



REPORT OF AN ANNOUNCED INSPECTION
OF CASUARINA PRISON

68

SEPTEMBER
2010

*Independent oversight
that contributes to a more
accountable public sector.*



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR
OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

**Report of an Announced Inspection
of Casuarina Prison**

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

www.oics.wa.gov.au

September 2010

ISSN 1445-3134

**This report is available on the Office's website
and will be made available, upon request,
in alternate formats.**



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

Contents

THE INSPECTOR'S OVERVIEW	
CASUARINA PRISON: MAXIMUM SECURITY BUT MULTI-PURPOSE.....	iii
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	vii
FACT PAGE.....	xiii
CHAPTER 1	
CASUARINA PRISON: 2007-2010 IN BRIEF.....	1
The Inspection - A Thematic Approach	2
CHAPTER 2	
THE EXPANSION OF CASUARINA PRISON.....	4
Statewide Expansion Plans	4
Building to Meet a Budget, or Building to Meet a Need?.....	7
CHAPTER 3	
MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	11
Budget Planning.....	11
Management and Leadership.....	12
Human Resource Management.....	14
Security and Emergency Management.....	21
Sustainability.....	22
CHAPTER 4	
PRISONER MANAGEMENT.....	24
Staff/Prisoner Relationships.....	24
Discipline and Punishment.....	29
The Multi-Purpose, Special Purpose and Special Handling Units	30
Protection prisoners.....	32
Minimum Security Prisoners.....	34
CHAPTER 5	
OFFENDER SERVICES.....	35
Structural Framework	35
CHAPTER 6	
WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO PRISONERS.....	41
Maintaining Family and Community Connections	41
Food	45
Prisoner Purchases	45
Recreation	46
CHAPTER 7	
ABORIGINAL PRISONERS	49
General	49

Aboriginal Prisoner Employment.....	50
Aboriginal Education.....	51
Food.....	51
Peer Support.....	52
Aboriginal Visitors' Scheme.....	52
Cultural Centre.....	53
Unit 1.....	54
Displaced Aboriginal Program.....	55
CHAPTER 8	
DOING TIME OR USING TIME?.....	57
Sentence Management and Case Management.....	57
Casuarina as a Releasing Prison.....	59
Prisoner Employment.....	61
Education and Training.....	66
CHAPTER 9	
HEALTH SERVICES.....	69
Organisational Structure.....	69
Background to the Inspection of Health Services at Casuarina.....	69
Clinical Assessment, Care Planning, and Information Management.....	71
Access.....	72
Mental Health.....	73
Alcohol and Substance Abuse.....	74
Aboriginal Health Care.....	75
Dental Services.....	76
Pharmacy.....	76
The Infirmary.....	77
Summary and Recommendations.....	78
APPENDIX 1	
THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2010 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	80
APPENDIX 2	
SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	85
APPENDIX 3	
THE INSPECTION TEAM.....	90
APPENDIX 4	
KEY DATES.....	91
APPENDIX 5	
ACRONYMS.....	92

The Inspector's Overview

CASUARINA PRISON: MAXIMUM SECURITY BUT MULTI-PURPOSE

PRESSURE OF NUMBERS

This is the report of an announced inspection of Casuarina Prison which took place in April 2010. At the time, Casuarina held around 694 prisoners. Although this is just under its official 'operational capacity' of 700,ⁱ this should not obscure the true extent of the overcrowding and the pressures this was generating for staff, prisoners and management.

Casuarina's 'design capacity' – the number of people for whom the cells were purpose built just over 20 years ago – is only 397. Until 2009 design capacity provided the key measure of official prison capacity and overcrowding was measured by the extent to which the number of prisoners exceeded design capacity. In mid-2009, when the prison population was rising rapidly, the Department of Corrective Services introduced a new Policy Directive governing prison beds and the term 'operational capacity' came into official use. The operational capacity includes all bunk beds or other beds that have been installed to accommodate increased numbers (but not the mattresses on floors that are found in some prisons).ⁱⁱ Thus, whilst Casuarina was operating just below its full operational capacity, it was in fact very overcrowded. Around 80 per cent of its prisoners were living in cells at double their design capacity.ⁱⁱⁱ

STAFF, MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

It is a great credit to management and staff that these pressures have been well-managed. Casuarina houses a complex mix of prisoners but the prison appeared both secure and relatively settled. Prisoners were often frustrated at the level of overcrowding but were generally accepting of their situation and understood that staff shared many of their concerns. The Inspectorate was impressed with staff professionalism, passion and pragmatism under pressure. However, staff were frustrated by the fact that investment in other supporting infrastructure had not kept pace with the increased number of beds and at perceived communication issues with management and head office. They were also concerned about the potential impact of two soon to be built accommodation units with a combined capacity of 256 prisoners.

This office has consistently placed on record its objections to double bunking and its concerns that it is becoming a norm across much of the prison system. At the time of our previous inspection in July 2007, double-bunking was already in train at Casuarina. However, that inspection did conclude that Casuarina was better placed to handle an increased population (then projected to be 580–600) than the State's other secure prisons because a stable, experienced and well-resourced management team was in place. Unfortunately, at this inspection the management team was not so stable, with a number

i The operational capacity and the design capacity of every prison in the state can be viewed at <http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au/prisons/prison-locations>

ii For example, Bandyup Women's Prison has been holding around 265 prisoners. Its design capacity is 183 and its operational capacity is virtually identical (184). The extra 80 women have been sleeping on mattresses on the floor of cells, generally in the more impoverished sections of the prison.

iii In round figures, the design capacity is 400 and the operational capacity is 700. This means that around 300 out of 400 cells are double bunked. Those 300 cells, at full capacity, will house 600 prisoners (85 per cent of an operational capacity of 700).

of senior managers on leave and the majority, including the Superintendent, in acting positions. The inspection also concluded that there was considerable room for improvement in communication between members of the management team, between management and staff at the prison and between head office and the prison.

ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION UNITS

Casuarina is one of a number of major prison expansion sites and is to have two new accommodation units. Each unit will consist of 64 double-bunked cells, giving a total of 256 (2 x 128) new beds. At the time of the inspection there seemed to be a very real prospect that Casuarina would grow fairly quickly from 700 prisoners to 900 or more. However, the number of male prisoners in Western Australia has dropped by around 180 since the Casuarina inspection.^{iv} Numbers are projected to rise again in the future but the lower number, coupled with the opening of new accommodation at a number of sites, should afford some breathing space. At Casuarina and other prisons, subject to funding, this should give an opportunity to address some of the existing infrastructure deficits and to ensure there is adequate infrastructure for the new prisoners.

For example, at Casuarina it should be possible for some prisoners to move into the new units, to return some of the existing units to single occupancy, and to address any infrastructure issues in the older cells. One of the priorities should be improving the designs of the double bunks, many of which have poor access and pose a risk of injury.^v However, the small size of the cells – never designed for double bunks – is problematic.

MAXIMUM SECURITY OR MULTI-PURPOSE?

Casuarina Prison is officially described as ‘the main maximum-security prison for male prisoners – particularly long-term prisoners – in Western Australia. Surrounded by a range of state-of-the-art security devices, the prison has a special unit for intensive, high-security supervision of offenders.’^{vi} At first sight, this description, viewed alongside Casuarina’s growing prisoner numbers, may conjure up alarming images of a prison and a prison system bulging at the seams with more and more very high risk prisoners.

The truth is somewhat different. Casuarina obviously does hold a significant number of prisoners who present as an escape risk or a serious management problem. However, at the time of the inspection, only 130 (less than 19 per cent) of its prisoners were actually rated maximum security. It was striking that almost as many (115) were rated minimum security and the balance (around 65 per cent) were medium security. This raises some interesting challenges given that the prison is going through such a large expansion. If Casuarina does expand to around 900 prisoners, it is very likely that the proportion of maximum security

iv The number of female prisoners has been rising at a much faster rate than men for many years. In the period from August 2008, the number of female prisoners has risen from around 280 to over 400 (an increase of over 40 per cent) and the number of male prisoners has increased from around 3575 to 4300 (an increase of 20 per cent). The current expansion plans have focused almost entirely on male prisoners and the women’s prison estate is therefore facing very serious pressures (see also footnote ii).

v This issue was also raised in Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services (OICS), *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 66 (June 2010).

vi See <http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au/prisons/prison-locations/casuarina>

prisoners will drop and that the number of medium and minimum security prisoners will rise. In other words, it will increasingly become a multi-purpose facility.

In addition to Casuarina, the State's two other main maximum security prisons (Hakea and Albany) are also being expanded. There are some obvious attractions in expanding maximum security facilities in that they can house prisoners of all classifications. But there are costs attached to routinely housing prisoners who do not need a maximum security placement in a maximum security facility. These costs are both financial (the costs involved in security and in prisoner management within the prison are likely to be higher) and systemic (prisoners will spend longer in a less positive environment, with less capacity for self-development). With such a high concentration of maximum security places, prisoners will also have less capacity to move to the lower security facilities for which they have been assessed as suitable.

