent at Boronia Pre-release Centre to 32 per cent at Bunbury. Other prisons in the highest bracket were Broome and Casuarina, with the lowest results returned for Boronia, Roebourne and Woorloo prisons. This variation cannot be simply linked to security rating or type of population.

21 The position had been re-advertised, with no successful applicants identified at the time of the inspection.

22 This was previously identified as an area of need, forming Recommendation 10 of the previous report OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 21 (February 2004).

23 There was an amount of missing data in this section of the survey and results must be treated with caution.

CUSTODY

- 2.40 Key initiatives to address drug use within Greenough's business plan included the establishment of the dog drug detection unit, staff training and the maintenance of the targeted urinalysis program. At the time of the inspection, only the maintenance of the urinalysis program had been achieved, as the prison did not have a permanent dog team and there was found to be limited staff awareness of drug and alcohol issues and relevant policy. While the prison had introduced a local drug action plan in early 2006, the Department's security audit found this was not being complied with because unit staff were largely not aware of the strategy in the prison.

Chapter 3

CARE AND WELLBEING

This section covers a range of prison services and issues which relate to the ‘care and wellbeing’ cornerstone of prisoner management. Prisons have a duty of care towards the prisoners they hold, and must provide adequate living conditions, access to services and amenities and treat prisoners with decency. The level of decency in a prison is influenced by the culture prevailing in the prison and its supporting policies and practices.

Overall, Greenough Regional Prison was assessed as providing adequate services and conditions to meet the care and wellbeing needs of its population. However, issues were identified with the poor living conditions in Unit 1, some resource issues impacting on the delivery of health services, drug use in the prison and issues experienced by out-of-country prisoners who were unable to maintain connections with their family and community. Most areas inspected had scope for further and continuous improvement.

ABORIGINAL ISSUES

- 3.1 As mentioned previously, Greenough’s population included a significant majority of Aboriginal prisoners. This group of prisoners was diverse, with significant numbers out-of-country, that is, held away from their home regions. Only about 50 per cent of the Aboriginal population were from the prison’s local catchment area.
- 3.2 The prison showed sensible management of this diverse population, based on an understanding that Aboriginal groups from different regions (and indeed for some within the same region) may not live comfortably with each other. Efforts to manage this were noted during the inspection. The use of peer supporters from the same region as intake prisoners during reception, region-based work teams in the laundry, and an effort to maintain an appropriate population mix in groups for locally-run Aboriginal offender treatment programs were examples of good management in this area.
- 3.3 There was some attempt locally to retain medium-security northern prisoners at Greenough, rather than sending them further out-of-country to Perth prisons, as evidenced by high numbers of Kimberley Aboriginal prisoners held at Greenough (36 per cent of the Aboriginal population of the prison in January 2006 decreasing to 27 per cent in June 2006). However, there were still many northern medium-security prisoners held in southern prisons, with Greenough’s efforts having little impact on the overall situation across the state.
- 3.4 During the inspection, prison staff raised the need for better cross-cultural awareness in the prison, given that the prisoner population was largely Aboriginal and the staff population largely non-Aboriginal. The nature of Greenough as a transit prison with a diverse population meant a variety of cross-cultural training was required, as Aboriginal groups from different areas have differing cultures. The prison had done some work increasing cultural awareness on Indonesian and Muslim issues in the months prior to the inspection, but little otherwise.
- 3.5 The prison had commissioned a cross-cultural training package focussing on Aboriginal issues, yet to be implemented at the time of the inspection. The prisoner support officer (PSO) also intended to be involved in providing cultural awareness sessions for staff. An integrated and ongoing program of cultural awareness was required in the prison, for all custodial, non-

custodial and management staff.

- 3.6 While the overall good management of Aboriginal prisoners was noted, some issues needing attention arose during the inspection. Those prisoners held out-of-country often experienced difficulties in maintaining family and community contacts while in prison. Planning for return home and reintegration upon release was further complicated for these prisoners. There was a lack of culturally-appropriate hierarchical accommodation. There was no Aboriginal Health Worker on-site, or indeed in any Western Australian prison with the exception of Acacia Prison (the state's only privately-run prison). Another persisting issue was heard during the inspection at Greenough (as at other prisons previously)²⁴ regarding approval to attend funerals, with limitations on the number of prisoners allowed to attend and resource limitations for transportation to remote funerals impacting on some prisoners' ability to attend significant funerals in their home communities.²⁵
- 3.7 These issues and other cultural pressures created stress for Aboriginal prisoners held outside their home regions. Despite this, there was no valid specialist assessment of the stress and risk profile of out-of-country Aboriginal prisoners available to the Department, and no cohesive attempt at the departmental level to address the issues faced by these prisoners. Given the size of the out-of-country population in prisons, development of such an instrument should be a priority, to better identify and manage the at-risk issues of this group of prisoners. Strategies should be implemented to address identified issues to better serve the Department's duty of care to manage all prisoners held out-of-country. This Office's Report 30 addressed Aboriginal issues in depth;²⁶ the Department should consider the recommendations of that report and the relevance to management of prisoners at Greenough, in particular with regards to assessment and security classification, access to home regions and assistance to maintain connections with family, community and culture for out-of-country prisoners.

Recommendation 7

That Greenough Regional Prison develop, pilot and implement a policy regarding the entitlement to a comprehensive range of compensatory measures to offset the dislocation of out-of-country Aboriginal prisoners. The Department should monitor this initiative with a view to application at other relevant prisons.

RECEPTION AND ORIENTATION

- 3.8 Reception procedures were observed during the inspection. There appeared to be a good flow to the reception process and prisoners were moved through at a considerate pace. All necessary information was collected and officers dealt with prisoners in a courteous and often friendly

24 Such as OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Broome Regional Prison*, Report No. 27 (March 2005).

25 In response to a draft of this report on 31 January 2007, the Department stated that it 'does consider Indigenous family connections and other cultural issues relating to funerals and mourning. This is included in PD [Policy Directive] 9 and is one of the considerations' in the assessments for prisoner attendance at funerals.

26 OICS, *Directed Review of the Management of Offenders in Custody*, Report No. 30 (November 2005). In particular, sections of Chapter 2 of Report 30 related to assessment and management of Aboriginal prisoners generally, and Chapter 3 and 4 discuss the management of Aboriginal prisoners in the example contexts of the Kimberley and Eastern Goldfields regions respectively.

manner. Two staff each time were observed to be involved in each strip-search, with genders matched to prisoners. Greenough was fortunate to have a large number of female staff to ensure that the gender issue was unlikely to interfere with this process.

- 3.9 Positively, peer support prisoners were involved in the reception process, a new initiative. The prison tried to ensure that a female peer supporter was present whenever female prisoners were received and that male peer supporters were selected to reflect the regional nature of intake prisoners. Involvement by peer support was also planned to extend to the orientation process, though this was not yet in place at the time of the inspection.
- 3.10 A nurse attended during the reception process for a quick triage on incoming prisoners to prioritise medical assessment appointments. Following reception processes, prisoners waited in the sally port to be seen by medical staff for full medical assessments.²⁷ Prisoners returning to Greenough after short periods could be sent directly to their unit if the prison was able to keep their previous cell clear.²⁸ In these instances, the medical staff requested that the prisoner attend the medical centre at a later time. Similarly, female prisoners proceeded directly to their unit and attended the medical centre for assessment after the male intake was processed.
- 3.11 A lack of privacy was noted in the reception area at Greenough, as at other prisons in the state. Prisoners were interviewed within the hearing of other prisoners in the reception holding cell. Given there was some physical distance between the reception desk and the holding cell, prisoners could talk quietly and not be overheard, but this solution did not inspire confidence in prisoners. Admission interviews may involve discussion of personal and at-risk details, and should best be conducted in a confidential setting.

Recommendation 8

That provision be made at Greenough Regional Prison for an interview room or area available for admission interviews out of earshot of other prisoners. Generic design standards to address the need for confidentiality during reception processes should be considered for all prisons.

- 3.12 During the last inspection, poor orientation processes were noted and in its pre-inspection audit, the prison itself recognised serious deficits in the orientation of prisoners. The pre-inspection prisoner survey indicated that only a small proportion of respondents thought they had received information from a formal orientation process, with the majority responding that they mainly received orientation information from family and friends in the prison.
- 3.13 Prior to this inspection the prison had made some improvements to the orientation program. Information packs for prisoners had been developed, an orientation video screened repeatedly in Unit 1 and 5 for new prisoners and the in-unit orientation process updated. The improvements to prisoner orientation were mostly new and as such a full assessment of their utility could not be made during the inspection. This will be examined further during future Inspectorate visits to the prison.

27 Having groups of prisoners waiting in the sally port area for assessment posed a security risk that the prison was aware of, but was yet to address at the time of the inspection.

28 This was a good local practice able to be implemented when the population was relatively low. Prisoners may leave the prison for short periods for temporary transfers for visits, court or to attend programs at other prisons.

ACCOMMODATION

- 3.14 For male prisoners, Greenough ran a hierarchical accommodation model as an incentive for prisoners to behave well in order to progress to improved accommodation and access to privileges.²⁹ New male prisoners requiring orientation entered at Unit 1, a multi-functional unit which also accommodated maximum-security prisoners, those undergoing punishment or who had completed punishment and were awaiting placement in mainstream accommodation, prisoners with behavioural problems regressed from other units and prisoners in transit to other prisons.
- 3.15 This multitude of functions created an environment within the unit of high stress, maximised the potential for staff errors in managing multiple regimes and could place prisoners at risk. The management of orientation prisoners required a different approach from staff as compared to managing prisoners on punishment or regression regimes. These two functions would be better separated.
- 3.16 When the unit was overcrowded, some prisoners had to sleep on mattresses on cell floors. This was often the case when transit prisoners arrived in the prison for overnight stays on inter-prison transports twice a week. Additionally, the unit was in a dilapidated state, difficult to keep looking neat or clean, which further exacerbated the stressful environment.

Recommendation 9

That the Department address conditions and regimes in Unit 1 at Greenough Regional Prison, to simplify the functions of unit staff and improve general living conditions and amenity of the unit.

- 3.17 Male prisoners were generally transferred to Unit 2 once oriented to the prison. Unit 2 was considered standard accommodation with better conditions than Unit 1 but was still in a run down state. Prisoners were not expected to be employed, although in reality most were under the structured day regime of the prison. There were a variety of single, double and four-bed cells in the unit, with prisoners able to influence their cell placement allowing family or community members to reside together. From Unit 2 prisoners were expected to progress to Unit 3, similar to Unit 2, except that prisoners had to be employed and the unit environment tended to be quieter.
- 3.18 From Unit 3, well-behaved prisoners could be transferred to Unit 4 which was deemed to be enhanced accommodation. Unit 4 was the newest part of the main prison, built in 1996. Most cells were single occupancy with one double on either side of the unit; one side of Unit 4 was deemed self-care and this was considered the top of the accommodation hierarchy within the secure perimeter.
- 3.19 Minimum-security male prisoners were housed in Unit 6, a separate compound outside the main prison fence. Unit 6 had donga-style,³⁰ single-cell accommodation where prisoners experienced a high degree of individual freedom and trust in the unit, which included not

²⁹ This section addresses male accommodation in the prison – female accommodation is outlined in Chapter 6.

³⁰ Transportable buildings similar to those used at mining camps.

being locked into their cells at night. Despite being considerably run down, Unit 6 was considered to provide prisoners with an enhanced living environment. All Unit 6 prisoners were engaged in work activities, with many participating in Section 94 work projects in the community.

- 3.20 Aside from Unit 4, the accommodation in most of the prison showed considerable wear. Despite this, prisoners tended to be satisfied with the general unit facilities available to them and the quality of their accommodation.
- 3.21 Greenough's cell and unit designs reflected the standard designs of the eras in which they were built. As such, prisoner accommodation reflected a metropolitan, Eurocentric design construct, with the possible exception of the multi-occupancy cells in Units 2 and 3. This design construct has implications for the hierarchical system given the particular Aboriginal cultural issues at Greenough.
- 3.22 Aboriginal prisoners were able to access self-care, the deemed top of hierarchical accommodation at Greenough. At the time of the inspection, 13 of the 19 prisoners in self-care were Aboriginal, a good proportion though not quite representative of the prison's population mix. However, some Aboriginal prisoners chose instead to remain in standard accommodation, with a disproportionate number of Kimberley and Pilbara Aboriginal prisoners, in particular, occupying cells in Units 2 and 3.
- 3.23 Aboriginal prisoners held out-of-country may feel at risk of violence from other groups and may choose to remain in units with family or community members. They may prefer the companionship and safety that residing in multi-occupancy cells with family can provide, rather than aim to progress to single-occupancy cells regardless of the improved accommodation conditions and regimes on offer. Non-Aboriginal prisoners without such a dissonance may tend, therefore, to move up the hierarchy faster than Aboriginal prisoners. This appeared to be the case for some prisoners at Greenough.
- 3.24 The Department should acknowledge that some Aboriginal prisoners value different aspects that will impact on their motivation to progress up the hierarchical model. An examination of the cultural appropriateness of the hierarchical accommodation structure was required, with a view to provide an enhanced living environment and regimes not predicated on single-cell design principles.

Recommendation 10

That the Department review the hierarchical accommodation model and capacity of existing cells and units to match the needs of the population at Greenough Regional Prison, with consideration of the diversity of Aboriginal groups in the prison and which aspects of improved accommodation and regimes are valued by these prisoners.

FOOD, DIET AND THE CANTEEN

- 3.25 The food served to prisoners at Greenough was of good quality and adequate quantity. This view was reflected by almost 70 per cent of prisoner respondents to the pre-inspection survey, a marked improvement from three years previously when most prisoners felt negatively about

the food served. This was remarkable, as Greenough, unlike any other regional prison, utilised the cook-chill method of food production as opposed to cook-fresh.³¹

- 3.26 There was significant innovation in the way food was produced and presented at Greenough, as the kitchen had adapted the normal cook-chill process to produce single servings rather than the mass-serve process seen in Hakea and Casuarina prisons, for example. The main parts of meals were pre-prepared, with fresh produce (either fresh salad or freshly cooked vegetables) added once the meals were reheated, all individually prepared in keep-warm containers that doubled as plates. Servings were thus presented in a portion-controlled and palatable manner with overall prisoner acceptance rates higher even than observed at Bunbury Prison, which used the cook-fresh method.³²
- 3.27 Greenough's kitchen was clean and well-run. It was a trial site for the 'three stars' food safe program and appeared to be implementing this with a high degree of competency and success. There were effective monitoring systems in place to ensure safe food handling practices, including the retention of chilled food samples for seven days for testing in case concerns arose.
- 3.28 There were no special diets in place at the time of the inspection, a surprising notion given the increased risk of diabetes and other health issues within Greenough's predominantly Aboriginal prisoner population. The prison felt there was no need for a specific diabetic diet in the prison because of the focus on low-fat, low-salt and sugar-replacement options already utilised by the kitchen for the general prison population. Arrangements were in place should a special diet be required, by way of a request through the medical centre; on occasions several prisoners had been on special diets although this was not a regular occurrence. No complaints regarding special dietary requirements were heard during the inspection from prisoners or medical staff.
- 3.29 The prison had eliminated fried foods from the menu, only one meal a week contained pastry, fish was served twice a week and the overall red meat serving had been reduced. Barbeques were available in the units on a rotational basis, a practice coordinated between unit managers, the grounds officer and the kitchen.
- 3.30 Overall, the efforts by the prison to improve the diet and serving methods produced an excellent result, much improved on the last inspection. Prisoners though still expressed two issues regarding food to the inspection team. Aboriginal prisoners wanted more frequent traditional foods, reflecting the diversity of their backgrounds. While traditional meat (typically kangaroo) was offered at least once a week, prisoners reported that traditional cooking and serving methods were not used, resulting in such dishes as 'kangaroo curry'. It was likely that the cooks had little experience cooking traditional ingredients in traditional ways, and would benefit from training in the preparation of traditional foods and the development of menu options to fit the necessary dietary guidelines and cost limitations.

31 'Cook-chill' (regothermic) methods involve pre-preparing meals and rapidly chilling them for storage, to be reheated for serving. This method retains the nutritional value of the food, but has been reported to be unpalatable by prisoners at other sites.

32 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Bunbury Regional Prison*, Report No. 33 (June 2006).

- 3.31 The second issue was that many prisoners simply did not like eating healthily. Their preference was for diets high in meat, fat and pastry. More, therefore, needed to be done in the area of health promotion and diet education for these prisoners and in their communities. Coordination on health promotion activities was required between the kitchen, education and health centre within the prison.

Recommendation 11: That the Department develop a range of menu options for traditional foods for delivery in the prison system that recognises the diversity within the Aboriginal prisoner population and that meets the requisite health and dietary limitations.

- 3.32 Prisoners could also purchase food and snack items (plus a range of toiletries and other sundry items) from the prison canteen. While the canteen was observed to be well-run, there was a somewhat limited range of stock available, and only a small selection of healthy or diet snacks were available. Female prisoners felt that there were more options available to the males than females. Town spends for specialty items were accessible and occurring for male and female prisoners.
- 3.33 Positively, during canteen spend times there was a focus on anti-bullying with many officers in attendance. The canteen officer also monitored spending patterns as part of the policy to control bullying, standover and gambling in the prison.

PRISONER HEALTH SERVICES

- 3.34 Overall, the health service provided to Greenough's prisoners was of a good standard, although there was scope for improvement with the provision of further resources and support.
- 3.35 The Geraldton Regional Aboriginal Medical Service (GRAMS) provided two doctor sessions a week to the prison although given the shortage of rural doctors, service to the prison could be disrupted. A local visiting psychiatrist attended regularly. The medical centre was staffed by nurses seven days a week during unlock hours, a sufficient presence to meet the daily needs of the general prisoner population.
- 3.36 As mentioned previously, the prison did not have an Aboriginal Health Worker on-site. The presence of an Aboriginal Health Worker would improve health service delivery and health promotion in culturally-appropriate ways to the prison's predominantly Aboriginal population, particularly for regional and remote prisoners who may be hesitant to discuss health issues with non-Aboriginal health professionals in the first instance. This service could be contracted in from a local health provider, such as GRAMS.

Recommendation 12

That the Department fund and support the introduction of an Aboriginal Health Worker service to Greenough Regional Prison. Aboriginal Health Worker positions should also be funded for other custodial facilities in the state, with Broome, Roebourne and Eastern Goldfields prisons as the priority.

- 3.37 As at some other regional prisons, the clinical nurse manager felt professionally isolated and not adequately supported by the Department's health services directorate. Persisting issues of insufficient resources for training and insufficient communication and support from head office had been raised by other medical staff across the system, so were not isolated to Greenough Prison.³³
- 3.38 While health staffing levels were generally adequate, resources could be overloaded. Greenough's nurses attempted to see all transit prisoners to ensure they were fit to travel with all their required documentation and medication for their onward journey. Some weeks there were up to 40 prisoners in transit through Greenough. This was a positive initiative, particularly given that some prisoners with medication needs had previously been sent without medication or with the wrong medication.
- 3.39 The nurses also completed suicide risk assessments for all transit prisoners with self-harm or mental health alerts, a good local practice (and one explicitly not required by departmental policy for prisoners in transit) that recognised the possible trauma to prisoners from long road journeys, especially those with risk histories. There had been some occasions where the nurse manager refused to let prisoners be transferred further, based on the local assessment of their mental state and suitability for travel at that time. This indicated a positive approach towards prisoner welfare and should be supported.
- 3.40 However, the timing of movement of prisoners through the prison caused problems for health staff. The transport often did not arrive until mid- or late afternoon which impacted on staff availability. Nurses stated they often received the prisoner transfer list with insufficient time to complete full assessments and prepare prisoners for onward journeys. This issue seemed to be partly due to a lack of communication between nurses and the operational staff who managed the transfers, and partly due to a lack of training for medical staff to access transfer information on the TOMS database. Either way, transit prisoners not seen upon arrival departed before they could be seen the next day.
- 3.41 There was no night nursing presence at Greenough. The lack of a local on-call medical practitioner for the prison was noted at the last inspection, and was the subject of a recommendation in that report.³⁴ While GRAMS provided some after-hours advice, they did not provide an after-hours on-call service. If any prisoners made a health complaint during the night shift, Greenough's staff telephoned the on-call doctor in Perth. That doctor, based on a telephone conversation with the officer and no access to the prisoner's medical history, would decide whether the prisoner should be transferred to hospital or be left until the arrival of nursing staff on day shift for treatment.
- 3.42 Night shift officers called the on-call doctor on four occasions over the four months prior to the inspection and on each occasion were directed to take the prisoner to hospital. This placed a burden on night staff, potentially delayed the prisoner's access to services and rendered the

33 For more information, see OICS, *Thematic Review of Offender Health Services*, Report No. 35 (June 2006).

34 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 21 (February 2004).

prison understaffed until such a time as relief staff arrived to backfill those on the medical escort.

- 3.43 The medical centre had been recently refurbished, improving working conditions, adding capacity for ancillary health services and space for a dental clinic. This should alleviate pressures for medical transports in the future as more services will be able to be performed on-site. However, sourcing a regular visiting dentist may be difficult, given the shortage of dentists for regional areas in general. At the time of the inspection, there were still cases where the contracted provider for prisoner transportation (AIMS) was unable to meet demand for medical transports. This situation was becoming more common in regional areas where AIMS staff filled both court and transport roles, with court services taking priority. The prison had been able to facilitate some of the excess transports; however, some specialist appointments had still been cancelled or delayed due to transport issues.
- 3.44 The positioning of the medical centre adjacent to the sally port was not ideal. The practice at the time of the inspection to have a number of prisoners waiting in the sally port area for medical appointments posed a potential security risk, especially given the lack of a designated disciplinary officer as mentioned previously. Also, when there was a vehicle in the sally port the area became a minimal or no-movement zone, disrupting access to and from the medical centre for prisoners and health staff. Any movements in this time required officers to escort staff or prisoners through the area and officers were not always available for this purpose.
- 3.45 Prisoners in Unit 6 (minimum-security) and most in Unit 4 were allowed keep-on-person medication, with the exception of psychotropic or trafficable medication. For all other prisoners with medication needs, a nurse accompanied the medication trolley on rounds through the units once each morning and evening. While this suited most medications, it could cause problems for those diabetic patients who required lunchtime dispensing. Nursing staff felt either a lunchtime medication round or officers available to bring those prisoners to the medical centre at lunch would be beneficial.³⁵ Also, nightly medications were dispensed on the evening round at 6.00 pm, unsuitable for medications causing drowsiness or sleep that would be better taken later in the evening.

Recommendation 13

That the medication dispensing policy at Greenough Regional Prison be reviewed to provide flexibility to support lunchtime dispensing and later dispensing of night medication for prisoners with an assessed requirement for this.

Health promotion

- 3.46 The prison had run anti-smoking campaigns, health promotions in line with official Department of Health campaigns such as heart week and diabetic week, and a wellness program for women prisoners. Aside from the anti-smoking campaigns, these promotions all commenced recently prior to the inspection; attention to health promotion was a relatively

35 There were three or four prisoners on average who would benefit from lunch dispensing in the prison.

new initiative in the prison. Nurses at the prison held portfolio interests, such as immunisation, women's health, anti-smoking, asthma and diabetes, to develop specialist knowledge in these areas and to provide better delivery of prisoner health awareness and health promotion programs.

- 3.47 However, no nurse had responsibility for the alcohol and other drugs portfolio, nor for mental health, and little health promotion or awareness was provided in those areas. Given the nature of the prison's population, these portfolios should be taken up locally and resources made available to do so.
- 3.48 The 'keep safe' (blood-borne communicable diseases) awareness program had not been delivered in the prison since August 2005. The Department's pre-inspection audit identified this as an issue, with the majority of prisoners in the prison having never completed this program. Urgent efforts were made to identify a local service provider and training had recommenced in July 2006.
- 3.49 Greenough had previously offered treatment for prisoners with Hepatitis C, due to the interest of one of the visiting doctors and the availability of a trained physician in Geraldton. However, the two nurses trained in Hepatitis C management had left the prison, and a nurse who had expressed interest in taking on this portfolio was unable to access the relevant training due to a lack of resources. As the doctor was keen to continue to treat eligible prisoners, and treatment can be difficult to access either within the prison system or the wider community, the provision of treatment at Greenough should be supported and resources made available for a nurse to receive the appropriate training.³⁶

Recommendation 14

That the Department provide resources for Greenough Regional Prison's nursing staff to fill the portfolio needs in the area of Hepatitis C care and treatment, alcohol and other drug issues and mental health.

Drug and alcohol issues³⁷

- 3.50 Only a very small percentage of Greenough's prisoners had drug-related charges as their most serious offence (approximately 3 to 4 per cent). This low rate however, did not reflect the actual high levels of alcohol and drug use (cannabis and amphetamines) among this population in the community and the probable impact it may have on their offending behaviour.
- 3.51 Greenough Prison introduced a local drug action plan in March 2006, based on a template developed by the Department.³⁸ Unfortunately, this focused almost entirely on supply reduction; strategies to address demand reduction and harm reduction attracted only nominal mention. In reality it constituted little more than a security plan. The balance of the reduction of supply, demand and harm which formed the basis of the departmental plan was lacking

36 The treatment for Hepatitis C includes the use of interferon, which has implications for nursing staff in the need for ongoing monitoring including blood tests and counselling support. Interferon side effects can include depression so support from allied health professionals may also be required.

37 Security matters relating to drug use in the prison have been addressed in Chapter 2.

38 Department of Justice, *Justice Drug Plan* (May 2003).

from the local plan and was reflected in the lack of coordinated activity related to drug issues in the prison. Without a sound action plan it was not surprising that the prison presented a disjointed approach to drug issues and could be said to be coping more out of luck than good management.

Recommendation 15

That Greenough Regional Prison review and update the local drug action plan to achieve a comprehensive delivery approach with a balance between reduction of supply, reduction of demand and reduction of harm as outlined in the Department's Justice Drug Plan (2003).

- 3.52 The prison did not have a PAST nurse or any nurse holding this portfolio.³⁹ Consequently, the management of methadone patients, in particular, was not supported by a sound understanding of the pharmacotherapy or infrastructure within the Department that supported the program. While the arrangement for access to PAST services on an as-needs basis was sufficient at the time of the inspection, the prison would be unable to manage larger numbers of prisoners on pharmacotherapies.
- 3.53 The medical centre had a store of generic drug and alcohol withdrawal packs, easy to use and effective in reducing the severity of withdrawal symptoms. This was beneficial to treat some newly-arrived and remand prisoners. Recently, prior to the inspection the prison health services directorate introduced set regimes for withdrawal medications and methadone prescribing, which were reported to be working well in the prison.

RECREATION

- 3.54 Greenough's recreation program featured some well-supported active sports competitions, in particular a football competition where prisoner teams participated in midweek training and weekend games, umpired by a referee from the local community. Prisoners not playing football could participate as spectators, including women prisoners who had a designated shade area at one end of the oval. Other organised sports ran regularly, including cricket matches and a basketball competition.
- 3.55 The prison's recreation hall contained gym equipment and a basketball half-court, and could be configured for badminton. In addition to sport and fitness, the hall also provided passive recreation options such as a pool table, darts and the prison library attached to the hall. While the range of activities provided in the recreation hall was relatively good, prisoner access for some was limited, due to prioritised access according to unit and competition with organised sports.
- 3.56 Prisoners in the external minimum-security Unit 6 and the women in Unit 5 had their own gym equipment, and prisoners in Unit 1 had access to limited isometric equipment. However, there was relatively limited access to gym equipment for the bulk of the population, as

³⁹ PAST is an acronym for Prisoner Addiction Services Team. PAST nurses are specially trained to support the pharmacotherapy programs in prisons, which include methadone, buprenorphine (very limited) and naltrexone.

CARE AND WELLBEING

prisoners from Units 2, 3 and 4 all utilised the equipment housed in the recreation hall during recreation time.

- 3.57 There was an outdoor basketball court and a beach volleyball court in the prison. Volleyball was the main sport available for women prisoners, with over half of those in the women's unit seen participating during the inspection. However, the location of the court in full view of male prisoners in Unit 4 was not ideal. Women were also afforded some access to the oval and the recreation hall each week, an improvement on access at the last inspection but still less than that available to their male counterparts.
- 3.58 Minimum-security prisoners with Section 94 clearance could access the library in Geraldton, an outing used regularly as an incentive for prisoners in Unit 6, and less frequently for minimum-security women prisoners. Positively, prisoners housed in the external minimum-security prison could enter the main compound to participate in some organised sport sessions. This option did not happen at other prisons with external minimum-security sections.⁴⁰
- 3.59 Aside from those activities available in the recreation hall, access to the oval (for walking) and in-unit activities such as watching TV and DVDs there was little provision for passive or less active recreation for most prisoners. Organised recreation was centred around competitive team sports, although there were occasional other activities including concerts from local community groups or other special events. Overall, the recreation program could be further developed and expanded at the local level, with attention to providing equitable access to all prisoners, regardless of fitness level and unit placement.

COMPLAINTS AND GRIEVANCES

- 3.60 There were several mechanisms whereby prisoners at Greenough could raise issues for resolution. They could do so at unit level, directly to unit staff or more formally at scheduled unit meetings; via the Department's formal prisoner grievance process; or via the confidential mail system to lodge complaints with external agencies such as the Ombudsman's office. Greenough had a fairly low rate of official prisoner complaint and grievance lodgement, likely linked to an active informal complaint resolution process at work in the prison, plus a lack of understanding and avoidance of official complaints systems by some prisoners.
- 3.61 The inspection found that some prisoners were not adequately aware of processes available or confident using the official systems to lodge complaints. While brochures and forms for the prisoner grievance process were available in the prison, they were not easily accessible to prisoners without approaching staff. Also, many prisoners did not clearly understand the purpose of the confidential mail system or the functions of agencies accessible through it.
- 3.62 Despite the relative complexity of the complaints systems available, the information given during prisoner orientation did not go into sufficient detail regarding how complaints and

40 For example, Bunbury Regional Prison. See OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Bunbury Regional Prison*, Report No. 33 (June 2006).

grievances could be addressed, mirroring the situation at many other prisons in the state. Instead, it fell to staff to provide correct information and assistance to any prisoners who did raise issues, with no guarantee this would be done well as staff may not have received adequate training in complaint handling.⁴¹

- 3.63 Typically, Aboriginal prisoners were less likely than other prisoners to access the formal grievance system or external complaints agencies.⁴² Also, the term ‘grievance’, may be confused with grief or grieving for some prisoners, particularly those with low literacy levels or English as a second language.
- 3.64 The reliance on written forms to lodge complaints could disadvantage prisoners with low English literacy, a significant number of Greenough’s prisoners. Information must be conveyed in other ways to ensure all prisoners understand the avenues available for raising issues and complaints (and their right to do so), and that support is accessible for illiterate prisoners wishing to lodge complaints.
- 3.65 What was identified to be working at Greenough was an informal resolution process, where prisoners raised concerns directly with unit staff, either for themselves or on behalf of others. This resulted in quick resolution of simple matters best handled under unit management, or else referral to senior staff or management for resolution. The generally good relationship between prisoners and staff made this an effective problem-solving process. However, this approach relied on prisoners being able to trust officers to handle their complaints fairly and appropriately, and that officers had adequate time and knowledge in how to do so. Issues raised in this manner were unlikely to be recorded formally, except possibly in unit logs and daily communication books. Minutes of unit meetings (scheduled fortnightly) did provide some documented evidence of issues raised, although did not often include outcomes after issues were raised; additionally at times meetings were cancelled due to poor prisoner attendance.
- 3.66 The official prisoner complaints lodged at Greenough were typical of those raised state-wide, and related to lost property, food issues, sentence management, loss of privileges, medication issues and problems with staff. However, prisoners also raised other issues with peer supporters, the prisoner support officer and other non-custodial staff, and to inspection officers during the inspection. These related to difficulties keeping in touch with families (such as problems accessing visits and video visits, or the cost of long-distance phone calls), or regarding fights or assaults arising from family feuds. While these issues did not fit into the official complaint systems, and could be better resolved through other processes, there was little way to track such issues as there was no record when raised outside formal processes.
- 3.67 The general lack of a mechanism to record and track issues raised informally made it difficult to find information later on issues raised if required, or to feed back outcomes to staff and prisoners. This lack of feedback may contribute to the low prisoner turnout for unit meetings and low usage of official complaints systems.

41 Ombudsman Western Australia, *Own Motion Investigation into the Department of Corrective Services’ Prisoner Grievance Process* (May 2006).

42 Ibid.

- 3.68 The Ombudsman’s office took the role of ‘office of last resort’ to investigate situations not adequately resolved within the prison system, and tended to refer matters back to the prison if they had not already been through the Department’s grievance process. Only one of the nine written complaints received by the Ombudsman during the 2005–2006 year was investigated, with two falling outside the Ombudsman’s jurisdiction and the majority referred back to the prison to be addressed locally. This practice of referring matters back to the Department was predicated on the assumption that prisoners were actively using the prisoner grievance process and that the grievance process was adequate for dealing with issues raised. In reality, this was not always the case.⁴³

Recommendation 16

That Greenough Regional Prison review the provision of information and assistance for prisoners to access complaint resolution processes, to ensure:

- a. accessibility of information appropriate to the diverse population regarding the prisoner grievance process, alternate complaint procedures and external agencies;*
- b. assistance is available for prisoners to lodge complaints other than via written means; and*
- c. all prison staff are trained in handling prisoner complaints and understand the prisoner grievance process and the role of external complaint agencies.*

PRISONER SUPPORT SERVICES

Peer support

- 3.69 The peer support presence in Greenough was not well-utilised at the time of the last inspection in 2003. In the period between inspections, the group had moved away from their main role to provide support activities and were attempting to act as a prisoner advocacy group, losing support from prison management, staff and eventually prisoners, with the group then disbanding.
- 3.70 A new prisoner support officer (PSO) commenced at Greenough early in 2005. Being new to the prison system, the PSO had taken some time to settle in and re-establish the peer support group. Despite this, upon inspection the group appeared focused on its core prisoner support functions and was aware of its role and boundaries, with better local support and involvement from management as the group consolidated. In the context of where peer support was when the PSO arrived in the prison, the situation at the time of the inspection was a strong improvement. Nonetheless, peer support was not being used to the extent it could be, and was expected to improve further given the progress so far.
- 3.71 Female prisoners and all regional groups within the prisoner population were represented in the peer support group at the time of the inspection. However, an ongoing issue had been maintaining representation in Unit 1, given the nature of Unit 1 as a maximum-security management and transit unit. There was a lack of a clear process regarding access for peer supporters into the unit, a restricted area for most prisoners. Arguably, some prisoners in Unit 1

43 See Ombudsman Western Australia, *Own Motion Investigation into the Department of Corrective Services’ Prisoner Grievance Process* (May 2006) for more information on the grievance process and Ombudsman’s role.

were most in need of support, so a process for peer supporters to access the unit should have been facilitated. Other prisons with similar issues had overcome this by designating specific prisoners as eligible for access and clearly identifying these for officers, to enable regular peer support access for prisoners within the unit.

Crisis intervention

- 3.72 There was a full-time prisoner counselling service (PCS) presence in the prison, sufficient to meet the local demand for crisis intervention counselling. There was a moderate use of PCS for this purpose, with 41 prisoners on the at-risk management system (ARMS) over the five months prior to the inspection, in line with the relatively low event history of the prison. This freed the PCS counsellor to provide more general counselling, an ongoing need in the prison given the complex population mix and variety of psychological needs.
- 3.73 The prisoner risk assessment group (PRAG) met each weekday to review any prisoners identified with current at-risk issues and decide on the placement and management strategies of such prisoners. All relevant staff attended including the Assistant Superintendent Prisoner Management, all unit managers and relevant non-custodial staff including the PCS counsellor. Unit managers had a good understanding of their prisoners and the process for transfer of information via unit handover and ARMS forms was evident, with unit staff supportive of and able to comply with the PRAG's directives regarding the management of at-risk prisoners.

Other support services

- 3.74 There was a regular chaplaincy service to meet the general (mainly Christian) religious needs of the population. The chaplain also coordinated access to Muslim clerics when required, and could do the same for other religions on an as-needs basis.
- 3.75 The prison previously had a visiting Aboriginal Elders Program, which had ceased since the time of the last inspection. One of the former visiting Elders still attended the prison regularly to assist with Aboriginal offender treatment programs.
- 3.76 Aboriginal Visitors Scheme (AVS) attendance at the prison had ceased around the time of the inspection, due to issues with the specific visitors to the prison. Visits had since recommenced but the service was somewhat disrupted for several months. This service should be maintained at the prison, in light of the significant and diverse Aboriginal prisoner population. However, the scheme must be adequately resourced with training and support provided to visitors who may have little experience otherwise of working in custodial environments.