OUT OF COUNTRY, OUT OF PLACE

Casuarina houses a large number of Aboriginal men from remote and regional parts of the State, especially the Kimberley. This has numerous consequences for the men – many of whom are not rated maximum security – and also for the prison. The men are geographically, culturally and socially isolated, and long to be returned to a prison closer to home. For its part, the prison, being so far from the regions, cannot readily access the culturally relevant services and family/community supports that would be more readily available if the men were still 'in country'.

At the time of the 2007 inspection, in recognition of the fact that many Aboriginal prisoners would remain 'out of country' because of the lack of regional beds, Casuarina was developing a model for a Displaced Aboriginal Prisoner program (DAP). The aim was to provide an opportunity for the displaced men to live together, to maintain cultural connections and to undertake culturally relevant education and training. Construction of the new West Kimberley Regional Prison in Derby is due to be completed at the end of 2011. However, even when it is fully operational, there will probably still be a significant number of out of country men at Casuarina. This inspection found scope for the aims, objectives and content of the DAP program – and for services for out of country Aboriginal men generally – to be revisited and reinvigorated.

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE MONITORING

This report contains 14 recommendations and the Department has expressed support for all of them. In the majority of cases, it has also said that the recommendations reflect 'existing departmental initiatives'. This is a new type of response from the Department, rather different from the traditional responses of 'supported', 'supported in part', 'supported in principle' or 'not supported'.

To date, the Department has provided only limited supporting documentation with respect to the impact of these existing initiatives and no detail about the nature of the initiatives or the timeframes for implementation. However, the fact that the recommendations are not

only supported but are already being pursued will allow this Office to monitor and assess their outcomes closely. Details of the initiatives, the outcomes being sought, the associated policies and time for implementation will be followed up with the Department on a regular basis and assessment against progress tracked.

Neil Morgan
Inspector of Custodial Services
24 August 2010

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The fourth announced inspection of Casuarina Prison commenced on Sunday 18 April and concluded on Thursday 29 April 2010. Of particular concern at Casuarina's last inspection in 2007 was the burgeoning population and the impacts of overcrowding. However, the then Inspector, Professor Richard Harding, expressed the view that because of its well resourced and stable senior management team, Casuarina was better placed than any other prison to cope with the challenges of a growing population.^{vii}

In the meantime, the population has continued to mushroom, and significantly exacerbated the problems which were becoming obvious in 2007. These included overcrowding and double-bunking in cells designed for single occupancy, unemployment and under-employment, an ailing infrastructure, and services (including programs, health, and education) and non-custodial staffing levels, which had not kept pace with the increased prisoner numbers.

Unfortunately, the stable management team that had been so well placed to deal with such issues had become somewhat fractured. In addition, Casuarina faced the challenge and uncertainty of a major expansion. An additional 256 prisoners were to be accommodated in two new units scheduled for completion in September 2010.

The inspection was focused, therefore, on gaining an understanding of the extent to which overcrowding was impacting upon the prison's operations, including its statewide services, and performance. The Inspectorate was also keen to understand the Department's plans for the additional 256 prisoners, in addition to the new accommodation units.

The inspection found a number of matters requiring attention. These and associated recommendations are outlined below.

It is important to emphasise that in identifying such matters and in making associated recommendations, we are not failing to recognise how well management, staff and prisoners have coped in such challenging conditions. Detailed descriptions are provided throughout this report. That the last three years have passed without major incident is testament to their tenacity and a major logistical achievement in itself. Having said that, the Department of Corrective Services is committed to continuous improvement and aims for its success to be measured in terms of positive, not negative, indicators. Our recommendations are made to that end.

PLANNING FOR THE EXPANSION

This Office has expressed concern for some time that for reasons of decency and safety, double-bunking – that is, the installation of a bunk bed in order to accommodate two prisoners in a cell designed for one – should not become the norm in Western Australian prisons. In order to accommodate the increased prisoner numbers, most cells at Casuarina have been double-bunked. The Department of Corrective Services has indicated that its expansion of accommodation at Casuarina aims to ease the requirement to double-bunk.^{viii} This would be a positive development.

vii OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) iii.

viii Department of Corrective Services (DCS) pre-inspection submission.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Meanwhile, however, there are at least three different types of bunks installed in single cells at Casuarina, the majority of which will continue to be used even when the new units have been commissioned. The safety of these bunks does not appear to have been comprehensively evaluated, thus potentially posing a major risk to prisoners and the Department. Fortunately, in response to a recommendation made in the recent Greenough Regional Prison report,^{ix} the Department has committed to conduct a full risk assessment of all double-bunk designs across the whole prison estate and to undertake such modifications as are necessary to minimise the risk of injuries. This report does not, therefore, repeat the same recommendation but we will continue to draw attention to bunk designs at all sites as necessary.

Although approval for two new units to accommodate the additional 256 prisoners had been secured, little information was available regarding the confirmed approval of plans and resources for associated infrastructure, staffing, and local and statewide service needs. Furthermore, the plans focused primarily on the projected new 256 prisoners, not on bridging the human, physical and financial resource deficiencies, which had grown incrementally over time as the population had risen.

Recommendation 1

Advise Casuarina management and staff about the additional resources which will be provided to expand the infrastructure, staffing levels, and service provision to meet Casuarina's obligations to all its prisoners.^x

MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Since Casuarina's last inspection in 2007 a performance appraisal process, the Performance Assessment Development System (PADS), has been implemented across the prison estate. This Office had been hopeful that the introduction of a formal system of performance appraisal would go some way to breaking down a culture in which allegations of bullying were common. Within such a framework, the risk that providing constructive criticism and lawful instruction be confused with intimidation is minimised.

However, there is no training component to the PADS and therefore when performance deficits are identified there is no facility within the system to identify and prioritise an employee's training needs. Furthermore, and somewhat paradoxically, the PADS has resulted in an increased fear on the part of supervising staff of accusations of bullying. Staff felt that they would be called to account if they scored an employee high or low; as such, they tended to give an average score to all.

ix OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 66 (June 2010) 45.

x At a liaison visit conducted 1 July 2010, the Superintendent was still unable to provide confirmation of approved plans to expand the infrastructure, staffing levels, and service provision to meet Casuarina's obligations to all its prisoners.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 2

In order to inspire confidence of all staff in the Performance Assessment Development System it should be reviewed and revised to ensure that (1) it facilitates accurate assessment of performance; and (2) it facilitates the identification of employee training needs and accordingly ensures provision of the requisite training.

Very little progress has been made in the area of sustainability since the last inspection. Prison management attributed its faltered progress to a lack of dedicated funding and mounting population pressures.

Recommendation 3

Consistent with the intent of the Department's key business philosophies underpinning its strategic plan,^{xi} Casuarina Prison should explore and develop alternative, innovative strategies to demonstrably reduce the impact of its activities upon the environment. Where necessary, it may be appropriate for the Department to provide additional resources for this purpose.

ABORIGINAL PRISONERS

Commonly, almost 50 per cent of Casuarina's prisoners are Aboriginal, with a significant proportion (60 per cent during the inspection) being held 'out of country'. In view of these high numbers, the inspection findings in relation to Aboriginal prisoners were particularly disappointing. They included:

- proportionately higher levels of unemployment and under employment;
- a lack of ongoing cultural awareness training for staff;
- a diet familiar to prisoners not being routinely or regularly provided;
- resources in the form of an Aboriginal Education Worker not being allocated in proportion to the numbers of prisoners at Casuarina;
- 'out of country' prisoners in Unit 1 lacking an accessible cultural space in which they felt comfortable; and
- the Displaced Aboriginal Prisoners (DAP) program having limited coverage and not delivering on stated intentions. Questions also arose as to the relevance of parts of the program to the participants. Significantly, its aims, objectives, and content had not been reviewed or revised since its inception.

Recommendation 4

Using a consultative approach, the Department and the Prison should develop and implement a detailed strategy with measurable outcomes, for the culturally appropriate management of all Aboriginal prisoners.^{xii} Consultation could involve volunteers and elders, Prison Support Officers, Aboriginal Visitor Scheme staff, and the Coordinator Aboriginal Services.

xi Department of Corrective Services (DCS) *Strategic Plan 2008-2011*: 'We will fulfill our corporate social responsibility by contributing to community well-being through our service activities and by taking responsibility for the impact of our activities on clients, staff, the community, and other stakeholders, as well as the environment.'

xii Issues to be addressed could include but should not be limited to those outlined above.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 5

Review the aims, objectives and content of the DAP program and revise the program accordingly.

RELEASE PLANNING

One of Casuarina's key functions has become that of a releasing prison. However, prisoners from regional areas (predominantly Aboriginal) were particularly disadvantaged in relation to release planning. Part of the problem was one identified in 2007^{xiii} and not addressed by the Department – that prisoners are being transferred back to their home locations only at the last possible chance prior to release. This potentially sets prisoners up to fail as they have few supports upon release.

Recommendation 6

The Department and Casuarina work together to put better systems and resources in place for the release planning and re-entry into the community of displaced prisoners. In particular, where security allows, displaced prisoners should be given more opportunity to spend more time at a prison closer to home before release.

PRISONER EMPLOYMENT

The inspection found that an extensive range of prisoner employment is established. However, while some adjustments to staffing arrangements have been made during the last three years, the industry infrastructure is still reflective of the original design capacity. As a result, almost a quarter of prisoners have no structured daytime activity, and half of those who have a job are under-employed.