Recommendation 17

That the Department ensure a regular and ongoing Aboriginal Visitors Scheme service to Greenough Regional Prison, with visitors appropriately trained and supported to work within the prison setting.

VISITS AND OTHER CONTACTS

- 3.77 As around 50 per cent of Greenough's prisoners were not from the local region, and even many of the 'locals' came from a fair distance away from the prison, access to visits and family and community contact was problematic for many prisoners. Just 29 per cent of prisoner respondents to the pre-inspection survey reported regular (at least once a week) contact with family or friends, while 40 per cent reported no personal contact at all. For the 2005–2006 year, an average of 291 visits were conducted at Greenough each month (including video visits), a monthly average of 1.43 visits per prisoner. This figure was the second lowest in the state after Roebourne Prison.⁴⁴ During the six months prior to the inspection, 137 individual prisoners held at Greenough did not receive any social visits, around 70 per cent of the daily average population.⁴⁵
- 3.78 Most of the negative prisoner comments regarding visits highlighted that distance from home was the major factor affecting family contact. Aside from reducing the likelihood of social visits, prisoners raised issues with maintaining telephone contact with family and community. Cost was a prohibitive factor for those required to call long-distance.
- 3.79 Locally, Greenough had attempted a number of initiatives to cater for prisoners held out-of-country, such as facilitating some officer-initiated calls to home communities, and an increased focus on video visits for out-of-country prisoners. The use of video visits had doubled from the time of the last inspection to around 20 per month, with multiple prisoners able to attend during video visits to home communities. Local agreements were in place with the Roebourne and Broome prisons to facilitate temporary transfers for visits where possible, although overcrowding in those prisons had limited this to just two or three prisoners per month at best.
- 3.80 More needed to be done to ensure prisoners could maintain meaningful contact with family and community while in prison. The Department had not established state-wide standards related to social contact for prisoners held outside their normal region, beyond specifying that prisoners could access free phone calls 'for compassionate reasons [where] a prisoner is, by virtue of his/her imprisonment, geographically isolated from his/her family or community'.⁴⁶ Even with this policy enabling free calls, prisoners were often still paying for long-distance calls, or not calling home regularly due to the cost of calls. Without departmental standards to address issues faced by out-of-country prisoners, there was little practical support available to the prison to maintain locally-developed initiatives to assist out-of-country prisoners maintain contact with family.
- 3.81 Greenough took a flexible approach regarding visitor identification, whereby up to three social visits were allowed for visitors presenting without identification. This was a positive local initiative acknowledging the distances travelled by some visitors to get to the prison. It showed an appreciation for cultural issues for those remote or regional visitors who may not

44 Department of Corrective Services, *Prisons Monthly Performance Report – June 2006*.

45 Using the daily average population of 196 for the month of June 2006, from the Department of Corrective Services, *Prisons Monthly Performance Report – June 2006*.

46 Department of Corrective Services, *Policy Directive 36, Communications* (updated on 4 April 2007).

be familiar with visits procedures or may be unable to easily access identification documents in the short term. The positive outcomes of this initiative outweighed the potential security issues posed by unidentified visitors entering the prison. Visitors spoken to during the inspection reported positive dealings with staff when booking and attending visits.

- 3.82 There was no external visitor support service on-site, as compared to the family support service provided by Outcare at most metropolitan prisons and local providers at some regional prisons. Neither was there an external visitors' centre affording basic facilities such as toilets or beverage making. This was a noticeable gap given that the prison was some distance out of town. Some visitors travelled significant distances to the prison and needed access to basic amenities upon arrival prior to commencing the visit session.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

- 3.83 The largest foreign national group Greenough has had to contend with were Indonesians. While there were no Indonesian prisoners in the prison during the inspection, there had at times been significant numbers held on illegal fishing charges, most of which were classified as minimum-security and housed in Unit 6. Positively, the prison's management was aware of the differing cultural and religious needs of this group, and attempted to meet these. Appropriate food and food preparation regimes, recreation options and employment were provided. The prisoner orientation booklet was translated into Indonesian and an interpreter used for initial orientation to the prison. A local imam attended the prison on occasions when required for Muslim prisoners.
- 3.84 The only negative sentiment heard had related to toileting arrangements, as non-Indonesian prisoners had complained about the practice of the Indonesian prisoners using sinks as proxy bidets. To counter this management introduced buckets for the Indonesian prisoners to wash themselves in. Except in the very short-term this was an unacceptable solution and a more hygienic solution would be required in the future.

Chapter 4

REHABILITATION

The ‘rehabilitation’ cornerstone covers those key services intended to assist prisoners to address their offending behaviour and develop skills to reduce the likelihood of reoffending after release. This chapter examines assessment and case management of prisoners, the provision of education and offender treatment programs, and the provision of re-entry services at Greenough to assist prisoners reintegrate with the community upon release.

As with other areas of service delivery in the prison, some aspects of rehabilitation could be improved. Much of the under-performance noted related to a lack of resources, such as limited physical space impacting on the delivery of education services; a lack of staff to complete assessments for offender treatment programs; and the lack of time and training for custodial staff to better complete case management tasks. Attention must be focused on the rehabilitative functions within Greenough Regional Prison to lift these from merely adequate to points of strong performance.

ASSESSMENT AND CASE MANAGEMENT

Assessment

- 4.1 All prisoners underwent a process of assessment upon arrival in prison, with a management and placement checklist (MAP) conducted in the first few days after reception to determine security rating and consequent placement in the prison. Those prisoners sentenced to more than six months in prison would also be assessed for treatment program needs and have a case officer assigned to complete an individual management plan (IMP) and ongoing reviews for the duration of their sentence. Prisoners also received medical assessments upon arrival and assessment for educational and other needs.
- 4.2 The MAP process was used at Greenough to routinely classify remand prisoners to the mainstream (medium-security) population. Remand prisoners who would otherwise score a minimum-security rating upon initial assessment typically had this classification overridden to medium-security, on the rationale that they posed too great a risk of escape if housed outside the secure perimeter. However, many maximum-security remands were also overridden to medium-security, if there was no obvious risk in doing so. This was a positive initiative allowing the majority of remanded prisoners to access mainstream accommodation and services in the prison.
- 4.3 The prison introduced an assessment and integrated prison regime (AIPR) assessor position in 2005 (not yet funded at the time of the inspection and staffed instead from the senior officer roster). The AIPR assessor’s primary role was to conduct initial assessment interviews for prisoner individual management plans (IMPs) and case conference reports. The assessor also assisted with parole reports, classification reviews and other case management tasks when required.
- 4.4 From a sample of IMPs and other case management paperwork in prisoner files examined during the inspection, a sufficient level of detail regarding prisoner circumstances was generally found, and program and educational needs were identified appropriately. However, some initial assessments were finalised late (related to delays in treatment assessments), several

had old information not updated, and while all were adequate, some could have been more detailed or shown initiative from completing officers. Some case officers admitted they just ‘filled in the blanks’ when completing prisoner reports, due to time constraints or through a lack of training in assessment tasks. Reports completed by the AIPR assessor were found to be more detailed, probably because this officer had access to background information (such as court history sheets and pre-sentence reports), a better knowledge of the system than many officers and could devote time and attention to assessments as a priority.

- 4.5 Sentenced prisoners transferred to Greenough from other prisons should have been assessed previously by the sending prison for initial case management, education and treatment program needs. In reality, these assessments were of varying standards according to the abilities of staff at other prisons, and in some cases not completed at all.⁴⁷ Prisoners received without completed assessments had to be seen by the assessments team, which created delays in allocating case officers, finalising IMPs and scheduling programs if required. For prisoners with poorly-completed assessments, access to programs, education, security classification and consequent prison placement could be affected. Additionally, this created extra work for case officers later as they had to, in effect, re-do the initial prisoner assessment at the time of reviews.

Case management

- 4.6 A case management coordinator (CMC) position had been created in the prison, although unfunded at the time of the inspection and staffed from the senior officer contingent. The CMC’s role was primarily to allocate, supervise and support case officers, and monitor completion and quality of IMPs and other reports. This officer also liaised with Community Justice Services staff when required, and with other prisons and departmental staff regarding case management and assessment issues.
- 4.7 Case officers were required to complete an initial contact interview with their allocated prisoners as soon as possible after arrival, and to complete regular reviews.⁴⁸ Case officers expressed frustration at the increased time required to complete reports, and the lack of training in the AIPR computer system and assessment processes. Initial officer induction training only briefly addressed this area, and did not take into account that in regional prisons, officers may undertake a variety of roles including assessment, consequently requiring more training.
- 4.8 At 9 August 2006, there were 105 prisoners (52 per cent of the total population) with a current IMP and case officer, and (aside from those delayed while waiting for treatment assessments) no outstanding reports or reviews. Prisoners interviewed during the inspection indicated some knowledge of the IMP and parole process, although some indicated having very little contact with their case officer besides their initial contact interview.
- 4.9 The majority of Greenough’s prisoners eligible for parole were released at their earliest

47 Generally assessments undertaken at the more isolated prisons were of poorer quality than those undertaken at the Hakea Prison Assessment Centre.

48 All officers at Greenough could be allocated prisoners to case manage, with up to three per officer’s case load.

REHABILITATION

eligible date, with most parole deferments related to accommodation issues or programs not yet completed (linked to delays in treatment assessment and program scheduling).

- 4.10 Case officers were not particularly involved in addressing welfare needs of their prisoners, beyond daily unit management if rostered into the same unit. Instead, they followed the departmental definition of case management focussing on the completion of reviews and reports and everyday management of prisoners.⁴⁹ Prisoners were referred to the prisoner support officer or women's support officer to deal with broader welfare issues, or to the visiting re-entry provider for welfare issues arising from imprisonment or to discuss re-entry issues in preparation for release.

EDUCATION

- 4.11 As outlined in the Inspector's exit debrief to the prison, 'essentially, the education service is impoverished because the facilities are very poor and the staffing levels are not needs based.'⁵⁰ The profile of the prison's population was such that they needed more service, not less, given the high levels of low literacy and numeracy and the consequent requirement for more direct support to assist prisoners undertake learning activities. The Department's formula to determine allocated staffing for the prison was paradoxical, supplying less service and fewer human resources when more of each was needed.
- 4.12 Education at Greenough was mostly restricted to full-time participation, with few opportunities for part-time study. Greenough had a lesser participation in education than most prisons, ranking last of all prisons on the Department's performance indicator for this on a monthly average for the 2005–2006 year. Greenough was reported to have an average of 32.3 per cent prisoner participation in education, as compared to 40.6 per cent at Roebourne and 48.2 per cent at Bunbury, two other regional medium-security prisons.⁵¹ During inspection, there were 30 male and two female prisoners in education, about 16 per cent of the prison's population at the time. The highest course level underway was Certificate 2.
- 4.13 The low participation rate in education and training at the prison was of concern. The reasons for this seemed to be partly due to the culture of the prison, with no strong commitment to education and training generally, evidenced by the inconsistent provision and promotion of training in industries and prison workplaces, and the lack of support for prisoners to access part-time study.
- 4.14 Another issue identified during staff interviews on-site seemed to be a focus on completion, with prisoners not encouraged to commence if staff felt they were unlikely to complete the course. This was not a positive approach considering the number of prisoners at Greenough with low literacy levels. These prisoners should be provided with formal and informal

49 Department of Corrective Services, *Director General's Rule 18 – Assessment and Case Management of Prisoners*, sighted 1 November 2006 on the Department's website: <http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au>

50 Harding, R. *Greenough Regional Prison, Announced Inspection Exit Debrief* (11 August 2006), 14.

51 Department of Corrective Services, *Prisons Monthly Performance Report – June 2006*. The Department's education and training branch reported a slightly lower figure in their submission to the inspection team, that on average, 29 per cent of Greenough's prisoners were enrolled in education during 2005.

education and training opportunities at every possible point, regardless of whether they will achieve high levels of completion of learning outcomes. The focus should instead be on participation, as neither TAFE nor the Department's education branch penalised prison education centres for completion rates.

- 4.15 In a response to the perception that prisoners were not interested in engaging in education, the prison's education centre had focused on project-based learning, incorporating literacy, numeracy, business or technology studies into projects related to art, sport or other areas of interest for the delivery of learning in a practical context. Male prisoners were organising a prison-based basketball competition as part of a sports management project;⁵² prior to the inspection, art students had planned an external art exhibition of their works, linking art with business and event management skills.
- 4.16 Another opportunity for improvement would be to offer a wider variety of courses. Greenough offered a much lower number of training activities and had a lower number of individual participants than any other prison. Classroom-based courses focused on general adult education for literacy and numeracy, basic business and IT skills and art. Positively, a number of short vocational courses were offered, mainly during term breaks and often facilitated by external providers. Such courses included construction, forklift, and front end loader courses, as well as workplace safety tickets and First Aid.
- 4.17 Accredited training was delivered in some work areas, with horticulture, laundry and hospitality training available at certificate level. The level of prison-based traineeships in the prison was very low, with just one prisoner on a traineeship at the time of the inspection. There were opportunities to expand work-based training as many areas did not have accredited training provided – for example, the textile workshop employing women prisoners, and the cleaning and maintenance work parties for male prisoners.
- 4.18 Women prisoners had much less access to education, and no vocational training opportunities, due to a lack of available space for classes. However, with the installation of a demountable building for women's use around the time of the inspection, it was expected that a full-time education program would be offered for women.⁵³
- 4.19 Access to education was also difficult for some male prisoners. Minimum-security prisoners in Unit 6 were not allowed into the main prison to attend education, and had no access to computers or designated study space in their unit. While most minimum-security prisoners undertook work in the community or around the external prison grounds offering opportunities for practical training, no accredited courses were available for this purpose at the time of the inspection or in the recent past. Courses did not run if there were insufficient prisoner numbers, or insufficient staff available. To qualify for free TAFE delivery hours, there had to be a minimum of eight per class, numbers which were not guaranteed for the Section 94 work parties engaged in work with skilling opportunities.

52 Unfortunately, this project did not extend to the provision of sports-based qualifications, which could have included the opportunity to gain umpiring credentials, coaching or team management experience.

53 This chapter focuses on male education in the prison. Women's education is addressed further in Chapter 6.

REHABILITATION

- 4.20 Maximum-security prisoners were not allowed to attend the education centre, so only external study was available to this group, although staff were of the opinion these prisoners neither wanted nor needed the service. Given that many prisoners in the maximum-security unit (Unit 1) were held in transit to other prisons or to the mainstream medium-security population, this may be true. Nevertheless, there were no suitable facilities or assistance available within the unit for education for prisoners wanting to study.
- 4.21 There was little external or self-paced study undertaken at the prison. Education staff felt there was a lack of commitment from prisoners so external study programs would not work; this attitude limited possibilities for prisoners who may otherwise benefit from the opportunity with motivation and assistance from staff.
- 4.22 The Indigenous Tutoring Assistance Scheme (ITAS), which could fund tutoring for Aboriginal prisoners, was not utilised in the prison. This resource could support more prisoners taking up external studies or other learning activities.
- 4.23 There were no computer-based learning packages delivered in the prison, as these were not seen as appropriate for the population. However, the prison's population was quite varied and computer-based packages facilitate individual and self-paced learning rather than classroom based learning, which could suit some students. It appeared this avenue had not been adequately explored in the prison. However, the number of computers available limited opportunities for this kind of delivery, with only 10 computers in the education centre, and no communal computers available for use in the units.

Education centre

- 4.24 The prison's education centre was an adapted workshop in the industrial area. This location seemed to work well, encouraging prisoners employed in industries to consider training options, and enabling those in full-time education to spend breaks with those in work. Signs of good administration were noted, such as a detailed memorandum of understanding with TAFE regarding course delivery in the prison, a newly developed movements register, and formal course reviews.
- 4.25 However, the actual centre was a crowded, poorly-organised space, not conducive to learning. Art and computing classes occurred in the same open area in the middle of the centre, regularly disrupted as visitors and staff walked through to reach the staff room or other classrooms. The prison had recently reviewed the area and remodelled it somewhat within the space available, improving visibility and safety and creating more functional space. However, these minor modifications did not go far enough. Ideally, the whole centre needed to be gutted and remodelled, with a proper mezzanine floor installed, to increase the capacity for the centre to offer more service. Until such infrastructure issues are addressed, improvements to service delivery within the education centre itself are unlikely. This does not prevent the expansion of learning activities into other areas of the prison, particularly those industry workshops and prisoner work parties without accredited training at the time of the inspection.

REHABILITATION

Recommendation 18

That the Department provide resources to significantly remodel Greenough Regional Prison's education centre to provide better use of the space available for formal learning activities in the prison.

- 4.26 Education staffing levels were sufficient to deliver the program of education offered in the prison at the time of the inspection. However, an additional staff member could be well-utilised to expand the education and training program, something which was urgently needed. This extra resource would not be utilised effectively in the current education centre due to the lack of space. It would be better used as an adjunct to the workshop-based skilling activities and to address other learning opportunities around the prison with training for work parties and in the new women's education area. To be truly effective, the issues within the prison that were restricting services would need to be addressed. Simply adding another staff member would not improve the situation unless participation in education was valued in all areas of the prison.
- 4.27 Education staff had little involvement in the orientation of new prisoners. While they did try to see all new arrivals for an education orientation and assessment interview, this generally took a week or more to occur. During this time prisoners would be employed elsewhere, often in the workshops who were then reluctant to let prisoners go due to the demands of external contracts and prison-based projects. A more flexible attitude towards combining part-time study or training with work could increase participation rates in the prison. Stronger promotion of education at orientation was required in the prison, a responsibility which could be taken on by an additional staff member.

Recommendation 19

That the Department resource an additional staff member for Greenough Regional Prison's education services, to boost the provision of work-based training and women's education and the promotion of education's profile in the prison.

OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAMS

- 4.28 Program delivery locally was identified as under-resourced and understaffed. An improvement from the time of the last inspection was that the program co-ordinator position was filled, although the co-ordinator had been seconded out to Broome Prison for several months.⁵⁴
- 4.29 Assessments of Greenough's prisoners for treatment program needs were delayed at the time of the inspection. In some cases, prisoners were approaching or had passed their earliest parole date without having been assessed for program requirements. The prison had no designated treatment assessor, with the expectation instead that program facilitators would conduct assessments. However, it was not possible for these staff to deliver programs and maintain treatment assessments concurrently without the risk of burnout. The scheduling of programs

⁵⁴ However, in October 2006, the program co-ordinator resigned; at the time of writing the position was vacant.

REHABILITATION

was such that facilitators often had little time between programs for program development, planning or other administrative work, let alone to undertake significant numbers of treatment assessments.

- 4.30 The local program staff stated they had requested assistance with treatment assessments from head office for many months, with limited results. A suggestion to use video links to treatment assessors at the Hakea Prison Assessment Centre to clear the backlog had not been implemented. Some intermittent assistance had been provided from visiting assessors from Perth, and some local prisoners had been transferred to Hakea Prison for assessment purposes. While these options relieved the most immediate pressures, they were not permanent solutions and had not made a sustainable difference to the mounting number of treatment assessments.
- 4.31 More resources were needed for offender services at Greenough, as there were not enough staff to meet prisoner demand. Enough work was available for a full-time treatment assessor, or another staff member to take on a joint facilitator and assessor role to allow staff to work in a variety of roles. Care must be taken not to overload existing staff as this could lead to burnout and staff attrition.

Recommendation 20

That more resources be provided for offender services at Greenough Regional Prison to address the delay in treatment assessments and to implement initiatives to reduce staff burnout and improve staff retention.

- 4.32 Offender treatment programs run at Greenough during 2006 prior to the inspection included the Indigenous men's managing anger and substance use program (IMMASU), cognitive skills, the Indigenous sex offender treatment program and the new Indigenous family and domestic violence program, all of which were programs for male prisoners. Scheduled for later in 2006 was a managing anger and substance use (MASU) program, a new cognitive skills program and a women's substance use program.⁵⁵
- 4.33 The actual level of program need for Greenough's catchment area was difficult to ascertain, given that many local prisoners were held at other prisons and program scheduling was centrally managed. It could be inferred, however, that programs provided locally did not meet demand, as many prisoners were transferred to other prisons for the purposes of program completion. Also, programs were booked out significantly in advance, impacting on prisoners applying for early release on parole. At the time of the inspection there were four prisoners at Greenough held past their parole dates as they were waiting to undertake the required programs.
- 4.34 Local prisoners did not get preference for locally-run programs; these were booked centrally on a first-come basis regardless of home location. Local prisoners were regularly sent to other prisons for programs that also ran at Greenough. In particular, Greenough prisoners were

55 A comprehensive evaluation program exists for these programs. However, accessing the evaluation results is often difficult. Note that this Report does not seek to evaluate the content of the programs.

sent to Roebourne and Broome prisons and vice versa to complete the IMMASU, despite this particular program running regularly at all three prisons. There was an obvious efficacy of delivering programs to prisoners in their own region, as transfers incur costs for prisoner transports, as well as creating unnecessary stress for prisoners moved out-of-country for the duration of the program.

- 4.35 Few programs had been available at Greenough for prisoners on short sentences. A new cognitive skills program ('think first') was scheduled to run later in 2006, targeted towards short-term and remand prisoners. This was a good initiative, but there needed to be much more delivery of brief intervention programs and other rehabilitative activities for short-term prisoners.
- 4.36 Since the previous inspection, the contracted provider for substance use programs had changed. Internal issues within the provider plus issues within the Department's Programs branch had resulted in difficulties locally, with some programs cancelled due to lack of facilitators and contractual issues. In some cases, where programs were cancelled additional programs were scheduled to run later.⁵⁶ The lack of clarity regarding program availability produced anxiety for prisoners required to complete programs for parole. In some cases, prisoners who had been transferred to Greenough specifically for a program had subsequently been denied parole due to non-completion, because the scheduled programs had been cancelled.

Aboriginal programs

- 4.37 The IMMASU had been running for a number of years in regional prisons, and was the most frequently run program at Greenough. The demand for the program outstripped the delivery, a problem given that substance use was a major issue in many regional and remote towns and communities.
- 4.38 The prison facilitated a pilot of the new Indigenous family and domestic violence program in late 2005, a program purchased and run under licence from the Northern Territory Government. The program was aimed at the male perpetrators of family and domestic violence, taking a systemic and family dynamics approach much different to the cognitive-behavioural, individual focus of most offender treatment programs. It also involved some contact with two local Aboriginal Elders (male and female), both of whom had prior experience working with offenders and were available for facilitators to contact for advice or assistance during the program.
- 4.39 Following the pilot, the program was run in January 2006, with another scheduled for late 2006. Twenty prisoners had completed this program at the time of the inspection (including the pilot group), with generally positive responses from participants. A mix of regional prisoners had participated, from Kimberley, Gascoyne and Pilbara regions. The program was designed with a broad cultural focus rather than region-specific, so this regional mix was not a detriment to the program. Facilitators were mindful not to schedule lone prisoners from any

⁵⁶ For example, the IMMASU program was run in January, April, May and August in 2005 and March, April and May of 2006 (with another planned for later in the year). This program should actually run once every quarter.

REHABILITATION

particular region with a group from another region, acknowledging the need for support from home regions and community.

- 4.40 One major difference from delivery in the Northern Territory was that the original program had two components: prison-based and community-based. The program guide for the original program states that:

‘Programs for perpetrators should not operate in isolation from services for women and children... The evaluation of programs for perpetrators needs to be ongoing with identified performance indicators of effectiveness and a methodology that includes feedback from partners and ex-partners.’⁵⁷

- 4.41 Greenough Prison had only implemented the prison-based component, and did not work with prisoners’ partners and families who had experienced the violence. This was a shortcoming in the program’s implementation in Western Australia, and undermined the family dynamics approach of the program. There were logistical issues preventing the community component being run concurrently with the prison-based program at Greenough, particularly given that participants often came from beyond the local area and family were living far away from the prison, with resulting funding and resource limitations preventing facilitators working with families. That the program had been bought and implemented at Greenough at all was a major step forward, given that there previously existed no suitable program addressing family violence for rural and remote Aboriginal men. However, to make the program as effective as intended, the Department must seek local community-based partners to deliver the community-based aspect of the program to families of participating prisoners.
- 4.42 In addition to the family violence program, Greenough was the only prison in the state running the Indigenous sex offender treatment program.⁵⁸ This was facilitated by prison-based programs staff, and also involved contact with the Aboriginal Elders who attended for the family violence program. Participants were pre-screened before each group commenced, to avoid scheduling perpetrators and victims’ family or community members together.
- 4.43 The sex offender program targeted regional and remote men and was not intended for metropolitan and urban participants. There was still some misunderstanding across the prison system regarding eligibility, as with the IMMASU in the past, given that the program’s title included the word ‘Indigenous’. Some Aboriginal prisoners had been scheduled into the program inappropriately and transferred up from metropolitan prisons. Not only had this taken away places from more suitable prisoners, it also disadvantaged those transferred inappropriately in terms of unnecessary transport to and from Greenough and delay in scheduling into the mainstream sex offender program if required. Local assessment and booking better ensured appropriate prisoners participated in the program, often in their home region.⁵⁹

57 Northern Territory Government, Office of Women’s Policy, *Northern Territory Prison Referred and Community Based Indigenous Family Violence Offender Program – Program Guide*, July 2001, 3.

58 Pilots of this program have also run at Acacia Prison and Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison.

59 The sex offender program running at the time of the inspection included five participants (out of eight) who had been assessed and scheduled in to the program locally by Greenough staff.

REHABILITATION

- 4.44 While the program was classified as ‘medium-intensity’,⁶⁰ it was actually quite a lengthy program, spanning eighteen weeks with sessions twice a week. Participants generally had high-intensity needs, not least of which included language barriers for some from remote areas. The program incorporated material from the IMMASU as the majority of participants tended to have substance issues, likely linked to their offending behaviour.

RE-ENTRY AND RELEASE

- 4.45 For the period 1 January 2006 to 25 May 2006, 113 prisoners were released from Greenough Prison, either to freedom, on parole or other orders, or released from court. Of these, 53 (47 per cent) were released to the Geraldton area (including Mullewa and Morawa), 41 (36 per cent) to other northern regional areas and eight to Perth. There was one interstate release and ten were deported to Indonesia.⁶¹
- 4.46 Greenough’s movements officer attempted to arrange for local prisoners held in other prisons to be transferred to Greenough two weeks prior to their release to assist them to prepare for release. Greenough’s out-of-country prisoners often were transferred to prisons closer to home shortly before their release, with several scheduled for transfer to Roebourne for release around the time of the inspection.
- 4.47 Transport home after release was an issue for many prisoners, as a significant number of prisoners were from outside the local area, and the prison itself is some distance out of town with no public transport available. The prison paid for bus fares home on commercial services for released prisoners, and provided transport to the bus depot in Geraldton on the day of release. There was also a positive initiative in place between the Department and the Marruwayura Aboriginal Corporation for the corporation to provide a bus service from Meekatharra to Wiluna and nearby communities for those without transport beyond the limits of the commercial bus service to Meekatharra.
- 4.48 The Geraldton Resource Centre (GRC) held the contract for the community re-entry coordination service (‘re-entry link’) for Greenough Prison. Re-entry link was a voluntary program, funded by the Department, commencing three months prior to release to assist eligible prisoners with release preparation, and provide support, referral and advocacy services in the community for up to six months post-release. GRC also saw new and remanded prisoners to assist with issues arising from their imprisonment.
- 4.49 GRC was the main community provider for Geraldton, incorporating community legal aid, emergency relief, tenants’ advocacy, and a variety of other services. As they were locally-based, the most they could do for prisoners returning to areas outside Geraldton was to connect them to community providers in their home area.
- 4.50 Re-entry link had reportedly taken some time to settle in to Greenough, but at the time of the inspection was running well, according to the visiting GRC workers and relevant prison

60 For more information on program classification, see Department of Corrective Services, *Offender Programs Service Guide June 2005 – June 2006*, (August 2005), available at <http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au>

61 Information from analysis of TOMS ‘discharge and transfers’ report for the period specified.

REHABILITATION

staff. Prison representatives attended regular meetings at GRC and the prison had designated an interview room for use by GRC staff on their regular visit days. GRC attended twice a week for prisoner interviews, and ran regular pre-release information sessions for prisoners, although attendance had been intermittent. They also held occasional information sessions for staff.

- 4.51 GRC kept their own statistical records quarterly; for the first quarter of 2006, they recorded 147 client contacts for re-entry link, from a total of 34 individual prisoners.⁶² They also received many casual enquiries for assistance, often from short-term prisoners or those who contacted shortly before release. The main services provided included accommodation support, advocacy and information; additional services included family support, financial assistance, drivers licence assistance and employment and training support. Some prisoners were referred to other agencies, such as Centrelink who also attended the prison regularly to assist prisoners wishing to claim social security payments upon release.
- 4.52 GRC also held the local contract for the community transitional accommodation and support service (TASS), managing three clients on TASS during the first quarter of 2006. There was a lack of accommodation in the Geraldton area as across the state, and many prisoners had limited housing options available upon release. There were only four TASS houses in Geraldton.
- 4.53 It was not solely up to visiting providers to assist prisoners prepare for release, and indeed the formal re-entry link program could not assist short-term prisoners or those contacting less than three months before release. There was some confusion regarding release preparation heard from prisoners during the inspection, which indicated more could be done in this area within the prison.

62 Of these, 29 were Aboriginal (19 men and 10 women) and five were non-Aboriginal men.

Chapter 5

REPARATION

‘Reparation’ refers to the notion that prisoners can, in a sense, make amends to society for their crimes through contribution of their low-cost labour.⁶³ This contribution can also be indirect, through the provision of services within the prison which reduce the cost of imprisonment, or through the production of goods that when sold can offset the cost of imprisonment.

Greenough Regional Prison was identified as performing strongly in this cornerstone area, although with some areas that could benefit from extra resources.

- 5.1 At Greenough Prison, reparative activities were undertaken in general prisoner employment, employment in prison industries and in the Section 94 program which facilitated work in the community.
- 5.2 Table 1 (below) shows the numbers of prisoners assigned to each type of work in the prison on a sample date of 10 August 2006 and the numbers on each gratuity level in that area.⁶⁴ The majority of prisoners were being paid Level 3 or above, a positive indication of prisoner involvement in meaningful work.
- 5.3 On the sample day, over 90 per cent of prisoners were working, much higher than at the previous inspection. Unit work in prisons tends to be menial and requires little effort, often as little as twenty minutes per prisoner per day, so high numbers in this area would indicate poor performance in the provision of prisoner employment. With 25 per cent assigned to unit work, and 65.4 per cent to more meaningful activities, Greenough was one of the state’s better performing prisons in this respect. Positively, prison industries provided employment for 43.1 per cent, with some opportunity for skill development in these positions.

Table 1: Prisoner work types and gratuity levels at Greenough Prison at 10 August 2006

Type of Work	Gratuity Level						Total	As %
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Education/Vocational Training	6	13	13	1	0	0	33	17.6
Industries	18	37	26	0	0	0	81	43.1
External (Section 94)	3	6	0	0	0	0	9	4.8
Unit Work/Cleaning	2	4	34	7	0	0	47	25.0
Nil Work/Restricted Regime	0	0	0	0	10	8	18	9.6
Gratuity Level Totals:	29	60	73	8	10	8	188	100
As % of Total:	15.4	31.9	38.8	4.3	5.3	4.3	100	

- 5.4 The structured day in the prison system was such that prisoners were available for productive activity for much less than the 7.5 or more hours per day that was standard in the community.

63 Prisoners are punished for their crimes by their loss of liberty, not by undertaking forced labour. While reparative work is of value, it is not intended as compensation for individual crimes committed.

64 Gratuities are prisoner earnings for work, study or other approved activities undertaken during imprisonment, with level 1 the highest, paid to particularly skilled workers or those undertaking extra responsibilities, and level 6 nil payment, to those prisoners on regression or temporary loss of gratuities following a prison charge.

REPARATION

Most prisoners at Greenough were sent to work or other activities at 8.30 am, returned to their units for lunch at 11.30 am, released for further work or activities at 12.30 pm, and then returned to unit around 2.30 pm for recreation time at 3.00 pm. Thus a maximum of five hours of productive activity per day was available for most prisoners, and in reality many unit-based workers worked for just an hour or two each day.

- 5.5 On these figures, (five hours per day for most positions, and two hours for unit work, with a total population of 188 on the sample day), the average output of prisoners at Greenough could be calculated at 3.78 hours per day,⁶⁵ roughly half of the community standard.
- 5.6 Also, a number of prisoners did not attend work or education for the whole structured day, due to activities such as court appearances, medical appointments or illness, funerals, visits, sentence management meetings or discipline regimes. Prisoners were locked down on Wednesday mornings, to allow prison officers access to training and meetings. Nevertheless, the sum total of effort by prisoners over the weeks and months was considerable, and there were many making a notable effort in the various areas of employment.
- 5.7 A key issue in relation to prisoner employment was whether different groups were appropriately represented in each work area and could access similar opportunities to progress to higher gratuity levels. At Greenough, it was encouraging to see that Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal prisoners were appropriately represented in most work areas, and at all levels of the gratuity system.
- 5.8 The one area of systemic imbalance, however, was in the opportunities provided to women. As can be seen in Table 2, women had much less opportunities for meaningful employment outside of their unit.⁶⁶ This was due to the policy of almost complete separation of male and female prisoners in the prison that limited women's access to areas of prisoner employment available to male prisoners.

Table 2: Differential employment opportunities for male and female prisoners as at 10 August 2006

Employment Category	Male	Female	Total
Work/Education/Training	68.2%	35.3%	65.4%
Unit based/Cleaning	22.4%	52.9%	25.0%
Nil Work/Restricted Regime	9.4%	11.8%	9.6%

Prison industries

- 5.9 As well as providing an opportunity for reparative activity, prison industries aimed, according to the Department, to 'develop opportunities for prisoners to learn vocational and work skills to help them gain and retain employment when released'.⁶⁷ While some international studies

65 This is a more realistic figure than the estimate of 7.35 hours per day for Greenough given within the Department's performance management system, (*Prisons Monthly Performance Report, June 2006*).

66 The women's unit kitchen workers were counted as part of industries, not as unit-based workers, as they provided meals for the entire unit and held a position of significant responsibility.

67 Department of Corrective Services website, <http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au> > file path: Adults in Custody > Prison Industries, sighted on 16 August 2006.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF GREENOUGH REGIONAL PRISON



Exercise yard in Unit 1, the maximum-security unit. While this yard allowed the required access to fresh air and recreation activities for prisoners in Unit 1, the design can be seen here to be oppressive, particularly given the pattern of shadows cast by sunlight shining through the roof bars.



Unit 1 cell walkway. A typical example of walkways present throughout the older parts of the prison. Unit 1 was found to be in great need of maintenance and upgrade.



Prisoner property from an inter-prison escort, in Reception. Greenough's role as a transit stop involved a significant amount of administrative processing, often for prisoners only in the prison overnight or on very short stays. Each item of property must be checked against a property sheet for each prisoner, a significant task for busy escort days when there could be up to 19 prisoners arriving on a single transport vehicle.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF GREENOUGH REGIONAL PRISON



Male prisoners during weekend recreation on the oval. Greenough had a well-maintained oval, used for active and organised sports and also as a walking track during regular recreation times. Many prisoners enjoyed the opportunity to socialise or just be outside in the open air during these times.



Women prisoners during weekend recreation. Volleyball was the main active sport available to the women, with keen interest shown by many of the women at the time of the inspection. However, the unfortunate location of the volleyball court in view of male prisoners in one of the accommodation units dissuaded some women from participating.



The general Section 94 team at work maintaining local road median strips. Section 94 of the Prisons Act 1981(WA) provided the legal basis for absences from prison for work and other approved activities undertaken outside the prison. The general Section 94 team undertook a variety of such maintenance works to the benefit of the local community.



A fine example of the type of work completed by the Section 94 project team. The project team undertook a number of high-quality projects in the local community, including a series of these gazebos and also toilets, picnic tables and fish-cleaning tables providing enhanced public facilities on Geraldton's beaches. Prisoners undertaking these projects could also access some accredited training to enhance their employment prospects upon release.

REPARATION

have questioned the value of prison industry employment in preparing prisoners for future employment, suggesting that workshop conditions may not sufficiently replicate those of the workplace,⁶⁸ the value of providing meaningful work linked to practical and vocational skills was irreplaceable. Additionally, many prison industries reaped profits from external contracts to deliver products or services, which offset the costs of imprisonment.