This situation looks set to worsen: provision is being made to accommodate a further 256 prisoners. However, no human resource or infrastructure plans to increase Casuarina's employment capacity have yet been approved.

Recommendation 7

In order to address the problem of unemployment and under-employment the Department should:

- 1) ensure all eligible prisoners at Casuarina are offered full-time, meaningful employment and/or skill development activity; and*
- 2) review and realign its employment and skill development activity at Casuarina to ensure an optimal balance between safety, improving the employment prospects of prisoners, offsetting the costs of imprisonment and benefiting the community.*

PRISONER EDUCATION

Since 2007, notwithstanding the continued population increases and a lagging infrastructure, the education program has been modified to increase access to more students. Services are prioritised for those prisoners who are trainees, who are nearing release, and those with very

xiii OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 66.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

low literacy. This is a sensible though a short term unsustainable approach to managing restricted resources.

A range of vocational courses is offered. However, much of the training offered is restricted to safety units. This concentration of single unit delivery masks the level of vocational training offered in most areas and is limited in terms of building skills for employment.

This situation looks set to worsen: provision is being made to accommodate a further 256 prisoners. However, no human resource or infrastructure plans to increase Casuarina's education capacity have yet been approved.

Recommendation 8

Implement a human resource management and infrastructure plan that will ensure that all eligible prisoners are offered education and training that is relevant, is evenly weighted across a range of employment skills, and can substantively benefit prisoners in terms of skill development and employability upon release.

HEALTH SERVICES

Health services staff were demonstrably committed and professional. Resourcing arrangements for health services were wholly inadequate and although staff's commitment compensated to some extent, this was not sustainable.

Impacts of this lack of resourcing were noted in the areas of clinical assessment and care planning, staff training, information management, access to services, mental health, alcohol and substance abuse, Aboriginal health care, dental services, pharmacy, and the infirmary.

In bridging the resourcing gaps, which have developed over years of prisoner population increases, and in planning for the resources needed for the additional 256 prisoners, careful health service planning is essential. The Department's planning for Casuarina will also need to take into account the role that its health service will continue to play across the wider estate.

The Inspectorate's view is that four distinct service areas are required: an infirmary for sick prisoners; a dedicated mental health unit managed by dedicated mental health clinical staff; an outpatients clinic; and a geriatric and long-term care unit.

At a strategic level and in order to progress such developments, it is recommended that the Department undertake the following:

Recommendation 9

Develop a staffing model that (1) is based on prisoners' evidenced health needs; (2) facilitates collaborative working between disciplines and continuity of prisoner-patient care; (3) provides options for career progression; and (4) provides comprehensive and ongoing professional development.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 10

In view of Casuarina's statewide obligation to provide infirmary and Crisis Care Unit services, the fact that there has been no increase in capacity of these services since the prison opened, and that the population has risen exponentially, it is recommended that the built environment should be reviewed and that there should be significant investment in expanded, appropriate and different facilities.^{xiv}

Recommended actions at an operational level are as follows:

Recommendation 11

- *Review and revise assessment and care planning tools to ensure that they facilitate more comprehensive identification of and support for health issues, particularly those impacting upon behaviour.*
- *Review assessment tools for their cultural relevance and develop or obtain alternatives accordingly.*

Recommendation 12

- *In order to enhance custodial staff's confidence, and to assist in ensuring appropriate responses to prisoners, provide training to custodial staff in how to challenge and change behaviour and in the common causes of behavioural problems.*
- *Provide initial and ongoing training to all health care staff to ensure culturally relevant and appropriate health care delivery.*

Recommendation 13

Review and revise appointment practices across the prison estate and implement a system or systems that improve timeliness and communication.

Recommendation 14

Recruit Aboriginal Health and Mental Health Workers.

xiv Areas to be addressed could include but should not be limited to those outlined above.

Fact Page

NAME OF FACILITY

Casuarina Prison

ROLE OF FACILITY

Maximum security Casuarina Prison is Western Australia's highest security prison. In addition, it provides specialist statewide services in the Special Handling Unit (SHU), the Special Purpose Unit (SPU), the Infirmarium, and the Crisis Care Unit (CCU). Unit 1 principally accommodates displaced Aboriginal prisoners from throughout the State.

LOCATION

35km south of Perth

BRIEF HISTORY^{xv}

Casuarina Prison opened in 1991 with a focus on addressing specific offending behaviours and preparing prisoners for eventual resettlement in the community, by providing a wide range of employment and skilling opportunities. Its original design capacity was for 397 prisoners.

By 1998, the prisoner population had increased to 529^{xvi}, far exceeding the prison's design capacity. This impacted upon many prisoners' ability to engage in programs and/or work in a meaningful way. Moreover, their supervision within accommodation units had become the norm, and there was a shift away from engagement required by case management, to an emphasis on security and safety, with staff retreating more to the unit control offices. On Christmas Day in 1998, a major riot occurred involving 100-140 prisoners and resulting in 21 staff and two prisoners requiring hospital treatment.

The Department set up an enquiry following the riot. In response to the resultant Smith report, the Department implemented a \$1.8 million program to strengthen security and provide staff with a safe working environment.

ORIGINAL DESIGN CAPACITY

397

OPERATIONAL CAPACITY (AS AT 27 MAY 2010)

700

NUMBER OF PRISONERS ON FIRST DAY OF ON-SITE INSPECTION

691

LAST INSPECTION

15-27 July 2007

xv OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.28 (June 2005) 1.

xvi OICS, *Report of a Follow-up Inspection of the Special Management Units at Casuarina Prison*, Report No. 8 (October 2001) 6.

DESCRIPTION OF ACCOMMODATION UNITS

Unit 1 – Principally accommodates those displaced Aboriginal prisoners from the North West, the Lands, and Eastern Goldfields, with the aim of reducing the trauma associated with being so far away from home.

Units 2, 3 & 4 – Accommodate mainstream prisoners.

Unit 5 – Accommodates newly received prisoners for orientation purposes.

Unit 6 – Accommodates those prisoners requiring special protection.

Unit 7 – Accommodates those prisoners who have progressed through the hierarchical management regime and earned the privilege of self-care.

Crisis Care Unit (CCU) – Accommodates those prisoners requiring a higher level of supervision because of a personal or mental health crisis.

Infirmary – Accommodates those prisoners from around the state, who are pre/post-acute and/or too infirm to be managed in mainstream accommodation.

Sexual Offenders Treatment Unit – Provides a group residential environment for those prisoners pursuing the Sexual Offenders Treatment Program (SOTP).

Special Handling Unit (SHU) – Accommodates those prisoners who are assessed as being extremely violent, predatory or disruptive or who constitute a high risk of escape.

Multi-purpose Unit (MPU) – Accommodates those prisoners on punishment.

Special Purpose Unit (SPU) – Accommodates those prisoners requiring a higher level of protection than those in Unit 6 (e.g. convicted prison and police officers).

Chapter 1

CASUARINA PRISON: 2007–2010 IN BRIEF

- 1.1 This inspection was the fourth routine announced inspection of Casuarina Prison (hereafter variously referred to as ‘Casuarina’ or ‘the prison’) in ten years.¹ Casuarina’s Induction and Orientation Unit and the Special Handling Unit were also the subject of a directed (and this Office’s first ever) inspection in late 2000² and a subsequent follow-up in October 2001.³ Aspects of the prison’s services have also been examined in thematic reviews in relation to vulnerable and predatory prisoners⁴ and prisoner health services.⁵
- 1.2 Of particular note at Casuarina’s last inspection in July 2007⁶ was the burgeoning population and its impacts. The West Australian prisoner population, which had been building during the preceding two years, had reached an all-time high of around 3,800. At Casuarina, the prisoner population had risen from 360 in 2004 to 580 in 2007. The design capacity of the prison was 397.
- 1.3 In spite of the regrettable and associated overcrowding, the then Inspector of Custodial Services, Professor Richard Harding commented in his overview of that inspection report⁷ that ‘Casuarina was better placed to deal with an increased population...principally because a stable and well-resourced management team had been established...enabl[ing] risk to be reduced and strategic planning to be enhanced.’ By way of example, the management team had recognised the need for, and orchestrated the designation of Unit 1 into, specialist accommodation for displaced Aboriginal prisoners. They also planned for the construction of an activity centre predominantly for Aboriginal prisoners’ use. The team had also submitted a business case, which was successful in securing a substantial increase in the number of custodial staff to manage the growing population.
- 1.4 Nonetheless, issues of concern as highlighted at the last inspection, some of which related to unprecedented prisoner numbers, included a lack of employment; a lack of workshop and classroom space; a prevalent bullying culture; and an environmental sustainability program that fell short of good practice. At his exit debrief,⁸ regarding the possibility of further population increases the Inspector warned of the need to ‘...make sure that the proper resources are put in place.’
- 1.5 Between 2007 and the lead up to this 2010 inspection, the population continued to increase with a new operational capacity set at 700 prisoners, and an average occupancy of around 690. The operational capacity was increased not by new units and cells but solely by the addition of bunk beds into single cells. At the time of the inspection the majority of cells in

1 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison – October 2001*, Report No.11 (2002), OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.28 (June 2005), and OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008).

2 OICS, *Report of an Unannounced Inspection of the Induction and Orientation Unit and the Special Handling Unit at Casuarina Prison*, Report No.1 (2001).

3 OICS, *Report of a Follow-up Inspection of the Special Management Unit at Casuarina Prison – October 2001*, Report No.8 (2002).

4 OICS, *Vulnerable and Predatory Prisoners in Western Australia: a Review of Policy and Practice*, Report No.15 (May 2003).

5 OICS, *Thematic Review of Offender Health Services*, Report No.35 (June 2006).

6 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008)10.

7 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008)iii.

8 Professor Richard Harding, Inspector of the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services, *Casuarina Prison Announced Inspection 15-27 July 2007 Exit Debrief* (oral presentation).

most units were double-bunked.⁹ Some capital works projects to provide extra classroom and workshop space had commenced in 2009 but these had been approved in 2007 when the prisoner population was 580. In any case, they were still not complete at the time of the on-site phase of this 2010 inspection. In other words, very few additional resources had been put in place to meet the increased service, infrastructure, and non-custodial staffing needs of the higher prisoner population.

- 1.6 On 1 November 2009 the Minister for Corrective Services, Christian Porter, announced plans for new accommodation for a further 256 prisoners at Casuarina.¹⁰ However, contrary to earlier circumstances, by 2010 the robustness of the management team to deal with an increased population had been considerably undermined. A number of positions had been filled in an acting capacity for protracted periods, and at the commencement of the inspection, the Superintendent had been acting in the position for well over a year.
- 1.7 The Inspector's overall finding at this inspection debrief was that the prison had 'coped admirably'.¹¹ Indeed, he congratulated management, staff, and prisoners alike. Nonetheless, while not intended to be critical of those who had worked so tirelessly at an operational level, the term, 'coped admirably', was not accidental. It implied making do, getting by, surviving, and reacting to each challenge faced. What it did not imply, however, was a sense that situations had been anticipated and planned for, that a strategic and proactive approach had been maintained, that investment had kept pace with demand, and that performance had continuously improved.
- 1.8 A key finding of this inspection and a running theme, therefore, throughout this report will be of a prison, already significantly under-resourced and stretched to capacity with 690 prisoners. It will also become clear that little account has been taken of correcting this pre-existing resourcing shortfall in developing the plans for the accommodation of an additional 256 prisoners.

THE INSPECTION – A THEMATIC APPROACH

- 1.9 Using this Office's Standards¹² as its framework, this inspection principally set out to explore the impact of overcrowding on staff, prisoners, and infrastructure at Casuarina, and to gain an understanding of the plans for, and progress of, preparations for the additional 256 prisoners.
- 1.10 In this context, the team was particularly interested in examining the implications for a changing prisoner profile, as well as the implications for those discrete groups of prisoners Casuarina specialises in managing for the wider Western Australian prison estate. These include those prisoners who are accommodated in the Special Handling Unit (SHU), the

9 For the purposes of this report, double-bunking refers to a cell in which a bunk bed has been installed so that two prisoners are sharing an area the size and dimension of which was originally designed to accommodate only one person.

10 The Hon. Christian Porter, Minister for Corrective Services, *Further 640 beds announced for prison system*, media statement (1 November 2009).

11 Professor Neil Morgan, Inspector of the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services, *Casuarina Prison Announced Inspection 18-29 April 2010 Exit Debrief* (oral presentation).

12 OICS, *Code of Inspection Standards for Adult Custodial Services*, Version One (19 April 2007).

Special Purpose Unit (SPU), the Infirmary, the Crisis Care Unit (CCU), and the ‘displaced Aboriginal prisoners’ in Unit 1.

- 1.11 As with all inspections, the team tested the prison’s performance against the Standards and followed up on this Office’s previous recommendations. However, for reporting purposes and because this is the fourth round of inspections, the findings and analysis have generally been presented by exception, focussing specifically on the overarching themes outlined above.
- 1.12 Inspection activity started in January 2010 with a request for documentation and specific information from the Department of Corrective Services (hereafter referred to as ‘DCS’ or ‘the Department’) about Casuarina’s progress against recommendations made by this Office in 2008. In addition, this Office requested detailed information about the role of the prison, plans for the proposed capacity increase and implications for the prisoner profile, health services, services for minimum security prisoners, and re-entry services for those preparing for release.
- 1.13 Other off- and on-site, pre- and post-inspection activity included meetings with community service providers; the Mayor of the Town of Kwinana; the Federal Member of Parliament for the area; RiskCover; Casuarina’s senior management team as well as principal, senior and Prison Support Officers; senior management at the Frankland Centre (the State Health Department’s maximum secured inpatient psychiatric hospital); and senior managers at the Department’s health services directorate.
- 1.14 Surveys of staff and prisoners were also undertaken. Newly developed, shorter questionnaires notably elicited a significant actual and proportionate increase in responses from randomly selected prisoners compared with the survey carried out in 2007.¹³ One hundred and ninety-six prisoners¹⁴ and 98 staff responded to the surveys.
- 1.15 The inspection team comprised 13 members and consistent with the thematic approach, a number of expert advisors were also included (see Appendix three of this report). The on-site inspection period was 18-29 April 2010, although the experts only attended the prison for as long as they needed, generally between one to three days. The Inspector presented an exit debrief to Head Office and prison management, and staff on 29 April 2010. That debrief outlined the main areas of good performance as well as issues of concern.

13 Prisoners accommodated in Units 1-7 were targeted and then occupants of alternate cells were selected to participate in the survey.

14 There were 68 prisoner respondents in 2007.

Chapter 2

THE EXPANSION OF CASUARINA PRISON

STATEWIDE EXPANSION PLANS

2.1 In November 2009, the Minister for Corrective Services announced plans for the expansion of the Western Australian prison estate in a bid to manage the increasing number of prisoners entering the system.¹⁵ Originally, expansion was planned both in the metropolitan area and the regions and included a mix of security classification beds. However, principally, the focus of expansion was on maximum security and prisons in the metropolitan area and Albany. The expansion would create 640 more beds, principally located at Albany, Casuarina, and Greenough prisons. Subsequently, these plans were changed and the expansion at Greenough was replaced by an expansion at Hakea Prison, eliminating any expansion in the north of the state.¹⁶

Casuarina's Specialist Role and the Expansion Plans

- 2.2 In its submission to this Office prior to this inspection, the Department confirmed that over and above being the state's main maximum security prison, Casuarina continues to perform specialist roles for the whole of the Western Australian prison estate. These include handling the most threatening and risky prisoners in the Special Handling and Multi-purpose Units, providing 'comprehensive assisted care' in the infirmary, and - in the absence of sufficient facilities in the state - catering for mentally ill prisoners within Crisis Care.
- 2.3 Given that the need to construct new beds to better accommodate the increased prisoner population had been recognised, it seemed reasonable to expect that the need for a corresponding and proportionate capacity increase in at least some of the state's specialist facilities at Casuarina should follow. Accordingly, the Department was invited to outline its expansion plans for its specialist services in its pre-inspection submission. However, no such information was provided.
- 2.4 The capacity of Casuarina's statewide provision has not been increased since the prison was commissioned in 1991. Arguably, with the statewide increase in prisoner population over many years, the service capacity of at least some of the specialist facilities at Casuarina has been proportionately and correspondingly eroded. With no firm expansion plans afoot, the situation looks set to deteriorate further. This issue will be explored in more detail later.

More Beds: Wrong Type, Wrong Place?

2.5 On the second day of the on-site phase of the inspection, there were 694 prisoners at Casuarina, with a security profile as follows: 130 (18.7 per cent) maximum security; 449 medium security (64.6 per cent); and 115 (15.5 per cent) minimum security. Two hundred and forty prisoners were approved and waiting for transfer.¹⁷ This profile of prisoners is neither

15 The Hon. Christian Porter, Minister for Corrective Services, *Further 640 beds announced for prison system*, media statement (1 November 2009).

16 The Hon. Christian Porter, Minister for Corrective Services, *Metropolitan and regional prisons get new accommodation units*, media statement (5 February 2010). This has implications for the continuing displacement of (mostly Aboriginal) prisoners. This has previously been discussed in OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Hakea Prison* Report No. 63 (April 2010) and OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 66 (June 2010) and will be discussed in greater detail later in this report.