- 5.10 Prison workshops collectively have to balance the quality and quantity of their outputs against the provision of appropriate work experience and training for significant numbers of prisoners. Greenough's kitchen and laundry were successful examples in this respect. Both met production requirements at a community standard for their external contracts, and also offered some accredited training to interested prisoner workers.
- 5.11 The kitchen provided 16 prisoner employment places on the sample day, including three working in unit kitchens. Vocational support officers (VSOs) in the kitchen delivered a quality food safety training program to all their workers, and prisoners also had the opportunity to undertake hospitality studies at certificate level. During inspection, just one prisoner was officially undertaking a traineeship in the kitchen, although several more had shown interest.
- 5.12 The laundry provided around 30 prisoner employment places, and held four commercial contracts in addition to servicing the needs of the prison. The largest of the contracts was with the regional hospital and the others were with mining companies. The laundry contracts generated \$97,836.57 revenue for the prison for the period January to May 2006 (equivalent to over \$200,000 per annum).
- 5.13 The volume of laundry work varied greatly from day to day, and consequently there were times when workers were not needed in the afternoon. This suited many prisoners as they then had more recreation time in unit, but also created a largely untapped opportunity for laundry workers to take on other roles or engage in study or training while not undertaking contract work. Laundry workers had the opportunity for certified training, an advance on the previous inspection. It was unfortunate more prisoners were not taking this opportunity at the time of the inspection.
- 5.14 The vocational skills workshop was another workshop that contributed significantly to the prison's revenue stream, with \$29,245.13 received for the same period (up to \$80,000 in a full year). This income derived mainly from the production of metal cray-pot frames. Up to eight prisoners were employed for this task, although only five were present on the sample day. The volume of output of these workers was impressive, with the pots much in demand in the local area.
- 5.15 This workshop also contributed to prison maintenance, one-off creative projects and Section 94 work projects, and was used for short skills courses such as a TAFE light machinery course, and a construction course delivered by Silver Trowel. Core workers in vocational skills and maintenance tended to be prisoners with prior trades experience who could help meet

68 Webster, R., Hedderman, C., Turnbull, P.J., & May, T. (2001) *Building Bridges to Employment for Prisoners*, Home Office Research Study 226, September, 2001.

REPARATION

production requirements. Therefore, there were only limited opportunities for others to gain this kind of experience outside of participation in short courses.

- 5.16 Funding had been sought for a second VSO in this workshop to increase prisoner participation in training, extend production hours to meet an increased cray-pot demand and facilitate possible weekend access for women to learn the use of hand-tools in metal or woodwork. However, at the time of inspection this funding was not available, with only one VSO based in the workshop.
- 5.17 The garden was another major prison employer, engaging up to 32 prisoners per day, 23 on the sample day. There was a large area in the prison under cultivation and good shade-house facilities and equipment for gardens and grounds maintenance. The garden contributed around 10 per cent of the prison's vegetable requirements, an important offset to the cost of imprisonment. There was a strong commitment to training, with four prisoners undertaking formal certificate training and eight involved in training to operate ride-on vehicles at the time of inspection.
- 5.18 The textiles workshop had two women assigned on the sample day, with three more women actually present in the workshop, two of whom were supposedly assigned to education. At its most productive, this workshop produced a range of pouch products, blood-spill kit bags and certain other garments, most of which were utilised within the prison system and were worth some \$4573.58 for the first five months of 2006. However, as this workshop drew from a small pool of women with varying degrees of capacity and commitment over time, production was intermittent. On the sample day, the women were working on personal projects, rather than contract work.

Work in the community

- 5.19 Although some years ago, Greenough had the use of the Badgingarra Work Camp, it no longer had this or any work camp facilities attached.⁶⁹ The previous inspection report recommended the establishment of a work camp for Greenough Prison, which had not happened nor was planned for the foreseeable future. Work camps can provide a positive environment to support re-entry into the community for prisoners approaching the end of their sentence, as well as reparative work activities to benefit the local community. The prison and the mid-west region in general would benefit from an active work camp; therefore this recommendation has been repeated for further attention.

Recommendation 21

That the Department establish a work camp for Greenough Regional Prison.

- 5.20 In a sense, the prison's external minimum-security section acted as its work camp. It had an active Section 94 program which contributed to the local community in three ways: through daily trusty placements at locations such as the police station, library, cemetery, and a senior citizens centre; through a group of prisoners accompanied by a prison officer to undertake

69 The Badgingarra property was not considered suitable for permanent accommodation and was sold.

REPARATION

‘work gang’ activities including cleaning up road verges and beauty spots; and through another group of prisoners accompanied by the Section 94 officer to undertake high-value projects in the community.

- 5.21 Only one trusty placement was ongoing at the time of the inspection, although other placements had been regularly utilised. Trusty placements provided the only Section 94 positions available for women, but no women had been assessed as suitable for this work for some time.
- 5.22 During the inspection, the work gang were observed maintaining roadway median strips and verges for the local shire council. The project group were engaged in building gazebos at one of Geraldton’s beaches. While the gazebos were largely pre-fabricated, there were still significant opportunities for skill development in their assembly and installation. A range of other projects had been undertaken in cooperation with various shire councils, the Department of Environment and Conservation (formerly CALM), a local school and other agencies in recent years, often of a significant scale and quality.
- 5.23 There were just nine prisoners assigned to Section 94 on the sample day; in recent months, the numbers have rarely been above 16. The reduced numbers resulted from recent policy change impacting on prisoners’ eligibility for minimum-security and Section 94 approval. In addition to limiting the amount of work completed in the community, this had also reduced opportunities for prisoners to access certified training, given the minimum class size of eight required to qualify for free TAFE hours. As the second Section 94 vehicle held less than eight passengers, it was unlikely this team would be able to access any regular TAFE courses given the minimum class size limitations.

Recommendation 22

That the Department review the prisoner assessment processes for eligibility for minimum-security status and Section 94 approval, with a view to restore the capacity of the Section 94 work program in the community.

Chapter 6

WOMEN PRISONERS

Greenough, like three other regional prisons, held male and female prisoners. Women were in the minority, comprising around seven per cent of the prisoner population, a similar proportion to the number of women held across the prison system. The small numbers of women and predominantly male design of the prison resulted in women being marginalised and disenfranchised within the prison.

There were efforts noted to improve the conditions for women prisoners at Greenough since the last inspection, with improved support from the Department through the women's custodial services directorate. Despite this, deficiencies were still noted. The Department acknowledged three problem areas at Greenough prior to the inspection: the need for employment options outside the unit, linked to skilling and training; the need for a program model to meet the complex needs of the women; and the need for access to meaningful visits with children.⁷⁰ These were all confirmed as issues during the inspection.

Given the physical infrastructure limitations and the isolation of the women in the midst of an otherwise male facility, a complete overhaul of women's facilities at Greenough would be necessary to cater appropriately for women prisoners.

CUSTODY

- 6.1 To reside in the prison, women had to be classified as either medium- or minimum-security. Those classified as maximum-security were transferred to Bandyup Women's Prison in Perth, although women on remand assessed initially as maximum-security had been overridden to a medium-security classification if they were not considered high risk, to allow them to remain at Greenough and access the standard female accommodation, services and activities. Some maximum-security remanded women were held for short stays for court appearances.
- 6.2 There was a policy of almost complete separation of female prisoners from male prisoners at Greenough, with the only exceptions being booked intra-prison visits, and participation as spectators during football games on the prison oval at weekends (although the women were cordoned off from the male spectators). This separation, while understandable to protect the women's safety and perceptions of safety, severely limited their access to amenities and services otherwise available to mainstream male prisoners.
- 6.3 There were inadequate conditions for women undergoing regression or punishment regimes. The only option for female prisoners requiring regression was placement in a cell in Unit 1. Once in Unit 1, for safety and segregation reasons, female prisoners were required to stay in their cell until they were no longer considered a management issue and were returned to the women's unit. Conversely, their male counterparts, once their initial behavioural disturbance had settled, could move between their cell and the common areas of Unit 1 until they were deemed ready to re-enter the mainstream population. It was not acceptable that the regimes for women undergoing regression were more punitive than for men, which was regularly the case for women held in regional prisons.

70 Bell, V. *Strategic Briefing for OICS August Inspection Greenough Regional Prison*, 25 July 2006.

CARE AND WELLBEING

Accommodation

- 6.4 Previously, Units 3 and 5 were designated female accommodation, offering standard accommodation in one unit and self-care in the other, with a total female bed capacity of 62. This capacity catered for the overflow of women prisoners during major capital works at Bandyup Prison over 2001–2002. Female numbers at Greenough dropped significantly once this work was completed, while population pressures in the male medium security cohort increased. Unit 3 was therefore reallocated to male use, with all women housed in Unit 5 (‘the women’s unit’) that was modified to hold 19 women. The unit had a variety of single, double and multi-occupancy cells, plus one mother and baby cell.⁷¹ All meals were prepared fresh in the unit by the unit’s cook. A women’s unit plan was developed acknowledging the differences in managing female as compared to male prisoners.
- 6.5 The unit was sufficient from a bed-space point of view, as female prisoner numbers at Greenough tended not to rise above 20. However, there was little option to meet specific placement criteria or provide hierarchical progression, and virtually no differentiation between minimum- and medium-security women held in the prison.

Women’s support officer

- 6.6 The role of the women’s support officer (WSO) commenced at Greenough in 2005, funded through the Department’s women’s custodial directorate.⁷² The role was introduced to provide support for women prisoners, to advocate for improvements and service delivery relevant to women, and to support at the local level the women’s custodial directorate’s strategies across the prison system. The WSO assisted with prisoners’ welfare needs and release preparation, liaising with community services to assist women with re-entry and reintegration into the community upon release. She also organised information sessions, short programs and activities for women prisoners, often in conjunction with other services in the prison.
- 6.7 The work of the WSO had contributed to the improved services available to women prisoners at Greenough and was valued by prisoners and staff. Unfortunately, the position was only funded part-time, with the WSO on-site two days a week. This was insufficient to meet the needs in the prison as well as maintaining and developing community contacts, an important aspect of the role.

REHABILITATION AND REPARATION

- 6.8 There was insufficient structured activity available to occupy all of the women. Employment available to them was mainly unit-based (consisting of cooking and cleaning), insufficient to provide full-time positions for all workers. There were also several positions in the textile workshop and some limited trusty Section 94 positions for eligible women.

71 According to prison staff, there had only been one occasion where a child was in the prison with its mother, and this only for a short time. Only infants under 12 months of age were allowed to stay in the unit.

72 WSOs were introduced into all regional prisons housing women in 2005.

- 6.9 Treatment programs for women who were serving their sentences locally were lacking, partly due to facilitator issues, and partly due to low numbers of local women scheduled for programs at any one time. Consequently, women were still being sent to Bandyup Prison in Perth for programs.
- 6.10 In the three years between inspections, there had been just four women's programs run at Greenough. All were substance use programs, including a one-day awareness workshop. The total number of participants over this period was 35, including four non-completions. A substance use program scheduled for early 2006 was cancelled, although another was scheduled to take place later in the year.
- 6.11 Until recently, the women had difficulty accessing educational activities due to a lack of dedicated space for women's education, and the location of the education centre in the midst of the (male) industry workshops. There was a similar lack of access to vocational work and skilling due to the use of these facilities for male prisoners.
- 6.12 In response to this, the Department's women's custodial directorate funded installation of a demountable building alongside the women's unit, primarily for education but also as a space for programs and other activities if required. The room opened for classes during the inspection. With the advent of this permanent space for women, education staff intended to deliver education for women comparative to male fulltime education hours. At the time of the inspection, only part-time education activities were available to the women, involving basic adult education, basic technology skills and art.
- 6.13 While the demountable offered an improvement in facilities for women, it was somewhat crowded and not open for the whole day, due to women's recreation sessions cutting short afternoon sessions. Those few prisoners who worked for most of the day (such as the cook and textile workers) consequently had no access to education as the centre was not open beyond 2.00 pm. While there were computers available in the demountable, there were none in the communal areas of the unit. As most prisoners could not afford to purchase computers, the women had limited access to computers for study or any other purpose.
- 6.14 Plans at the time of the inspection were to include a small hothouse and plant propagation area and a space for pottery and other art activities in the outdoor area next to the new classroom. However, little space around the demountable was provided, even though there was much unused space behind it. If a greater area was available, there would be greater scope for outdoor classes, vocational worktables and a bigger hothouse for horticulture; this could easily be remedied at low cost by moving the fence.
- 6.15 There were no vocational skilling opportunities for women, and no obvious support in the prison to provide these.⁷³ Several women expressed frustration at not being able to try vocational training or work, such as the metalwork, woodwork and construction courses available to male prisoners. Even those employed in the textile workshop could not access accredited training in that area.

73 Positively, at the time of writing this report, the prison was planning a forklift course for interested women prisoners to run later in 2006. This is the first such course that has been available to women at Greenough.

- 6.16 Given the small population of women, there was often not a ‘critical mass’ of interest to run programs and activities, especially for TAFE courses requiring a minimum class size of eight. There had been little scope for smaller classes or individualised learning packages, although it appeared the prison had not fully explored options for service delivery for women, especially for external study.
- 6.17 Only two women were assigned to education as their workplace at the time of the inspection; however, on the first day the demountable was open, four women attended classes. Women at Greenough were well-positioned to undertake part-time education due to the nature of their routine confined to their unit. Many finished their work within a short period of time and could be meaningfully engaged in educational activities for the remainder of the structured day. With appropriate support, many women could access external study beyond the courses offered by the prison.

CONCLUSION

- 6.18 Overall, women prisoners at Greenough had poorer access than men to all of the services available within the prison. The small number of women and the lack of homogeneity between them imposed limitations on the breadth of services available.
- 6.19 Safety must be a paramount concern when considering women in mixed regional prisons.⁷⁴ The conundrum exists that women must be provided equity in relation to services but not at the risk of their safety. In order for women in regional prisons to be safe there is the need for a degree of segregation from men, but this segregation should not be provided at the expense of services. Properly-supervised communal access to services and activities should be supported also.
- 6.20 A means of resolving this problem is the development of women’s precincts within mixed prisons. Ideally, these precincts should not be located in the middle of the main prison, as this can result in women being essentially confined to isolated islands in the midst of a male environment. Instead, women’s precincts should be attached to the prison but separate from the men’s sections, offering safe retreat from the male population with supervised access to a full range of services.
- 6.21 In Greenough the ideal location for such a precinct is the area currently occupied by the male minimum-security section (Unit 6).⁷⁵ This is a part of the prison complex and as such all the services of the prison can be accessed; however, being outside the main compound it is sufficiently removed to provide the women with a safe environment. The current design and infrastructure of the minimum-security section would require some modification to be suitable for women’s use.
- 6.22 A women’s medium-security facility could be built on this part of the Greenough site, co-located but separate from the existing prison. This purpose-built annex could provide services

⁷⁴ During 2006 there were two prison-based pregnancies and one alleged sexual assault at mixed prisons in WA.

⁷⁵ There is sufficient space on the Greenough site to relocate or build a new men’s minimum-security facility; alternatively, a local work camp could house the many of Greenough’s minimum-security men.

to benefit women prisoners across the state, although primarily those from the local area and northern regions. It could become a ‘women’s hub’ for the north, to provide comprehensive assessment services for all northern women prisoners. There would be scope to deliver full treatment program, educational, vocational skilling and employment services, with a population able to sustain a wider variety of options than currently available. Facilities could be built for child stays or extended visits with children, an option currently lacking for women in Greenough or any regional prison. The centre would fill the gap for women-centred, medium-security accommodation in the state, and would have scope to take women from Bandyup Prison for management or other reasons.

- 6.23 The development of a women’s hub at Greenough would not abrogate the Department’s responsibility to provide adequate living conditions, amenities and services for women in all regional prisons, nor should women be housed out-of-country for more than the minimal time required to access services provided in the hub. The facility would enhance, rather than replace, the provision of services for women in other regional prisons.

Recommendation 23

That the Department invest in a purpose-built, medium security facility on the Greenough Regional Prison site for female prisoners, to provide appropriate accommodation and a full range of services to meet the assessment, educational, program and welfare needs of the northern regional women prisoner population, and provide support to the rest of the women’s prison estate when required.

Chapter 7

RESOURCES AND SYSTEMS

For any prison to function well, it requires adequate resources in terms of staff, infrastructure and equipment, suitable forward planning and budgetary resources. Greenough Regional Prison was found to have a positive staff group, although a lack of stability was noted due to the largely acting management team and acting senior officer group at the time of the inspection. Issues were identified with limited access to training budgets for regional staff. Positively, Greenough's attention to occupational safety and health was found to be excellent.

While there were no pressing capital works needs, the prison was beginning to show its age and would benefit from forward planning for improved capital infrastructure. With additional funding, Greenough had the potential to develop into a strong regional corrections hub to support the northern prisons.

STAFFING

- 7.1 Greenough Prison demonstrated a positive culture in regards to staff. Staff felt supported by their peers and management, generally felt safe in the prison, and demonstrated knowledge of the prison and a sense of pride in its success. There was a low level of sick leave and no evidence of large numbers of officers wanting to transfer out of the prison, statistics which can indicate whether or not staff are happy with their work environment.
- 7.2 Despite the good aspects to staffing at the prison, three key staffing issues were found during the inspection period: the lack of permanency in the management team, the need to ensure that staffing levels were adequate for future population increases and the need to ensure that staff training levels are maintained.
- 7.3 Greenough Prison did not have a substantive superintendent during the inspection, as the superintendent was away on an extended secondment. In addition, the acting superintendent at the time of the inspection had accepted a position at a metropolitan prison to leave shortly after the inspection. This situation, like that observed in other prisons, tends to have a detrimental impact on the forward planning and functioning of the prison.
- 7.4 In the last inspection of Greenough Prison the good relationship between prison officers and prisoners was identified as one of the strengths of the prison. This positive relationship still existed upon examination in the current inspection. Eighty-five per cent of prisoners in the pre-inspection survey rated relations between prison officers and prisoners as okay or better, a view confirmed by discussions with prisoners during the on-site inspection.
- 7.5 Positive aspects to the complement of custodial staff at Greenough included a good representation of female custodial staff. At the time of the inspection there were 20 female officers employed at Greenough, 24 per cent of the total custodial staff. The high numbers of female officers meant that generally there would be at least one to assist with reception processes for new women prisoners (which involved strip-searches and other procedures requiring gender matching).
- 7.6 Female officers felt supported and safe within the prison, both in terms of having sufficient other female officers around for support and also being treated equally by their male

counterparts and management. Female officers generally felt safe within the prison, and were confident that any safety concerns raised would be addressed by management. Positively, there was no evidence found of bullying among staff. This was a good aspect to the culture of Greenough Prison, as in some custodial environments female staff reported being intimidated by other (mainly male) officers and that issues of safety specific to women were not addressed.