17 Data provided by personnel on site using Total Offender Management Solutions (TOMS).

appropriate nor cost effective for the state's highest maximum security prison.¹⁸

- 2.6 Two factors appear to be influencing the security profile of prisoners across Western Australia and leading to a log jam of prisoners across the system, including Casuarina. First, the prisoner population – which had been growing for some time anyway and without relief in terms of significant prison capacity expansion – surged considerably in 2009 when parole practices changed. Consequently, a much larger number of prisoners are not being granted parole and are remaining in prison longer, often at minimum security.¹⁹ Some prisoners who have been refused parole have had an upward reclassification of their security.
- 2.7 Secondly, further to a review commenced in February 2007 and jointly conducted by this Office and the Department,²⁰ assessment and classification practices have been changed and have resulted in a significant downward shift in security ratings for many prisoners. The report of this review²¹ predicted that there would be a significant increase in the numbers of prisoners classified minimum security. It also predicted that because of the lack of minimum security bed space, there would be significant increases in the number of these prisoners held in over-secure conditions in the metropolitan area. Accordingly, the report suggested that the Department and the Government take this into account when addressing infrastructure/construction priorities.
- 2.8 Once the additional minimum security accommodation is constructed and commissioned at other prisons²² and work camps, and if DCS estimates are correct, there should be no further need to accommodate so many minimum security prisoners at Casuarina.²³ Also, once the additional accommodation for male metropolitan remand prisoners becomes available, the placement of remand prisoners at Casuarina (representing 7.4 per cent of its population at the time of the inspection)²⁴ should no longer be necessary.
- 2.9 Therefore, based on the prisoner profile at the time of the inspection, and in anticipation of the likely redistribution of minimum security and remand prisoners to other facilities, around 130 maximum security and 449 medium security prisoners would remain at Casuarina. The figures suggest that there is an obvious and overwhelming need for medium

18 For example it contravenes Guideline 1.37 of *The Australian Standard Guidelines for Corrections in Australia*, which requires provision of '... a well-structured and transparent system of classification and placement of prisoners which has as its central aim: the safety of prisoners, staff and the community, *while ensuring placement of prisoners at their lowest level of security appropriate for their circumstances.*' It also contravenes Standard 10 of OICS, *Code of Inspection Standards for Adult Custodial Services, Version One* (19 April 2007), which states: 'The Department must implement an accurate and transparent classification system that enables prisoners to be individually assessed and placed into the lowest security classification level commensurate with safety.'

19 On 2 April 2009, there were 1494 people on state parole orders. Just over a year later on 20 May 2010, the number had dropped to 579 – 38.75% of the number on parole in April 2009 (figures taken from DCS weekly statistics on DCS website).

20 OICS, *Report into the Review of Assessment and Classification Within the Department of Corrective Services*, Report No.51 (April 2008).

21 Ibid.

22 At the time of writing, new minimum security beds had already been commissioned at Pardelup and Wooroloo Prison Farms, and Bunbury Regional Prison.

23 Some minimum security prisoners will always be placed at Casuarina for various reasons, including access to programs, their own safety etc.

24 As of 20 April 2010.

rather than maximum security accommodation. It is mystifying, therefore, that new accommodation for an additional 256 prisoners (with presumably a similar security profile) at Casuarina is planned. The ongoing cost of managing prisoners within the Casuarina perimeter is one of the highest among Western Australian prisons. To keep expanding the Department's most costly institution is to incur unnecessary costs for managing around 70 per cent of the prison's population. This indicates a need to build medium security accommodation elsewhere.²⁵

- 2.10 By way of illustration, medium security prisoners neither require an armed response group patrolling the perimeter 24/7, nor do they require the costly movement control systems in place at Casuarina. Furthermore, the expense of building cellular accommodation to conform to maximum security standards is considerable, not to mention the costs of maintaining security each day while construction is in progress. Countering this is the argument that building within Casuarina avoids outlaying for a new perimeter, with all of the expensive electronic detection and escape prevention technologies necessary for even a medium security perimeter. Further, that while medium security prisoners do not require armed perimeter patrols, these would cost no more as they are already in place. Nonetheless, these arguments overlook the fact that to ensure good custodial management, all resources would need to be increased to accommodate the expanded population: a raft of additional custodial and non-custodial staff, new classrooms and workshops, and expensive security procedures, all of which would have to be set at a level that meets the needs of the highest security classification.
- 2.11 The current building program should be seen as an opportunity to reconfigure the prison security estate so that it reflects prisoner need and is cost effective for the foreseeable future. To build further maximum security beds at Casuarina when maximum security sentenced prisoners constitute less than 19 per cent of its population raises serious questions about value for money for taxpayers.
- 2.12 One final and important point that will be explored in more detail later is the impact of the plans for this increased capacity on Aboriginal prisoners. It has already been shown that the overwhelming need is for medium security beds. Furthermore, the table below shows that over 40 per cent of those prisoners at Casuarina who were classified as medium security on 30 April 2010 originated from outside the Perth Statistical Division; of these over 76 per cent were of Aboriginal descent.²⁶ Displacing prisoners adds further to the trauma of imprisonment, and disproportionately affects Aboriginal people. This illustrates that not only is there an overwhelming need for medium security beds, but also that there is a greater need for them in the regions as opposed to the metropolitan area.

25 It is acknowledged that the numbers of beds at medium security Acacia Prison have been increased. The prison is now almost totally double-bunked to allow for the accommodation of 1000 prisoners. In addition, at the time of writing, a proposal for the extension of Acacia prison in the form of three new units to provide accommodation for a further 400 prisoners was being considered. This adds further weight to the question of whether the additional maximum security beds at Casuarina Prison will in fact be needed, even for medium security prisoners.

26 As of 30 April 2010, there were a total of 319 Aboriginal prisoners at Casuarina; 62 per cent of these were from outside of the Perth Statistical Division (figures provided by DCS Strategic and Executive Services Directorate – Performance and Statistics Branch).

Table 1: Prisoners from Outside Perth Statistical Division²⁷ at Casuarina Prison at 30 April 2010 by Race and Personal Security Rating.

Race	Security Classification	No. of Prisoners
Aboriginal	Maximum	38
Aboriginal	Medium	140
Aboriginal	Minimum	22
Non-Aboriginal	Maximum	19
Non-Aboriginal	Medium	44
Non-Aboriginal	Minimum	15
Total Aboriginal		200 (72%)
Total Non-Aboriginal		78 (28%)
TOTAL		278

BUILDING TO MEET A BUDGET, OR BUILDING TO MEET A NEED?

2.13 The Department informed the Office that at Casuarina, the planned expansion is set to be in the form of ‘2 x 64-bed units, i.e. double bunked to 256.’²⁸ Each unit will thus house 128 prisoners. The prisoner population at Casuarina will be increased by another 256 prisoners once the new units have been filled and are operational. This represents a 38.5 per cent increase to the current prison population. The Department also advised that the timeframe for completion of the construction phase was September 2010.

Double-bunking

2.14 Recommendation Eight from the last inspection,²⁹ which the Department supported in principle, stated that ‘the Department should not adopt a position where double-bunking becomes an acceptable norm in the Western Australian prison system.’ The Department outlined its progress against this previous recommendation in its pre-inspection submission, and stated that it had been completed. It added: ‘The Department agrees that double-bunking is not a viable long-term solution to increased prison musters, and is undertaking an expansion of accommodation at Casuarina to ease the requirement to double-bunk.’

2.15 The Inspectorate was somewhat baffled in the Department saying it was achieving a recommendation not to double-bunk by an expansion that consists entirely of double bunking. We inferred the conclusion that the Department is trying to get away from enforced double-bunking in single designed cells by building into expansion plans a design of cellular accommodation that is still designated ‘single cell’ but is more suitable for two people to share. From a decency point of view, the Inspectorate expects, therefore, that once such accommodation is built, those cells originally designed for one person, which had become double-bunked, would revert back to their original single design occupancy.

27 Data provided by DCS, Strategic and Executive Services Directorate, Performance and Statistics Branch.

28 DCS pre-inspection submission.

29 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 67.

2.16 One last point needs to be made about double –bunking. The Inspectorate expressed concern about the safety of bunk designs at Casuarina at the time of the last inspection³⁰ and again during the Greenough inspection in August 2009.³¹ At Casuarina’s exit debrief at the end of this inspection, the Inspector again expressed concern with regard to possible risks associated with accessibility and falls prevention.³² For example, prisoners were noted to step onto a plastic chair or a toilet to aid their climb into bed, and side panels – to reduce the risk of falls – were not always featured. As such, in addition to the risks to decency posed by the installation of bunk beds in single cells, the potential risks to safety are much more pressing. The safety of these bunks has not been comprehensively evaluated, thus potentially posing a major risk to prisoners and the Department. However, in response to a recommendation made in the Greenough Regional Prison report³³ the Department has made a commitment to conduct a full risk assessment of all double bunk designs across the whole prison estate and to undertake such modifications as are necessary to minimise the risk of injuries.

Planning

- 2.17 The inspection team found a ‘cart before the horse’ approach to the planning for the new units. The contractors had indicated their readiness to start building. However, security and logistical considerations, critical to the success of the project and which should have been the first planning priority, had not been sorted out. Progress was being thwarted by the lack of risk assessment and management planning that had to be completed before the work could go ahead.³⁴
- 2.18 The opportunities for a considered approach to planning for the associated infrastructure and services that a 256 increase in prisoner numbers would necessitate were even more lacking. Information provided to the Inspectorate confirmed that the only sure thing at the time of the Inspection about the expansion was that there would be the two accommodation units. There was little certainty about any other services or facilities that would need to be expanded to support the needs of the extra prisoners.
- 2.19 Prison management agreed with these findings and expressed similar levels of frustration as the inspection team about the planning. The management team had been given one week’s notice to prepare a comprehensive submission for the staffing, infrastructure and service needs to support the proposed expansion.³⁵ They noted, however, that the primary purpose was to identify resourcing requirements for an additional 256 prisoners. It was *not* to secure ‘catch-up’ funding for those neglected areas of staffing and infrastructure arrangements, some of which had remained unchanged at best since the population was 580, and at worst since the population was 397.