- 7.7 Greenough had success in recruiting staff locally. This contributed positively to staff stability, as local staff were less likely to transfer to other sites closer to family or other commitments, and had contacts in the local community. However, the prison did not appear to have a specific project aimed at attracting Aboriginal people to work in the prison and the complement of Aboriginal staff was still far short of what it should be.
- 7.8 The biggest issue confronting Greenough in terms of custodial staffing was the lack of appointed senior and first class officers. While Greenough had been previously been recognised for its strong complement of senior officers, in recent years many had retired or transferred to other prisons. At the time of the inspection Greenough had nine vacant senior officer positions and five vacant first class officer positions, most of which had been vacant since 2005. The current senior officers, although being a strong and cohesive group, did not have the depth of experience required to further develop the prison. There was an urgent need to fill the vacant positions and to provide development opportunities for experienced staff at Greenough, to give those staff who had been acting successfully in the positions for extended periods more stability and recognition.
- 7.9 The senior officer promotional round was underway at the time of the inspection. However, the process had been halted due to a perceived procedural breach, with officers involved in the process being seriously inconvenienced and becoming sceptical of the whole promotional process. Some staff indicated that they would not apply for promotional positions in the future unless the Department rectified the current problems. The failure of the Department to effectively manage this promotional round had further damaged the relationship between operational staff and the Department's human resources section.

Recommendation 24

That the Department undertake a review of the senior officer promotional process to ascertain the issues delaying the recent round as a matter of urgency, to inform the development of improved promotional rounds in the future.

- 7.10 Greenough benefited from having a stable group of VSOs, valued and supported by other local staff and administration. The Department had recently invested in the provision of operational training for VSOs, with almost half of the Greenough contingent having completed this at the time of inspection. This contributed to VSOs' improved operational knowledge relating to security, safety, and prisoner management matters, and had probably contributed to the positive dealings of VSOs with custodial staff in the prison.
- 7.11 VSOs had some level of autonomy to place orders within a budget, and were able to secure the necessary resources for equipment upgrades and key projects in their areas. They contributed

somewhat to yearly business planning within the prison, although this input could be developed further.

- 7.12 An issue raised during inspection was staff coverage for VSOs on leave. Most were highly-skilled tradespersons not readily replaced from the prison officer pool. While their leave plan ran on a seven-year cycle, coverage tended to be organised shortly before they went on leave, often with little effective handover. This could affect the quality of output from industries, training delivered to prisoners, and increase the stress of VSOs planning for and returning from leave. This area would benefit from better forward planning.
- 7.13 In recent staffing reviews, the prison had sought extra VSOs to increase prisoner involvement in reparative activity and certified training. Funding had not been released for this at the time of inspection. Additional VSOs will be required to cope with any increase in local prisoner numbers and the consequent increased need for workplaces in the prison, given the region's projected population growth.

Recommendation 25

That the Department fund the proposed increase in vocational support officers at Greenough Regional Prison to increase prisoner participation in work activities and accredited skills training. The relief arrangements for such officers should also be reviewed to reduce the loss of quality and output during leave periods.

- 7.14 Non-custodial staff reported feeling safe in the prison and supported by custodial staff and management. Overall, non-custodial staff reported that Greenough had good staff, good communications and a supportive and respectful environment. They did not feel that the prison was characterised by bullying or intimidation.
- 7.15 There were some indications that non-custodial staff were less likely to be seen as part of the prison than custodial staff. However, those who had worked in other prisons felt that this problem was less evident at Greenough than at other prisons within the state. Some comments were also heard regarding the need for better integration between non-custodial services in the prison – education, programs, and health – as they had only recently begun to discuss working together on joint activities and service delivery in the prison. While there were all-of-staff meetings on occasions, these were sporadic and often poorly attended. However, there were some efforts noted to keep non-custodial staff informed about operational activities within the prison.
- 7.16 Management at the prison level felt that some non-custodial staff were separate from the prison, as the current human resource processes required some staff, such as offender services and health, to report to management outside of the prison, and the budgets for these staff were not held at the prison level. This fostered a somewhat divisive element to the prison structure.
- 7.17 Looking broadly, the changes to the Department's structure in 2006 established three deputy commissioners, the Deputy Commissioner Adult Custodial (responsible for prisons), the Deputy Commissioner Community and Juvenile Justice (responsible for community

and juvenile justice services) and the Deputy Commissioner Offender Management and Professional Development (responsible for education, programs, health services, training and professional development). As a way of supporting the non-custodial offender services at Greenough, the management structure of the prison could replicate this broader management structure. There is a need for a superintendent who has responsibility for the overall management of the prison and there is also a need for a manager with responsibility for the delivery and management of education, treatment programs, health services and professional development at the prison.⁷⁶ This position would provide a clear management structure at the local level for offender services within the prison and provide the capacity to coordinate among these services. The position would have some local budgetary control and could work with the superintendent to ensure these services were better integrated with the overall prison structure.

Recommendation 26

That the Department investigates the development of a managerial position to lead, co-ordinate, support and represent non-custodial services staff (including programs, prisoner counselling service (PCS), education, health and other support services staff) for Greenough Regional Prison. Consideration should also be given to establishing a similar position at other regional prisons.

Staff training

- 7.18 Similar to other prisons, recurrent staff training at Greenough Prison was under-resourced. In the year prior to inspection, the prison introduced a training officer position to address ongoing staff training needs. However, this position was un-funded while waiting for the results of staffing review funding bids, instead staffed from the senior officer roster on a three month expression of interest rotation. This created the potential for a lack of continuity and little opportunity for forward planning given that the officer was only guaranteed three months in the position.
- 7.19 There was also a lack of budget and support from head office for training locally and the training officer lacked many of the necessary items to conduct effective training including equipment, payment for experts and proper amenities. Additionally, resources for reaccreditation costs for prison-based trainers and assessors were not easily available. As an example, officers indicated difficulties in keeping trainer certifications for breathing apparatus refreshers current, given the shortage of staff to backfill their positions and the costs of travelling to Perth to access this training.
- 7.20 The training officer had developed a plan for training to address gaps identified in the knowledge base of the prison. Positively, many of the identified gaps related to case management rather than simply focusing on security. The prison was also investigating the provision of training in drug and alcohol issues, the new 'working with children' check legislation, and business planning.

76 There would be no need for an equivalent community justice manager in the prison, as this role is filled by the regional manager of the local Community Justice Services office.

- 7.21 Non-custodial staff were offered some of the training provided to custodial officers. They also provided some training to custodial officers in their areas of expertise, with a recent example being grooming behaviour awareness sessions delivered by local programs staff. While non-custodial staff felt that this involvement in custodial training was good, it did not provide them with sufficient support for their professional development.
- 7.22 Training for non-custodial staff such as nurses and program staff and the budgets for this purpose were managed centrally in the Department and although appropriate training programs were offered, access was limited for regional staff. Without a specific local training budget they were unable to access local services and were required to travel to Perth for training, again proving difficult as often there was no relief for their positions, or the total costs to attend training were too high. Positively, the PCS counsellor and some nursing staff were able to access mental health and suicide prevention training through the local hospital shortly before the inspection, an initiative sourced via positive local community relations rather than head office initiative.
- 7.23 There was a need for a strong integrated staff training program at Greenough Prison, which should be funded and supported through local and head office policies. There was a need to ensure that the budget was able to support a variety of training and that adequate resources were provided at the prison level.
- 7.24 At the time of the inspection, the prison was also waiting for confirmation of the outcome of budget bids from an internal staff review and the distribution of funding arising from recommendations of the Mahoney inquiry.⁷⁷ In anticipation of future funding, several positions had been implemented off the existing staff roster, in particular, the case management co-ordinator, AIPR assessor and senior officer training. Additional custodial and vocational support officers had been identified as required in the prison but were not yet funded. This impacted on the prison's ability to meet preferred service standards at the time of inspection.

Recommendation 27

That the Department provide an adequate training budget to improve the provision of and access to training for all of Greenough Regional Prison's staff, including non-custodial and non-security training.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

- 7.25 An independent audit on occupational safety and health (OSH) at Greenough Prison was conducted in November 2005, and found that:

This prison has shown good attendance to meeting the Department's OSH expectations; however, OSH practice substantially operates at an informal level across the site. A variety of statutory non-compliances were identified during the audit.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ Mahoney, D. *Mahoney Inquiry into the Management of Offenders in Custody and in the Community* (November 2005).

⁷⁸ MacPherson, G. *Local OSH Management System Overview Report, Geraldton Prison [sic]*, Shawmac Pty Ltd, (November 2005), 2.

- 7.26 In response to the audit, a safety coordinator was appointed by the prison, and issues raised were progressively addressed. This officer had the opportunity to complete accredited studies in OSH and was taken off regular duties for three months to develop a local OSH procedure manual and specific procedures for each industry area. These were in place at the time of the inspection.
- 7.27 All prisoners at Greenough were required to undertake a generic OSH course shortly after arrival in the prison. All prisoners employed in industries were also required to undertake specific workshop safety training upon commencement in the workplace. These processes were found to be appropriately documented.
- 7.28 Staff training was also a priority, for general OSH awareness as well as first aid and emergency aids. An occasional newsletter also raised awareness among staff, the last of which focused on bullying among prisoners.
- 7.29 The OSH practices at Greenough appeared to be best practice in the Western Australian prison system, a standard that other prisons should be seeking to emulate.⁷⁹ Greenough Prison demonstrated a significant commitment to OSH with good results for prisoners and staff alike.

RESOURCES

- 7.30 Similar to other prisons across the state and in particular regional prisons, the overall budgetary situation for Greenough was poor. The prison's budget was based on historical factors with little or no forward financial planning undertaken. This rendered the budget difficult to manage, with little financial prioritisation undertaken if and when funds were cut.
- 7.31 At the time of inspection in August 2006, Greenough Prison had yet to receive confirmation of its budget allocation for the 2006–2007 financial year, due to ineffectual budget management processes at the departmental level. The prison was unaware as to whether or not its submitted budget was to be fully funded. This placed extreme pressure on the prison, as they would have to urgently trim budgets part-way through the financial year should they be under-funded following confirmation of the budget allocations. Financial planning and budgets should have been set by the Department prior to the start of the financial year to allow prison management to plan and prioritise the year's spending according to available funds.
- 7.32 Problems existed in relation to budget planning at the prison level. There were no formal processes by which budget bids could be developed or to consult and involve staff from the various sections within the prison for this purpose. During the inspection it was clear that budgets were developed in isolation by management. Processes similar to those observed at Wooroloo Prison Farm,⁸⁰ whereby staff from prison industries and services were involved in business planning relevant to their areas, should be investigated for implementation.

79 Harding, R. *Greenough Regional Prison – Announced Inspection Exit Debrief* (11 August 2006).

80 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Wooroloo Prison Farm*, Report No. 39, (January 2007).

- 7.33 The prison needed to develop a longer term budget planning process. This should involve strategic planning for the future of the prison with development of budget bids aligned with the strategic focus. Long-term planning would allow for prioritisation, development and supported budget bids. Strategic planning skills at both the prison level and the head office level would be required for this process to be successful; these were found to be lacking at the time of inspection.
- 7.34 Greenough did not appear to have strong strategic planning processes. There was a lack of knowledge and expertise at the prison level on strategic planning processes and a lack of support from head office to develop these skills. Business plans were developed primarily at the management level without much input from other areas of the prison. This was particularly noticeable in relation to the business activities of the prison and contracts undertaken through reparative activities. The business plan of the prison focused primarily on what happened in the past rather than making forward plans for what may or could happen. An example of this was that although the prison was aware that large increases in the population were likely in the Gascoyne region in the future, there had been little analysis of how this would impact on the prison and what changes might be needed to cater for an increased population.
- 7.35 One issue, which was evident in the business planning processes at the time of the inspection, was the role of the business manager. The business manager's position was often seen as one of the positions on the custodial officers' career path rather than a position which requires specialist financial and business skills. The Department should ensure that the job description for this position highlights selection criteria that are directly relevant to financial and business skills rather than custodial management.
- 7.36 In light of proposals made within this report for Greenough Prison to take on a more significant role in the northern regions (see Chapter 8), the needs of Greenough's management team as a whole in the areas of budget planning, business management and strategic planning should be supported. Either the management team must be provided with training and support, or consideration made to appoint specialist staff to the prison to assist in these areas. Strong business and strategic management at the local level will be required at all prisons in the future if the Department's moves towards implementing 'service level agreements' with individual prisons.

Recommendation 28

That the Department support enhancements to the organisational arrangements for business management and strategic planning at Greenough Regional Prison and other regional prisons to ensure that such prisons are best-served by the appropriate levels of skills, experience and training for these critical functions.

- 7.37 Capital works funding for Greenough was lacking. Similar to other areas of the prison service it was apparent that only urgent maintenance was undertaken rather than any planned long-term works. This primarily was a result of a lack of funding at the head office level rather

than failures at the prison level. Greenough Prison, unlike many regional prisons, did not have pressing and ongoing maintenance needs at the time of inspection. However, continued under-funding of regular maintenance would result in a deteriorating state asset and a possible situation such as that which existed in Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison, with identified issues arising from deteriorating physical infrastructure.⁸¹

Recommendation 29

That the Department consider long-term infrastructure plans to adequately resource Greenough Regional Prison for maintenance works of the existing asset and new works to strengthen the role of Greenough in the prison system.

81 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Eastern Goldfields Regional Prison*, Report No. 34 (June 2006).

Chapter 8

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

GREENOUGH REGIONAL PRISON – ADDING VALUE TO CORRECTIVE SERVICES

- 8.1 As part of the *Directed Review of the Management of Offenders in Custody* (“Report 30”),⁸² detailed consideration was given to the future regional custodial management strategies for the Kimberley and Eastern Goldfields regions. The report also called for the development of regional blueprints and correctional strategies for all regions of the state. For planning purposes, Greenough Regional Prison was deemed to be located in the Central region.
- 8.2 The current inspection report of Greenough Prison provides the opportunity to supplement the commentary in Report 30 with regard to the Central region and its links to the northern regions. Given its geographical location at about the mid-point of the state, the Greenough’s function as a transit station was an important part of its role in the overall prison system. However, at the time of the inspection this role was limited to providing overnight accommodation and some attendant administrative processing.
- 8.3 There was a high-priority need to establish a northern prison as an inter-regional correctional hub for assessment and service delivery. Over the last few years the Department had considered establishing Roebourne Prison as such a facility. On reflection, this role would be better suited to Greenough Prison. Such an inter-regional correctional hub would be expected to develop a range of services beyond managing inter-prison movements, including comprehensive assessments of educational, skilling and offender treatment program needs.
- 8.4 Within such an inter-regional hub, the required offender services could be directly delivered at the prison or, alternatively, specialists at the hub could provide supervision for staff delivering these services at other regional prisons. The diverse needs of individual prisoners within regional prisons has impacted on service delivery in the north, as there are not always sufficient group sizes to enable programs to run. This critical mass for programs and other activities would more likely be available in an inter-regional hub than a single regional prison.
- 8.5 Greenough’s current role as a transit station could be expanded, to hold transit prisoners for longer than just overnight, to provide the full range of assessments and required services. Prisoners would then continue on their journey to their placement prison with a completed full initial assessment. This would reduce the numbers of unnecessary transports south, given that some local prisoners are sent to metropolitan prisons for assessment and program purposes. Creating a well-resourced assessment centre at Greenough would also reduce the numbers of assessments completed poorly at other prisons, and enable more local bookings into programs and other activities.
- 8.6 Given that Greenough had a functioning assessment team (albeit small) with an understanding of the issues surrounding remote and regional Aboriginal prisoners, and Broome and Roebourne prisons did not have adequate resources for this function, Greenough was well-positioned to take on a greater assessment role for northern prisoners if provided with additional assessment staff and resources.

82 OICS, *Directed Review of the Management of Offenders in Custody*, Report No. 30 (November 2005).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.7 In addition to assessment staff (both in terms of AIPR assessments and treatment program assessments), additional resources for health services, education and programs would be needed, to enable the full range of services to be available at Greenough for transit and local prisoners.
- 8.8 Additional infrastructure would also be needed to support the longer stays of transit prisoners. Ideally, a transit and orientation wing could be built, to house these prisoners. This would remove the reliance on Unit 1 for these prisoners, allowing that unit to retain the core function of a maximum-security management unit dealing with prisoners on punishment or regression regimes.
- 8.9 Another potential for growth at Greenough Prison is in the area of the management of women. As previously discussed, Greenough could develop a strong women's section which would provide a range of assessment and treatment services for women from the northern regions.

Recommendation 30

That the Department develop and resource Greenough Regional Prison as a management and support base for assessments, program development and program delivery for the northern prisons.

- 8.10 The consideration to develop Greenough into an inter-regional hub is justified also on the basis that the Department has experienced considerable difficulty in attracting and retaining the staff necessary for sustainable service delivery in the regions. While more staff resources and support would be required to take on a greater number of assessment and delivery tasks, providing these for Greenough would be an easier task than for the prisons further north. Greenough is close enough to the metropolitan area and developed enough to attract staff who may otherwise be hesitant to move to more regional areas. The location of the prison could also better attract staff on short secondments to cover leave periods or provide supplementary services when required.
- 8.11 Having said this, Greenough still is a regional prison, and its staff should be compensated appropriately with a regional allowance, something not in place at the time of the inspection. While not as remote as some other regional prisons, costs were still higher for some commodities than in the metropolitan area; additionally given the likelihood of jobs in the resource sector attracting potential new staff, a regional allowance could assist in staff recruitment and retention in the prison.

Recommendation 31

That the Department improve recruitment and retention strategies for regional staff. Specifically for Greenough Regional Prison, this would include extending eligibility for a regional incentives package to Greenough staff.

- 8.12 In the medium term (five years) a range of correctional services strategies will be established in the Kimberley and other regions that may change the service demands on the Central

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

region and Greenough Prison, in particular. This is likely to occur progressively so the prison's operational context may be impacted on in both the short and long terms. Also, the Central regional custodial population is likely to experience modest growth over the next 10 years.⁸³ Significant differences are expected in the population demographics of prisoners across the regions. Therefore, the concept of an inter-regional correctional hub will need to be kept under active review as service demands and delivery capabilities change over time.