30 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 31–32.

31 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No.66 (June 2010).

32 A prisoner was awarded £4.7M damages after suffering a seizure and falling from a top bunk in Brixton Prison. www.independent.co.uk/.../braindamaged-prisoner-awarded-pound47m-1944607.html.

33 OICS *Report of an Announced Inspection of Greenough Regional Prison*, Report No. 66 (June 2010) 45.

34 For example, it had not been established how trucks were going to access the prison and if they were going to use the sally port whether they would in fact be able to fit.

35 DCS, *Casuarina Current Staffing and Infrastructure Status* (undated).

- 2.20 The resulting document was as good an effort as possible given the short timeframe in which the management team had to develop what was essentially a whole new operating model. The document set out a vision of the respective roles and functions of the new units (although thoughts and ideas have changed since its submission) and on this basis identified the associated staffing and infrastructure requirements.
- 2.21 In summary, it stated that the following service areas were all stretched to capacity: security, administration, education, programs, Prison Counselling Service, industries, the laundry, kitchen, visits, crisis care, reception, stores, gatehouse, Outcare, the canteen, and the library. They each required some or all of the following: more space, more staff, more equipment, and facility upgrades. The submission also recommended that there should be an assessment of the capacity of essential services (e.g. hot water, telephones, electricity, gas etc) to cope with the increased prisoners. Consideration would also need to be given to the security infrastructure in the vicinity of the new units, which are likely to be in close proximity to the existing self-care unit.
- 2.22 These were the infrastructure/service items that Casuarina management put forward in their rushed bid to secure sufficient resources to adequately manage a significantly increased prisoner population.³⁶ At the time of the inspection, Casuarina management could not, with complete certainty, tell the inspection team, which if any of these items would be progressed in terms of meeting the expansion needs.
- 2.23 It is important to note that although support service infrastructure and staffing requirements in terms of offender services, education, and health were included, the document raised doubts about their relevance because ‘their own directorate is compiling resource requirements and costings.’³⁷ This apparent siloed approach did little to inspire confidence that this expansion would be strategically and holistically managed and that ultimately a positive outcome would be achieved across the board.
- 2.24 This sentiment was further vindicated when, early in the site inspection, members of the Inspectorate attended a meeting scheduled by personnel from the Department’s Strategic Assets Division to discuss the infrastructure requirements with prison management. This meeting further deepened the Inspectorate’s concern over the lack of planning that has occurred in relation to these crucial services. Most of the items outlined above require significant investment, both in terms of time and money if they are to adequately service an increased population. At the time of the inspection, the expected completion of the physical build was only five months away, but there was a paucity of information to confirm exactly what investment would be made in terms of supporting infrastructure and staffing to service the increased population. Based on evidence gathered to date, the Inspectorate has little confidence that that investment will be forthcoming.

36 Supplementary to Casuarina management’s bid to secure more resources, a preliminary plan for the way forward for prisoner employment at Casuarina, in terms of infrastructure/equipment requirements, and the types of industries and vocational training that could be developed had also been prepared by the Manager, Prison Industries in consultation with Industries staff at Casuarina. DCS, *Prison Industries Casuarina Prison – A Summary of Current Issues and Drivers that will Influence Planning for the Future Direction of Prison Industries at Casuarina Prison* March 2010, 3. Prepared by Kathy Csaba, Manager Prison Industries.

37 DCS, *Casuarina Current Staffing and Infrastructure Status* (undated) 1.

2.25 The evidence provided displayed that the expansion project at Casuarina is more an exercise in building to meet a budget, than building to meet a need. The Inspectorate commends local management in its attempts to identify and plan for infrastructure and service needs. Similarly, the Inspectorate shared local management's frustration at Head Office's limited sharing of information about the action it was going to take. Without ongoing and open communication about the Department's direction and investment into the expansion, Head Office puts at risk local management's and staff's loyalty and commitment, the loss of which would pose a significant impediment to the project.

Recommendation 1

Advise Casuarina management and staff about the additional resources which will be provided to expand the infrastructure, staffing levels, and service provision to meet Casuarina's obligations to all its prisoners.

Chapter 3

MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BUDGET PLANNING

- 3.1 The two previous inspection reports³⁸ have made comments and recommendations about the deficiencies in the process for allocating funds to the prison. The Department did not support the recommendation from the 2007 inspection.
- 3.2 Budget funds are allocated on the basis of the number of prisoners anticipated to be accommodated for the coming year.³⁹ Invariably and somewhat bizarrely, however, the annual operating budget allocation tends to be for a prisoner number that the prison has already exceeded. For example, evidence obtained prior to the current inspection of Casuarina indicated that the budget allocation still fell short of the actual prisoner population. The Casuarina Business Plan for 2009–2010 stipulated a funding allocation based on a daily average population of 630. The prison’s capacity is 700–726. In July 2009, the very beginning of the financial year in which this budget allocation would apply, there were over 670 prisoners accommodated at Casuarina prison.
- 3.3 This Office has previously argued – and not just in relation to Casuarina⁴⁰ – that this method of funds allocation is inefficient. It requires local management to request supplementary funding for a population already in situ. As such, this method compromises management’s ability to plan ahead for a population that it knows will be substantially larger than currently, and also results in the incurrence of unnecessary costs (at the very least in terms of management’s time and energy).
- 3.4 On 23 September 2009 the Chair of the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee questioned the Commissioner of DCS about this very issue. He acknowledged that there is always a time lag in the funding ‘...so we manage the business accordingly.’⁴¹ He was then asked: ‘Do you practise a loaves and fishes type thing?’ to which he responded:
- We have not got to that yet. But we say to the divisional heads, “This is the expected population, so the funding will be in this vicinity. Start to manage your respective divisions with that in mind, but additional funding will come. Don’t stop doing things because you don’t have the money in the bank at the moment; it is coming.” It is a proven formula that has been going on for numerous years in terms of catch-up funding.⁴²
- 3.5 In the view of the Inspectorate and contrary to the evidence provided by the Commissioner the established funding formula has been proven to be inappropriate and inefficient for many years. However, given the Commissioner’s statement, it would seem unlikely that the Department will change its view about its process of estimating average daily populations being the right way to secure appropriate levels of funding. Nonetheless, the Inspectorate now knows that it should expect nothing less than that the prisons, including Casuarina, are

38 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.28 (June 2005) and *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No. 49 (March 2008).

39 The appropriateness of applying the ‘per prisoner per day’ formula for calculating budget requirements in relation to health services is discussed in Chapter Eight.

40 For example see: OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Hakea Prison*, Report No. 63 (April 2010).

41 Transcript of Evidence Taken at Perth Wednesday 23 September 2009 *Community Development and Justice Standing Committee Corrective Services 2009*, 7.

42 Ibid.

managed on the basis that there is an actual budget for the population they currently have in situ. The Department cannot use the argument that it is not being funded for the numbers of prisoners it has in situ as a reason for inaction. Moreover, the Inspectorate maintains its contention that this retrospective approach to securing appropriate levels of funding is inefficient and counter to conventional, let alone proactive business management.

MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

Relationships with Head Office

- 3.6 The difficulties experienced in relationships and communication between Head Office and local management have been discussed earlier in relation to the expansion project. This was fuelled a few weeks prior to the inspection following a serious incident involving a prisoner from Casuarina. It came to the attention of the press and an investigation was ongoing at the time of the inspection.
- 3.7 Local management and staff were clearly distraught not just because of the incident, but also because of their perception that their professionalism was being called into question, that they were being blamed, being made scapegoats, and were not being supported in the course of the subsequent investigation. The Inspectorate cannot comment on whether this was actually the case. However, the Inspector at the exit debrief first expressed the view that in terms of relationships and communication, perceptions matter as much, if not more than reality. Secondly, that it is essential to strike the right balance between accountability and pragmatism. Staff must be accountable but risks will increase if staff feel hesitant or unable to take pragmatic and on the spot decisions, in good faith.
- 3.8 This adds further weight to the earlier contention that the Department needs to develop robust communication practices. That need is urgent and critical to sustaining the loyalty and commitment of staff, particularly at a time when the Department is about to embark on a major expansion project.

Relationships at Local Level

- 3.9 Particular comment had previously been made about the robustness of the local management team in place at the time of the last inspection in July 2007, and was noted earlier in this report. At this inspection, the Inspectorate found that relations within the management team were somewhat fractured. Nonetheless, the team was still managing to steer the prison along its designated course. All members of the senior management team had demanding workloads⁴³ and yet were managing to perform their respective roles efficiently and effectively.
- 3.10 Whereas at the time of the previous inspection, a substantive superintendent was in position at Casuarina, in April 2010 the position was filled on an acting basis. The Acting Superintendent had been in the position for 14 months. During the preceding three years, the business and security manager positions had also been temporarily filled for protracted

43 Management staff expressed the view that staffing levels had not been increased in administration commensurate with the increased workload generated by the higher prison population.

periods. A few weeks before the commencement of the on-site phase of the inspection, the Deputy Superintendent commenced what was likely to be long term sick leave and three days prior to the start of the inspection, cover for this position was provided by an individual usually located at Head Office. It was anticipated and in fact did eventuate that at the end of a fortnight a senior manager from another prison would be seconded to succeed the coverage of this position.