CONCLUSION

- 8.13 This inspection found Greenough Regional Prison to be a prison that continued to function well, though it had not developed in the way it could have during the three years between inspections. Services provided to prisoners were adequate, but could be much improved with the provision of resources and better strategic planning at the prison and departmental levels.
- 8.14 Positively, the good staff–prisoner relations noted during the last inspection were again identified in the prison. Most prisoners felt safe in the prison, as did staff. Relations between staff – custodial, non-custodial and management – were identified to be good, and most staff felt supported at the prison level. Some issues were noted relating to lack of integration and confusion regarding the place of non-custodial staff whose line management and funding was held at Department level; this area needed some further clarification and local resourcing to improve.
- 8.15 Greenough has long been thought a well-functioning prison, and consequently was largely left alone by the Department. It could have, however, benefited from positive attention and resourcing to move it from a prison with few problems to a prison at the cutting edge of innovation and development in the state. The potential to develop the prison into a inter-regional hub and innovator should now be supported by the Department.
- 8.16 The inspection exit debrief proposed a new pathway for the prison to become an inter-regional correctional hub by building upon its transit role, rather than its past inclination to be an overflow facility for the northern prisons and Bandyup Prison.⁸⁴ This inspection report has outlined the need for a separate women's facility at Greenough, and the possibility to strengthen the assessment and service delivery functions of the prison to cater for all northern regional prisoners. Significant capital works funding will be required to support such developments of Greenough's potential, an investment which should ultimately provide benefits for the whole prison system if incorporated into a master plan for correctional development across the state.

83 See Appendix 9 of OICS, *Directed Review of the Management of Offenders in Custody*, Report No. 30 (November 2005), 302–313, for a report on projected prisoner populations to 2015.

84 Harding, R., *Greenough Regional Prison - Announced Inspection Exit Debrief* (11 August 2006).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Custody

1. That a Disciplinary Officer is stationed in the medical centre at Greenough Regional Prison during all times prisoners are present. [2.7–2.8]
2. That the Department address the need for safer cells within Greenough Regional Prison's standard accommodation units and, in particular, plan to retrofit multi-occupancy cells in Units 2 and 3. [2.9–2.13]
3. That the position of Greenough Regional Prison's security manager be upgraded and the role expanded to incorporate a wider range of tasks and responsibilities related to security and safety. The management of routine security tasks could be devolved to other security staff, to give scope for a more strategic focus from the redefined security manager position. [2.20–2.21]
4. That the Department implement an appropriate action plan to address identified issues to restore Greenough Regional Prison to a level appropriate for a contemporary medium-security prison. In particular, to consider:
 - a. infrastructure needs, including the technologies and systems that support perimeter security;
 - b. staffing issues, training and procedural enhancements; and
 - c. sustainable management and monitoring procedures to minimise future under-performance.[2.14–2.19]
5. That Greenough Regional Prison undertakes a comprehensive review and update of the emergency response procedures along the lines identified by the Department's security audit. In particular there is a need to:
 - a. ensure sufficient staff are trained in Breathing Apparatus (BA) and First Aid to cover all shift combinations; and
 - b. ensure safe evacuation of all staff and prisoners in the case of fire or other emergency situation.[2.23–2.28]
6. That multiple cameras be installed in the visits areas at Greenough Regional Prison to better prevent contraband transfer into or out of the prison via visit sessions. [2.32]

Care and wellbeing

7. That Greenough Regional Prison develop, pilot and implement a policy regarding the entitlement to a comprehensive range of compensatory measures to offset the dislocation of out-of-country Aboriginal prisoners. The Department should monitor this initiative with a view to application at other relevant prisons. [3.1–3.7]
8. That the provision be made at Greenough Regional Prison for an interview room or area available for admission interviews out of earshot of other prisoners. Generic design standards to address the need for confidentiality during reception processes should be considered for all prisons. [3.11]
9. That the Department address conditions and regimes in Unit 1 at Greenough Regional Prison, to simplify the functions of unit staff and improve general living conditions and amenity of the unit. [3.14–3.16]
10. That the Department review the hierarchical accommodation model and capacity of existing cells and units to match the needs of the population at Greenough Prison, with consideration of the diversity of

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Aboriginal groups in the prison and the aspects of improved accommodation and regimes valued by these prisoners. [3.21–3.24]

11. *That the Department develop of a range of menu options for traditional foods for delivery in the prison system that recognises the diversity within the Aboriginal prisoner population and that meets the requisite health and dietary limitations. [3.30–3.31]*
12. *That the Department fund and support the introduction of an Aboriginal Health Worker service to Greenough Regional Prison. Aboriginal Health Worker positions should also be funded for other custodial facilities in the state, with Broome, Roebourne and Eastern Goldfields prisons as the priority. [3.6 and 3.36]*
13. *That the medication dispensing policy at Greenough Regional Prison be reviewed to provide flexibility to support lunchtime dispensing and later dispensing of night medication for prisoners with an assessed requirement for this. [3.45]*
14. *That the Department provides resources for Greenough Regional Prison’s nursing staff to fill the portfolio needs in the area of Hepatitis C care and treatment, alcohol and other drug issues and mental health. [3.47–3.49]*
15. *That the Greenough Regional Prison review and update the local drug action plan to achieve a comprehensive delivery approach with a balance between reduction of supply, reduction of demand and reduction of harm as outlined in the Department’s Justice Drug Plan (2003). [3.51]*
16. *That Greenough Regional Prison review the provision of information and assistance for prisoners to access complaint resolution processes, to ensure:*
 - a. *accessibility of information appropriate to the diverse population regarding the prisoner grievance process, alternate complaint procedures and external agencies;*
 - b. *assistance is available for prisoners to lodge complaints other than via written means; and*
 - c. *all prison staff are trained in handling prisoner complaints and understand the prisoner grievance process and the role of external complaint agencies. [3.61–3.68]*
17. *That the Department ensure a regular and ongoing Aboriginal Visitors Scheme service to Greenough Regional Prison, with visitors appropriately trained and supported to work within the prison setting. [3.76]*

Rehabilitation

18. *That the Department provide resources to significantly remodel Greenough Regional Prison’s education centre to provide better use of the space available for formal learning activities in the prison. [4.25]*
19. *That the Department resource an additional staff member for Greenough Prison’s education services, to boost the provision of work-based training and women’s education and to promote the profile of education in the prison. [4.26–4.27]*
20. *That more resources be provided for offender services at Greenough Regional Prison to address the delay in treatment assessments and to implement initiatives to reduce staff burnout and improve staff retention. [4.28–4.31]*

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Reparation

21. That the Department establish a work camp for Greenough Regional Prison. [5.19]
22. That the Department review the prisoner assessment processes for eligibility for minimum-security status and Section 94 approval, with a view to restore the capacity of the Section 94 work program in the community. [5.23]

Women's issues

23. That the Department invest in a purpose-built, medium-security facility on the Greenough Regional Prison site for female prisoners, to provide appropriate accommodation and a full range of services to meet the assessment, educational, program and welfare needs of the northern regional women prisoner population, and provide support to the rest of the women's prison estate when required. [6.18–6.23]

Resources and systems

24. That the Department undertake a review of the senior officer promotional process to ascertain the issues delaying the recent round as a matter of urgency, to inform the development of improved promotional rounds in the future. [7.8–7.9]
25. That the Department fund the proposed increase in vocational support officers at Greenough Prison to increase prisoner participation in work activities and accredited skills training. The relief arrangements for such officers should also be reviewed to reduce the loss of quality and output during leave periods. [7.12–7.13]
26. That the Department investigate the development of a managerial position to lead, co-ordinate, support and represent non-custodial services staff (including programs, prisoner counselling services (PCS), education, health and other support services staff) for Greenough Regional Prison. Consideration should also be given to establishing a similar position at other regional prisons. [7.15–7.17]
27. That the Department provide an adequate training budget to improve the provision of and access to training for all of Greenough Regional Prison's staff, including non-custodial and non-security training. [7.18–7.24]
28. That the Department support enhancements to the organisational arrangements for business management and strategic planning at Greenough Regional Prison and other regional prisons to ensure that such prisons are best served by the appropriate levels of skills, experience and training for these critical functions. [7.32–7.36]
29. That the Department consider long-term infrastructure plans to adequately resource Greenough Regional Prison for maintenance works of the existing asset and new works to strengthen the role of Greenough in the prison system. [7.37]
30. That the Department develop and resource Greenough Regional Prison as a management and support base for assessments, program development and program delivery for the northern prisons. [8.2–8.9]
31. That the Department improve recruitment and retention strategies for regional staff. Specifically for Greenough Regional Prison, this would include extending eligibility for a regional incentives package to Greenough staff. [8.11]

Appendix 1

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
Custody and Security	Agree/High
1. That a disciplinary officer is stationed in the medical centre at Greenough Regional Prison during all times prisoners are present.	<p>A review of the staff at Greenough Regional Prison was conducted in 2004 as a part of a comprehensive state-wide review of the Public Prison System.</p> <p>As a result of the review, funding for the staffing complement of Greenough Regional Prison was increased from 99 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) to 115 FTE.</p> <p>One of the positions recommended was that of a Medical Duty Officer. This position is currently being filled by overtime on an as-needs basis.</p> <p>A dedicated officer will be assigned to the role as recruits are trained and allocated according to the Department's priorities of filling vacancies.</p>
Custody and Security	Agree/Low
2. That the Department address the need for safer cells within Greenough Regional Prison's standard accommodation units and, in particular, plan to retrofit multi-occupancy cells in Units 2 and 3.	<p>A Cell Ligation Working Group was formed in 2004 to identify known ligation points and prioritise those points in accordance with past Deaths In Custody statistics. The three ligation points identified as highest priority were cell windows, light fittings and shelving (which accounted for approximately 50 per cent of Deaths In Custody). The next step was to prioritise cells at each prison.</p> <p>Unit 1 was identified as the highest priority at Greenough Prison as this is the unit for receivals/remand of new prisoners and risk assessments are conducted in Unit 1 on new prisoners prior to being placed throughout the prison.</p> <p>Implementation at Greenough is in line with state-wide 5-year program and other competing priorities. Funding secured for 2006–2007 and Capital Works Steering Committee has endorsed funding for five years. Proposed self-harm minimisation schedule for Greenough is:</p> <p>05/06: Unit 1, 23 cells 3 x ligation points 06/07: Unit 1, 18 cells 25 x ligation points 07/08: Unit 2, 20 cells 3 x ligation points</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
	<p>07/08: Unit 3, 24 cells 3 x ligature points 07/08: Unit 3, 2 cells 25 x ligature points 08/09: Unit 4, 2 cells 25 x ligature points 08/09: Unit 5, 2 cells 25 x ligature points 08/09: Unit 5, 21 cells 3 x ligature points 09/10: Unit 4, 36 cells 3 x ligature points. The approved funding of the ligature point removal is \$3 million over five years.</p>
Staffing Issues	Agree/Moderate
<p>3. That the position of Greenough Regional Prison's security manager be upgraded and the role expanded to incorporate a wider range of tasks and responsibilities related to security and safety. The management of routine security tasks could be devolved to other security staff, to give scope for a more strategic focus from the redefined security manager position.</p>	<p>The grade and role of Security Managers is being reviewed on a state-wide basis.</p> <p>The possible upgrade of the Security Manager at Greenough will be consistent with the outcome of the review. At the time of writing, without pre-empting the outcome of the review, the Department is supportive of issues raised in this recommendation.</p>
Custody and Security	Agree in part/Moderate
<p>4. That the Department implement an appropriate action plan to address identified issues to restore Greenough Regional Prison to a level appropriate for a contemporary medium-security prison.</p> <p>In particular, to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. infrastructure needs, including the technologies and systems that support perimeter security; b. staffing issues, training and procedural enhancements; and c. sustainable management and monitoring procedures to minimise future under-performance. 	<p>The Department will implement an action plan that is cognisant of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. the security function is being reviewed in conjunction with the outcome against Recommendation 3. c. operational performance management is being introduced state-wide over the 18 months from January 2007 and will include security performance measures. <p>With regard to point a), as the report text identifies, the issue is one of timely maintenance by qualified personnel. This is a continuous issue facing regional prisons and one the Department of Housing and Works in partnership with DCS works at to minimise downtime or substandard performance.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk/Rating/Response
<p>Custody and Security</p>	<p>Agree/Moderate</p>
<p>5. That Greenough Regional Prison undertakes a comprehensive review and update of the emergency response procedures along the lines identified by the Department's security audit. In particular there is a need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. ensure sufficient staff are trained in Breathing Apparatus (BA) and First Aid to cover all shift combinations; and b. ensure safe evacuation of all staff and prisoners in the case of fire or other emergency situation. 	<p>Emergency procedures are being reviewed state-wide in line with established security standards for maximum-, medium- and minimum-security prisons to ensure consistency across the prison system.</p> <p>This review will include the development at Greenough of procedures in a standard state-wide format and will encompass the issues of Breathing Apparatus training and evacuation procedures raised in the recommendation.</p>
<p>Custody and Security</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p>
<p>6. That multiple cameras be installed in the visits areas at Greenough Regional Prison to better prevent contraband transfer into or out of the prison via visit sessions.</p>	<p>The Department agrees that the present camera coverage is inadequate in the visit areas. Greenough is currently reviewing its future building needs with a view to having a purpose built visits area that meets current standards across the state. The camera issue would be addressed as part of these requirements. However, Greenough Regional Prison is not currently a priority within the long-term Strategic Asset Plan.</p> <p>The functional review of visits and administration will be completed with a scheme and budget estimates prepared by May/June 2007.</p> <p>In the more immediate future, the Department will review the need for cameras in the current building in the context of cost, time and the likely outcome of the long-term Strategic Asset Plan.</p>
<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity</p>	<p>Agree in part/Moderate</p>
<p>7. That Greenough Regional Prison develop, pilot and implement a policy regarding entitlement to a comprehensive range of compensatory measures to offset</p>	<p>The Department is reviewing its management of Aboriginal prisoners across the state to improve services to those held out-of-country in a strategic manner.</p> <p>Part of this review involves the drafting of a philosophy</p>

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk/Rating/Response
<p>the dislocation of out-of-country Aboriginal prisoners. The Department should monitor this initiative with a view to application at other relevant prisons.</p>	<p>addressing what the Inspector's Office has referred to as 'Aboriginal Prisons'. This philosophy will incorporate the Inspector's recommendations, regional prison philosophies developed by the Change Management Teams in each prison and work being done as part of the Regional Custodial Plans.</p> <p>As such, it may not be for Greenough to pilot outcomes of a review that need to be Department-wide and relevant to all regional prisons accommodating Aboriginal prisoners.</p>
<p>Care and Wellbeing</p> <p>8. That the provision be made at Greenough Regional Prison for an interview room or area available for admission interviews out of earshot of other prisoners. Generic design standards to address the need for confidentiality during reception processes should be considered for all prisons.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p> <p>Greenough prison has a holding cell that is quite separate from the initial reception desk. This permits staff to maintain confidentiality at all times during initial reception of a prisoner. The reception room also opens in to the Assistant Superintendent's office which provides additional privacy and confidentiality should additional discussion be required at intake.</p> <p>The functional review of visits and administration incorporates a review of prisoner interview function within reception and will be included in the review of visits and administration scheme and budget estimates prepared by May/June 2007.</p> <p>To go some way to addressing the concerns of the Inspection Team, Greenough will install a cubicle type interview site similar to those used in hospital emergency rooms. While this is not seen as the ideal resolution, this solution can be achieved expediently and incur a minimal cost.</p> <p>General principles for confidentiality, i.e. confidentiality of documents, sensitive and personal information, is considered to be more appropriate during reception rather than generic design standards due to the varied nature of prison infrastructure and processes across the state.</p>