- 3.11 So already, the stability of the management team presented as less certain. Add to this the recent serious incident (mentioned above), as well as the negative perception amongst some senior managers in relation to the individuals chosen to act in these most senior positions, and the sense of instability was heightened.
- 3.12 It is not within the scope of an inspection to comment on the dynamics amongst managers where these are informed by personal likes or dislikes for other managers in certain positions. However, should the Inspectorate note these dynamics to be adversely affecting services to prisoners and the working environment for staff, it would not hesitate to assert its position and make recommendations accordingly.
- 3.13 In this respect, there was early indication that the fractured nature of the relations amongst senior management staff was impacting upon custodial staff. In contrast to the last inspection,⁴⁴ officers complained about the invisibility of the most senior members of the administration around the prison, and they commented that some management seemed reluctant to make decisions. In the pre-inspection survey, staff cited local management as the most stressful thing about working at Casuarina.⁴⁵
- 3.14 The impact of the fractured nature of relations on staff morale could perhaps be seen most clearly in relation to the expansion project. Officers told the inspection team that there had been very limited communication about any aspect of the expansion project. While it has been shown earlier in this report that local management itself was unclear about the project, officers in turn perceived this lack of communication with them as disregard for their role.
- 3.15 The overall picture that emerged was one of dysfunctional communication and relationships cascading and gathering momentum as they flowed through from Head Office to local management and in turn, from local management through to 'coalface' staff.
- 3.16 In the weeks preceding the on-site inspection, a number of substantive superintendent positions across the state, including the one at Casuarina, were advertised. The Inspectorate is cautiously optimistic that the appointment of a substantive superintendent will re-introduce the stability needed by the management team that was found to be a critical feature of the prison administration at the previous inspection.

44 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 9.

45 Staff cited local management as the most stressful thing about working at Casuarina in response to the survey question 'What are the three most stressful things about working in the prison?'

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Custodial Staff⁴⁶

- 3.17 Casuarina has agreed approval for the appropriate number of uniformed staff to manage a prisoner population of between 680 and 726. Different documents provided to the Inspectorate provided conflicting information and it was therefore difficult to determine the exact numbers of uniformed staff at Casuarina. However, such inconsistencies did not translate into staffing inconsistencies on the ground. Documentation reviewed indicated that a moderate amount of overtime was being scheduled to meet minimum staffing requirements. Nonetheless, uniformed officers' feedback to the Inspectorate gave no indication that this level of overtime was leading to burnout.
- 3.18 Custodial officers repeatedly attributed the smooth functioning of the prison to their efforts and commitment. Indeed, in the pre-inspection survey, staff cited their co-workers as the second of the three most satisfying things about working in the prison.
- 3.19 In addition to the lack of consultation around the expansion project, custodial officers expressed a level of dissatisfaction in relation to a number of other issues. In particular, the rolling roster; the make-up of the uniformed staff group in terms of gender balance, levels of experience, and the lack of promotion opportunities; and the lack of staff amenities.

The Rolling Roster

- 3.20 The rolling roster system of allocating prison officer shifts had been reintroduced at Casuarina and become effective on 16 April 2010 (that is, two days before the commencement of the on-site phase of the inspection). There were no adverse inspection findings with regard to the rolling roster. In fact, the Inspectorate is of the opinion that its implementation will have a positive effect on the workplace culture at Casuarina.
- 3.21 The rolling roster is a system whereby prison officers 'roll' out of one unit and into another when they reach the end of the roster. The roster is made up of officers' names, each of which is allocated a line on the roster. Each line is equivalent to six weeks worth of shifts. As officers complete six weeks' worth of shifts, they roll onto the next line, complete another six weeks of shifts, roll onto the next line, and so on until they each reach the last line on the roster. At the end of this six-week block, they 'roll' off the roster for that particular unit and into the first line of the roster for the next unit.
- 3.22 The SHU, the SPU, the MPU and CCU are not included in this rolling roster. These specialist units operate under a separate roster for good reason. The SHU, for example, is an isolated unit housing the state's most dangerous and difficult to manage prisoners, and officers must be specifically trained to deal with the prisoner population. Officers who work in the specialist units are selected through an expression of interest process, rather than rolling through the roster.
- 3.23 The rationale behind the implementation of the rolling roster was to ensure equitable opportunities for all officers to work in as many varied units and positions as possible.

46 The precise issues affecting Vocational Support Officers (VSOs) and other non-custodial staff (e.g. health, education, programs, and counselling staff) will be addressed in discussions relating to those areas of service.

In reality there had always been a rolling roster in place for officers working at Casuarina. In the past, however, the rolling roster was a lot more malleable. So if officers did not want to roll out of a unit, they could ask the Deputy Superintendent to swap back into the unit. Such requests were invariably approved. Under the new rolling roster the Deputy Superintendent's discretion will be more rigidly applied, and requests will more than likely be declined.

- 3.24 The rolling roster system provides for equity across work areas and for all staff. More importantly, it ensures the integrity of work practices. The previous system, whereby officers kept swapping back into units, ran the risk of encouraging work practices that may not have been contemporary or appropriate. They were sanctioned because that was how they had always been done. The Inspectorate is therefore supportive of a change to this rostering arrangement. By its ever-changing nature, this roster reduces the risk of cliques developing and poor work habits becoming entrenched. It provides for a wider range of work experience and in turn has the potential to open up career development opportunities.
- 3.25 At the time of the inspection, this rolling roster had only been reintroduced for general prison officers. The inclusion of senior officers was also planned, much to their dissatisfaction.
- 3.26 On the whole, custodial officers were most unhappy with the reintroduction of the rolling roster. Their dissatisfaction fuelled many myths and rumours, which suggested that the development of this roster had been ill conceived. However, inspection of all the processes surrounding its development and implementation suggested the exact opposite. The overall inspection finding was that the rolling roster was itself good practice and would foster good custodial practice across the site. Moreover, the Inspectorate strongly supports the expansion of this rolling roster to include senior officers.

The Make-up of the Custodial Staff Group

- 3.27 Staff's perception was that disproportionately low levels of experience in terms of years of service among the officer group, and an over-representation of female officers in some areas were impacting upon the functioning of the team. They attributed this to a high attrition rate, and said that too many staff were leaving the prison, citing a recent exodus of staff to Karnet Prison Farm as an example. Since August 2008,⁴⁷ the attrition rate of uniformed staff across the state numbered 97. By contrast, during that time, the number of probationary staff entering the system exceeded 300. The Inspectorate could not find any evidence to suggest that the attrition rate of officers at Casuarina or statewide should be a cause for concern.
- 3.28 The Inspection found that of the 98 respondents to the pre-inspection staff survey, the average length of service was eight years. Furthermore, at the request of the inspection team a breakdown of the uniformed staff years of service was provided, which showed that 38 per cent of custodial staff had 10 years or more service, and 24 per cent had between five and ten years' service.
- 3.29 The inspection found, therefore, that contrary to staff's perceptions, the current group of uniformed staff is highly experienced. At the exit debrief the Inspector acknowledged this

⁴⁷ DCS, *HR Report (Prison Officers)* 6, January 2010.

experience, but at the same time, however, alerted management to the fact that this experience creates a particular set of challenges. It foreshadows a time in five to seven years' time when a significant cohort of senior officer staff will be due to retire. It is therefore incumbent upon management to ensure that appropriate succession planning processes are established thus enabling the continued effective functioning of the uniformed staff group.

- 3.30 At the time of the inspection, local management's capacity to implement the Senior Officer promotion system was limited because of developments higher up the human resource management chain at Head Office level. There were 86 Senior Officer positions vacant statewide that could not be advertised. At Casuarina, there were between 10 and 12 Senior Officer positions that were vacant and being filled by staff in an acting capacity.
- 3.31 A new prison officer rank – Assistant Senior Officer – a much needed operational role that will open up promotional opportunities, has been approved for some time. According to representatives from the Western Australia Prison Officers' Union (WAPOU) these positions were meant to be in place by June 2010, with 130 positions approved across the state. However, at the time of the inspection, recruitment processes had not yet started.
- 3.32 With regard to the perception that female officers were over-represented, the Inspectorate found that this group constituted 20 per cent of uniformed staff. This does not, therefore, support the officers' perceptions that there are too many female officers at Casuarina. However, through the rostering process female officers may be disproportionately deployed within individual units or discrete work locations. In these instances, staff are able to swap shifts to ensure a more even distribution of male and female officers across the site.

Staff Amenities

- 3.33 Uniformed staff expressed dissatisfaction with the amenities available to them. They cited as examples a lack of water dispensers in the units, a lack of equipment in the staff gym, and the lack of a staff canteen or dining area. Some staff commented that this meant that they had to have their meal breaks in the units and could spend an entire 12-hour shift therein. This lack of amenities is not a new phenomenon for staff at Casuarina. However, more and more staff are being deployed to work areas, which have not been extended in size to accommodate the increased numbers, and apart from the obvious health and safety implication, staff's tolerance levels may be diluted.