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk/Rating/Response
<p>Care and Wellbeing</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p>
<p>9. That the Department address conditions and regimes in Unit 1 at Greenough Regional Prison, to simplify the functions of unit staff and improve general living conditions and amenity of the unit.</p>	<p>Although the Department agrees with the principle of the recommendation, as the prison is presently structured it would not be feasible to permanently relocate the function of regime management. Unit 1 is the secure unit with the necessary infrastructure to support the management of the regimes and the secure placement of maximum-security prisoners.</p> <p>The placement of medium- and minimum-security prisoners in Unit 1 is driven by bed placement options, i.e. all other beds in the prison are being used.</p> <p>Greenough is currently reviewing the regimens managed in Unit 1. Current initiatives being considered are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prison orientation being completed external of Unit 1 by a designated Officer; • relocation of Basic Supervision regimens to Unit 2; and • the placement of medium and minimum security prisoners into Units 2 and 3 during unlock hours. <p>These initiatives will reduce the work load on Unit 1 staff and also provide additional access to employment and recreational opportunities for prisoners.</p>
<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity</p>	<p>Agree/Low</p>
<p>10. That the Department review the hierarchical accommodation model and capacity of existing cells and units to match the needs of the population at Greenough Regional Prison, with consideration of the diversity of Aboriginal groups in the prison and the aspects of improved accommodation and regimes valued by these prisoners.</p>	<p>The diversity of Indigenous prisoners, in terms of their area of origin, is acknowledged and as far as practicable catered for in relation to where and how a prisoner is housed.</p> <p>The Department will review the hierarchical model at Greenough, in the context of the Review mentioned in Recommendation 7.</p> <p>Possible solutions from the review may include addressing the lack of multi-bed cells in Unit 4 by installing connecting doors between a given number of cells. This option would require a reconstruction of cell furniture.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk/Rating/Response
<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity</p>	<p>Disagree</p>
<p>11. That the Department develop a range of menu options for traditional foods for delivery in the prison system that recognises the diversity within the Aboriginal prisoner population and that meets the requisite health and dietary limitations.</p>	<p>The nature of diverse Indigenous groups, which in the case of Greenough Regional Prison represents a minimum of eight groups, makes it difficult for caterers to service. Each group have their own method of killing, preparing and serving kangaroo depending on the particular region or community.</p> <p>Traditional cooking methods are further hampered by fire bans for up to eight months of the year and the requirement to source traditional foods from accredited suppliers such as 'King River International'.</p> <p>Kangaroo will continue to be served at the current frequency together with an alternate meal for those who choose not to eat kangaroo. A request form will be introduced two days prior to service so that those prisoners requiring kangaroo can be accommodated.</p> <p>Peer support meetings will continue to provide prisoners with the opportunity to have input on menu options. This meeting is attended by the Assistant Superintendent (Prisoner Management).</p> <p>Attempts have been made to engage a local community group to provide and cook food using the traditional methods. However, this was unsuccessful due to lack of conformity with Departmental Health standards around the preparation of food.</p>
<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity</p>	<p>Agree/Low</p>
<p>12. That the Department fund and support the introduction of an Aboriginal Health Worker service to Greenough Regional Prison. Aboriginal Health Worker positions should also be funded for other custodial facilities in the state, with Broome, Roebourne and Eastern Goldfields prisons as the priority.</p>	<p>Health Services annually seek funding for Aboriginal Health Workers. However, this has not been supported to date. Health Services will continue to submit requests for this important service.</p> <p>The regional Aboriginal Medical Service provides additional health care to Aboriginal prisoners if resources are readily available. These services include GP, chronic disease management, dental care, diabetic care and podiatry.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
<p>Health</p> <p>13. That the medication dispensing policy at Greenough Regional Prison be reviewed to provide flexibility to support lunchtime dispensing and later dispensing of night medication for prisoners with an assessed requirement for this.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p> <p>General medication is usually issued once daily, with certain types issued according to prescriptive instructions. The issuing of medication is reviewed on a regular basis to ensure compliance, best practice and patient safety. A review is currently underway with a view to moving to once only daily medication issue for most medications. This recommendation will be taken into account in the review.</p> <p>Blister pack medication issue has improved patient safety and decreased the incidence of contraindications. Where possible, 'keep on person' medication is encouraged (trafficable medications excluded), therefore, diabetics are mostly self-medicating.</p>
<p>Health</p> <p>14. That the Department provides resources for Greenough Regional Prison's nursing staff to fill the portfolio needs in the area of Hepatitis C care and treatment, alcohol and other drug issues and mental health.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p> <p>Health Services annually seek funding for this service, and will continue to do so. However, this has not been supported to date. The services mentioned do not necessarily have to be delivered by nursing staff and can be delivered by other health professionals as is currently the case in the community.</p>
<p>Custody and Security</p> <p>15. That the Greenough Regional Prison review and update the local drug action plan to achieve a comprehensive delivery approach with a balance between reduction of supply, reduction of demand and reduction of harm as outlined in the Department's <i>Justice Drug Plan</i> (2003).</p>	<p>Agree/Low</p> <p>The Department's Drug Plan 2003 was initially funded for four years until 2006–2007 to implement a range of strategies to reduce drug use within the offender population.</p> <p>Discussions regarding an updated drug strategy have commenced and once in progress, new funding submissions will be included.</p> <p>The Local Drug Action Plan (LDAP) is the application at a local level. This was signed off in March 2006. The review of the LDAP will be undertaken at the prison level utilising information from The Drug Strategy Monitoring Report (twice yearly reports on drug related charges, drug testing, program delivery, pharmacotherapy</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
	<p>programs and Drug Free Unit data) to negotiate improved service delivery to reduce drug use at the local level.</p>
Human Rights	Agree/Low
<p>16. That Greenough Regional Prison review the provision of information and assistance for prisoners to access complaint resolution processes, to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. accessibility of information appropriate to the diverse population regarding the prisoner grievance process, alternate complaint procedures and external agencies; b. assistance is available for prisoners to lodge complaints other than via written means; and c. all prison staff are trained in handling prisoner complaints and understand the prisoner grievance process and the role of external complaint agencies. 	<p>Professional Standards Integrity and Compliance, the Division responsible for grievance/ complaints handling is addressing the issues identified by OICS via a Complaints Administration Centre (CAC) to manage prisoner grievances.</p> <p>The CAC is in the process of establishing a Complaints Handling Management Information System, together with a telephone system which will enable prisoners to call the centre with their complaint via a dedicated number. Consideration is currently being given to the introduction of a 1300Complaints or 1800Complaints telephone number.</p> <p>A video specifically for the Indigenous prisoner population is planned for production as part of a communication strategy developed in consultation with Public Affairs. These systems and videos will be piloted in a regional prison prior to full implementation and devolution.</p> <p>Posters, brochures and information sheets are to be produced and consideration will be given to these being printed in languages other than English.</p> <p>Ongoing training as conducted by the Prisoner Grievance Co-ordinator will be continuous throughout all prisons.</p>
Racism, Aboriginality and Equity	Agree/Low
<p>17. That the Department ensure a regular and ongoing Aboriginal Visitors Scheme service to Greenough Regional Prison, with visitors appropriately trained and supported to work within the prison setting.</p>	<p>Recruitment and retention of Aboriginal Visitors Scheme (AVS) staff has proven to be difficult in regional areas. As of February 2007, AVS will move under the umbrella of Offender Management and Professional Developments, which will alleviate training and support issues at a Departmental level.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
	<p>AVS are considered a valued service at Greenough. To assist in the delivery of the service, Greenough currently provides the following support to AVS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to all areas under the escort of the Prisoner Support Officer twice weekly; • attendance at PRAG and Vulnerable and Disturbed meetings on Tuesday and Thursday; • a prison induction and issue with DCS ID Tags; • daily access to the ASPM; • office area to conduct private prisoner interviews when required; and • gate-keeper [suicide prevention] training. <p>In addition Greenough is now provided with a service four days per week and AVS staffing currently meets the requirements of the prison, which may not have been the case during the inspection in August 2006.</p>
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>18. That the Department provide resources to significantly remodel Greenough Regional Prison's education centre to provide better use of the space available for formal learning activities in the prison.</p>	<p>Agree/Low</p> <p>The Offender Services Capital Works Business Case has been submitted to the Corporate Executive Team (CET). This includes funding submissions to upgrade education and vocational training and program support infrastructure at Greenough Regional Prison.</p> <p>The Department's 10-year capital investment program includes an item for a state-wide program of works for Education and Programs commencing 2010–2011 with an ETC of \$13.98 million.</p>
<p>Staffing Issues</p> <p>19. That the Department resource an additional staff member for Greenough Regional Prison's education services, to boost the provision of work-based training and women's education and to promote the profile of education in the prison.</p>	<p>Agree/Low</p> <p>The 2006–2007 budget allocation to the Department's Education and Vocational Training Unit (EVTU) does not support any FTE increase.</p> <p>The 2007–08 submission will include additional EVTU FTE increases. Greenough will be included in the submission request.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
<p>Staffing Issues</p> <p>20. That more resources be provided for offender services at Greenough Regional Prison to address the delay in treatment assessments and to implement initiatives to reduce staff burnout and improve staff retention.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Moderate</p> <p>The workload and efficiency of offender services delivery at Greenough will be examined before a commitment to an additional resource at this particular site is made. The ability to redistribute some metropolitan Offender Services human resources to regional areas is currently under examination.</p> <p>As an interim measure for Greenough, Offender Services has sent metropolitan staff to Greenough to assist in reducing the backlog of assessment. The review will dictate whether this should be an ongoing arrangement.</p>
<p>Reparation</p> <p>21. That the Department establish a work camp for Greenough Regional Prison.</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The current state-wide population profile results in under-utilisation of the already existing work camps throughout the state.</p> <p>The Section 94 work at Greenough has been very successful and is felt to be adequate for the region.</p> <p>The situation will be monitored in accordance with the outcome of the review of work camp eligibility criteria.</p>
<p>Reparation</p> <p>22. That the Department review the prisoner assessment processes for eligibility for minimum-security status and Section 94 approval, with a view to restore the capacity of the Section 94 work program in the community.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Moderate</p> <p>The Department is reviewing the criteria for Section 94 and workcamp eligibility. The outcome of the review may include the restoration of Section 94 capacity; however, the overall objective is one of general management.</p> <p>The Prisons Amendment Act to be proclaimed includes a significant expansion of Absence Permits. Included in this is the streamlining of Section 94 suitability and the inclusion of workcamps as a minimum-security facility.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk/Rating/Response
<p>Care and Wellbeing</p> <p>23. That the Department invest in a purpose-built, medium-security facility on the Greenough Regional Prison site for female prisoners, to provide appropriate accommodation and a full range of services to meet the assessment, educational, program and welfare needs of the northern regional women prisoner population, and provide support to the rest of the women's prison estate when required.</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The Department promotes the principle that Women's Precincts be located at regional prisons and that these precincts provide the full range of services to meet the needs of women accommodated there.</p> <p>At this stage, Greenough Prison has the most up to date Women's Unit of all the regional prisons. As planning for the Kimberley and Eastern Goldfields prisons progresses, greater clarity around when we can examine enhancing Greenough will emerge.</p>
<p>Staffing Issues</p> <p>24. That the Department undertake a review of the senior officer promotional process to ascertain the issues delaying the recent round as a matter of urgency, to inform the development of improved promotional rounds in the future.</p>	<p>Agree/High</p> <p>A review of the current senior officer promotion process has been implemented and is due for completion by the end of March 2007.</p> <p>The Department has committed to modernising and formalising the new process as soon as practicable.</p>
<p>Staffing Issues</p> <p>25. That the Department fund the proposed increase in vocational support officers at Greenough Regional Prison to increase prisoner participation in work activities and accredited skills training. The relief arrangements for such officers should also be reviewed to reduce the loss of quality and output during leave periods.</p>	<p>Agree/Low</p> <p>The Department has committed to the implementation of all the staffing review positions identified in the 2004 staffing review, taking the staffing compliment at Greenough to 115.</p> <p>Vocational support officers were not considered as part of the original staffing review. They were deemed to be less of a priority than the disciplinary staff as there would have to be significant infrastructure cost and capital expenditure to facilitate the new positions. Other positions could be increased without the cost and better fulfilled the needs of the Department in managing the higher prisoner muster.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
	<p>Three new vocational support officer positions have since been identified for Greenough Regional Prison. However, these positions do not form part of the 115 and therefore will be activated as funding becomes available.</p> <p>The Regional Prisons Directorate has committed to continue to monitor the vocational support officer requirements of all regional prisons.</p>
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>26. That the Department investigates the development of a managerial position to lead, co-ordinate, support and represent non-custodial services staff (including programs, prisoner counselling services (PCS), education, health and other support services staff) for Greenough Regional Prison. Consideration should also be given to establishing a similar position at other regional prisons.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p> <p>Offender Services is reviewing positions available across the state in assessments, treatment and counselling services. Depending on the outcome of the review and if resources become available, consideration will be given to a managerial position at Greenough.</p> <p>In the meantime, Offender Services Co-ordinator positions are being established to represent each site; however, this may not mean a managerial position located at each site. These positions will report to the existing Level 7 Manager, Offender Services (Regional).</p>
<p>Staffing Issues</p> <p>27. That the Department provide an adequate training budget to improve the provision of and access to training for all of Greenough Regional Prison's staff, including non-custodial and non-security training.</p>	<p>Agree/Moderate</p> <p>The Satellite Staff Development Service project (M136a), provides funding for a full-time Staff Development Officer (SDO) at Greenough Prison. The project has an anticipated start date of 1 June 2007. The SDO will have responsibility for coordinating and facilitating training, education and professional development for all staff; existing staff may also be trained to supplement training delivery where required.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2006 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level Risk/Rating/Response
<p>Administration and Accountability</p> <p>28. That the Department support enhancements to the organisational arrangements for business management and strategic planning at Greenough Regional Prison and other regional prisons to ensure that such prisons are best-served by the appropriate levels of skills, experience and training for these critical functions.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p> <p>The review mentioned in Recommendation 3 is not limited to security staff, but is intended to scrutinise the numbers, grading and organisation of management teams in all prisons to ensure they are able to best discharge their responsibilities. The review will encompass but is not limited to the issues raised in this recommendation.</p>
<p>Correctional Value-For-Money</p> <p>29. That the Department consider long-term infrastructure plans to adequately resource Greenough Regional Prison for maintenance works of the existing asset and new works to strengthen the role of Greenough in the prison system.</p>	<p>Agree/Moderate</p> <p>Long-term infrastructure plans will consider undertaking maintenance works of the existing asset (in addition to those supplied at the time of the Inspection) and new works when the outcome of the Department's Strategic Asset Plan funding submission is known.</p>
<p>Correctional Value-For-Money</p> <p>30. That the Department develop and resource Greenough Regional Prison as a management and support base for assessments, program development and program delivery for the northern prisons.</p>	<p>Agree in part/Low</p> <p>Initial consideration suggests that there will be limited benefits in relocating these functions. However, the Department will undertake a review of the viability of developing Greenough Prison as a management and support base for assessments and programs.</p>
<p>Staffing Issues</p> <p>31. That the Department improve recruitment and retention strategies for regional staff. Specifically for Greenough Regional Prison, this would include extending eligibility for a regional incentives package to Greenough staff.</p>	<p>Agree/High</p> <p>Recruitment for all regional prisons is a priority for the DCS and has been a central issue in EBA discussions.</p> <p>A project tasked with the restructuring of the Department's recruitment and retention processes has been approved and will commence in February 2007.</p> <p>The identification of Greenough Regional Prison as a regional incentive prison is being discussed by the 2007 Prison Officer EBA Steering Committee.</p>

Appendix 2

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2003 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	Recommendation/Duration	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
1.	<p>Staffing issues/Long-term</p> <p>The Department should demonstrate a more robust commitment to regional prison capacity building through infrastructure and staff deployments. For Greenough Prison the point of balance between its ability to fully develop into a regional custodial service provider and its capacity to contribute to the total prison system needs to be articulated. In this regard, the staff deployments and related regional posting conditions, as well as specific training and development requirements, should be a central consideration.</p>			•		
2.	<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity/Medium-term</p> <p>The Department should develop systems to monitor the extent to which prisoners are outside their normal region and implement strategies to address this to the greatest extent possible. For Greenough Prison, monitoring the diversity of the population with a view to facilitating the transfer of prisoner groups close to their home communities should be a priority.</p>			•		
3.	<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity/Long-term</p> <p>Appropriately resource the actions described in the Aboriginal Strategic Plan. For Greenough Prison Key Objectives 4 and 6 have particular relevance.</p>		•			
4.	<p>Administration and Accountability/Short-term</p> <p>Greenough Prison should improve and clarify protocols with the police, fire and emergency services and the ambulance services. There are also opportunities for other regional prisons to do likewise.</p>			•		
5.	<p>Administration and Accountability/Medium-term</p> <p>The Department should develop a better performance monitoring and reporting framework, especially for care and wellbeing and rehabilitation and resettlement service outputs. The management team at Greenough Prison should draft local indicators having regard to the diverse prison population.</p>		•			

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2003
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	Recommendation/Duration	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
6.	<p>Health/Short-term</p> <p>The Department should establish adequate on-call arrangements for Prison Health Services. This is an urgent matter for Greenough Prison, but prompts the need for a review of the arrangements at all other locations.</p>		•			
7.	<p>Care and Wellbeing/Short-term</p> <p>The Department should conduct a state-wide review of all prisons to remove or modify identified ligature anchor points in accommodation cells to improve prisoner safety. The work already identified at Greenough Prison should be attended to as a matter of high priority.</p>			•		
8.	<p>Care and Wellbeing/Short-term</p> <p>The Greenough local management should better explain the procurement of catering supplies, including the production of meat products, to prisoners as a part of health promotion services. This particular Greenough Prison situation may also arise at other prisons.</p>				•	
9.	<p>Health/Short-term</p> <p>The Department and local management should audit the impact that the non-availability of transport has on the delivery of dental and other medical services. There are state-wide implications arising from the Greenough situation that should be taken up by the Court Security and Custodial Services Contract Manager.</p>		•			
10.	<p>Health/Short-term</p> <p>The Department should conduct appropriate staff training for all relevant staff in alcohol and other drugs issues. Priority should be given to regional prisons in view of the potential flow-on implications for country health services in emergency situations.</p>		•			
11.	<p>Reparation/Long-term</p> <p>The Department should expand Work Camps and outstation initiatives. Greenough Prison should actively work towards establishing a Work Camp.</p>	•				

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2003
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	Recommendation/Duration	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
12.	<p>Care and Wellbeing/Short-term</p> <p>The Department should establish standards relating to family and community contact for prisoners outside their normal regions. This should include, but not be limited to, temporary transfer for visits and officer-initiated (free) calls. Greenough Prison should establish local operational procedures within the current arrangements as an interim response while a state-wide policy framework is being established.</p>		•			
13.	<p>Rehabilitation/Short-term</p> <p>The Department should audit the nature and quality of treatment and development programs provided at each prison to ensure equity and access. The current program structure at Greenough Prison requires urgent attention.</p>		•			
14.	<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity/Medium-term</p> <p>The Department should develop a strategic framework to guide service improvement for women in regional prisons. Greenough Prison should be assisted to address the range of urgent operational deficits canvassed in this Report, including the full closure of Unit 3 and the appropriate integration of regimes within the prison.</p>		•			
15.	<p>Rehabilitation/Medium-term</p> <p>The Department should revitalise and appropriately resource offender programs and family contact services (also see Recommendations 2 and 13). Greenough Prison should develop a business case to identify any resourcing impediments to delivering need-based offender programs and family contact services.</p>		•			
16.	<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity/Short-term</p> <p>The Department should develop a more strategic approach in the management of foreign nationals, including for religious practice, culture and diet. Some of the more operational aspects of this recommendation are reflected in Recommendation 8.</p>			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2003
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	Recommendation/Duration	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
17.	<p>Administration and Accountability/Medium-term</p> <p>The Department should develop a system-wide change management strategy to carry forward various operational initiatives, and to address relationship management at a local, prison to Head Office and community level. Greenough Prison should directly address those local matters raised in this Report, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a local communications strategy; • take greater responsibility for supervision of Departmental staff; • document and report operational risks and develop local costed strategies; and • consult more widely with community representatives and agencies. 		•			

Appendix 3

THE INSPECTION TEAM

Professor Richard Harding	Inspector of Custodial Services
Mr Bob Stacey	Deputy Inspector of Custodial Services
Ms Kati Kraszlan	Manager Inspections and Research
Ms Fiona Paskulich	Inspections and Research Officer
Mr John Acres	Inspections and Research Officer
Mr Cliff Holdom	Inspections and Research Officer
Ms Kate Hitchins	Inspections and Research Officer
Mr Trevor Collins	Inspections and Research Officer (Seconded from the Department of Corrective Services)
Mr Joseph Wallam	Community Liaison Officer
Ms Cheryl Wiltshire	Expert Adviser (Department of Education and Training)
Ms Dace Tomsons	Expert Adviser (Drug and Alcohol Office)
Dr Steve Patchett	Expert Adviser (Department of Health)
Dr Inez Dussuyer	Expert Adviser (State Ombudsman's Office, Victoria)

Appendix 4

KEY DATES

Formal notification of announced inspection	13 April 2006
Pre-inspection community consultation	18 July 2006
Start of on-site phase	6 August 2006
Completion of on-site phase	11 August 2006
Inspection exit debrief	11 August 2006
Draftreport sent to the Department of Corrective Services	14 December 2006
Draft report returned by the Department of Corrective Services	2 February 2007
Declaration of prepared report	4 May 2007



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR
OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

www.custodialinspector.wa.gov.au

Level 27, 197 St George's Terrace, Perth, Western Australia, Australia 6000
Telephone: +61 8 9212 6200 Facsimile: +61 8 9226 4616