Performance and Development

- 3.34 Since Casuarina's last inspection in 2007, there have been a number of initiatives implemented across the prison estate intended to reinforce performance assessment and staff development.
- 3.35 A new staffing rank of Principal Officer has been introduced. In the Superintendent's Overview to the Casuarina Annual Business Plan 2009–2010, the vision for the Principal Officer role included 'maintaining standards across the site and supporting and developing uniformed staff in their job'.⁴⁸

48 DCS, Adult Custodial Division, *Casuarina Annual Business Plan, 2009-2010*.

-
- 3.36 Four Principal Officer positions have been created and filled at Casuarina, and are uniformed. This was a deliberate strategy to encourage prison officers' identification with the role in a way that they may not with other managers. These officers work 10-hour shifts, with early and late starts to ensure coverage of the 12-hour prison officer shift period. The Principal Officers themselves preferred a more operational role and their duty statements were being amended accordingly.
- 3.37 A second initiative has been the implementation of a performance appraisal system for custodial and non-custodial staff. The Inspector, in Casuarina's last inspection report,⁴⁹ emphasised the need for an effective performance appraisal system.
- 3.38 Over the years, there had been allegations of bullying of different groups of staff at Casuarina. In the absence of a structured performance appraisal system the Inspectorate struggled to get a handle on such allegations because of people's differing perceptions of constructive criticism and intimidation. Arguably, a formal mechanism for constructive criticism can serve to protect supervisor and supervisee alike. At one and the same time, it can minimise the risk of power being abused, and of legitimate instruction and guidance being misconstrued as intimidation.
- 3.39 In light of this, the Inspector recommended that the Department supply the appropriate policies and guidelines to the Superintendent of Casuarina Prison to address the allegations of bullying, including embedding staff performance management systems. These policies and procedures are now in place across the Department.
- 3.40 At Casuarina, there is a 98 per cent completion rate for the Performance and Assessment Development System (PADS) for available staff.⁵⁰ However, the output is potentially misleading. Just because the process is being completed it does not necessarily follow that the system has the substance and integrity to facilitate positive outcomes.
- 3.41 This inspection found that there was no training component incorporated into the PADS. As such, if an individual's performance is appraised as below an expected standard, there is no capacity for the system to identify opportunities for improvement.
- 3.42 Further, officers were reluctant to fully engage with this appraisal system for fear of being accused of bullying. They said that when assessing individuals' performance, they would err on the side of caution and give everybody the same average score. In this way they would not be called upon to account for their decision to score an individual either very well or very poorly. It is ironic that officers perceive a system, which aimed to address bullying as a tool by which they can be accused of bullying.
- 3.43 A performance appraisal system that lacks integrity and in turn, the confidence of the staff who are responsible for its administration, is meaningless. The dual expected outcomes of the system were to address the bullying culture, and at the same time identify and provide for staff's training needs. Regrettably, neither has been achieved.

49 OICS Report No.49, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, (March 2008) iii.

50 DCS, Adult Custodial Division, *Casuarina Annual Business Plan, 2009-2010*.

- 3.44 In following up on the issues of bullying, this inspection found that steps had been taken to address the bullying that was present at the previous inspection. There was evidence that some of the so-called bullies, who had been the subject of many complaints at the previous inspection, had been counselled and that appropriate action had been taken against them. Further, the Acting Superintendent had engaged the Equal Opportunities Commission to educate staff about bullying in the workplace.
- 3.45 Comments from senior custodial staff in the previous inspection implied that the so-called victims of bullying should 'toughen up'.⁵¹ Evidence at this inspection was that officers had in fact 'toughened up' and demonstrated a much keener awareness of their rights. As a result, senior officers now felt vulnerable when issuing instruction for fear of being accused of bullying. This is not satisfactory either. Senior officers are expected to manage and to be decisive. They must be enabled to issue lawful instructions without fear or favour.
- 3.46 Nonetheless, the increased awareness among officers and the proactive management of bullying shown by Casuarina administration are positive. They have had a destabilising effect on a bullying culture.

Recommendation 2

In order to inspire confidence of all staff in the Performance Assessment Development System it should be reviewed and revised to ensure that (1) it facilitates accurate assessment of performance; and (2) it facilitates the identification of employee training needs and accordingly ensures provision of the requisite training.

Training

- 3.47 The previous inspection of Casuarina Prison revealed positive findings about the training program for officers working in the prison. The quantity of training being delivered had increased and an annual training program had been developed in which training requirements had been prioritised.⁵²
- 3.48 At the time of this inspection there were two senior training officers at Casuarina Prison, one of whom was a satellite training officer from the Training Academy. As well as facilitating training delivery through external or departmental providers in the prison and other DCS environments in the local area, the satellite training officer also had responsibility for providing training support to the new probationary officers at Casuarina Prison. The prison is locked down every Tuesday morning and this time is reserved for training.
- 3.49 Pre-inspection staff surveys revealed that respondents believed that they were adequately trained across a range of different areas. However, on-site, the inspection team discovered that much of the required refresher training was not up to date due to factors outside of Casuarina's control, specifically: the overcrowding; the lack of specialist Academy trainers; and, perceived unrealistic expectations by Head Office.

51 OICS Report No.49, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, March 2008, 12.

52 Ibid, 11.

-
- 3.50 The training officer could confirm the currency of Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (CPR) training across the prison site, with only 20 out of a staffing component of more than 350 not current in CPR skills. This was due to the number of officers on-site who were qualified to provide this training. On the other hand, the Senior Training Officer's database showed substantial discrepancies in relation to the currency of training associated with Policy Directive 5 (Use of Force). In particular, refresher training in the appropriate use of Breathing Apparatus was not up to date with only about 70 officers out of the entire custodial prison staff at Casuarina current.
- 3.51 This refresher training was supposed to be delivered by specialist trainers at the Training Academy, or at the prison, if sufficient numbers could be released. However, correspondence showed that the Training Academy was not able to supply prison-based specialist trainers for at least two months between February–April 2010, because of the workload associated with providing training to a large number of new recruits.⁵³
- 3.52 In the absence of specialist trainers from the Academy, training staff had implemented a local training program for Casuarina Prison staff. This program incorporated all staff working in the prison, not just custodial officers. So, for example the Vocational and Support Officers (VSOs) and medical staff have had training on grooming behaviours; education staff have had updated training on emergency management plans; and the stores workers and vehicle drivers similarly have had appropriate training provided at this local level.
- 3.53 Training staff emphasised their frustration at having to adhere to complicated key performance indicators and reporting requirements that were unrealistic and unworkable in a prison environment. Training has to fit in with the working prison environment. Thus, whilst time is set aside each week for training, any other training that cannot be facilitated during these two hours must be carefully scheduled within the prison's routine. The current levels of overcrowding and the added impact of this on staff workloads inevitably influence the amount of training that officers can undertake. Further, the shift nature of prison officer work undermines any training program no matter how robust; it is impossible to tailor a training program to accommodate everybody's different shifts.
- 3.54 The overcrowding was also impacting on officers' ability to undertake off-site training. In these overcrowded times, the luxury of having extra officers available to call upon to fill vacant shifts has dissipated. As a result, we were told by on site staff that most of the applications by custodial staff to attend external, Academy-based training were not being approved due to the inability to replace these officers for the duration of their course/s.
- 3.55 The overall inspection finding in relation to training at Casuarina Prison was that the program was operating well at the local level driven by committed staff and supported by local management. However, logistics and rostering imperatives limited staff attendance at external, Academy-based training.

53 Email received by the Senior Officer Training, and sighted by the Inspectorate.

Occupational Safety and Health (OSH)

- 3.56 Since Casuarina's last inspection, at which a representative from RiskCover provided expert input, the prison has maintained active engagement with that agency. Prior to this inspection, members of the Inspectorate met with the RiskCover consultant. In summary, RiskCover's role has been to facilitate and enable the prison to develop and maintain a system for the proactive management of risk.
- 3.57 Initially, RiskCover focused on assisting the prison to develop a risk profile as it related to the increasing prisoner population. This work was being revisited in light of the prospect of a further escalation in the population band from 690 to 950. In relation to this, RiskCover was also poised to assist the prison with mapping the risks, specifically in relation to security, associated with the planned construction of the two new units. However, without a clear idea of the project plan at the time of the inspection, undertaking a meaningful risk assessment was proving impossible.
- 3.58 Another major component of RiskCover's involvement has been to implement software that would enable the prison to track and manage the risks associated with predatory prisoners. According to prison staff, the priority that they had been able to give to this component of risk management had been superseded by the more pressing needs associated with the higher population and the plans for the construction of the two new units.
- 3.59 It is important to note at this point that within the context of an overcrowded environment and the consequent impact on staff workloads, a considerable amount of work has been completed, but without a dedicated health and safety management budget. Rather, the system has been dependent on staff and management finding the time to dedicate to ensuring that Casuarina Prison is a safe and healthy working environment.
- 3.60 The responsibility for coordinating the OSH system across the site was allocated to one uniformed officer. This equated to half a full-time equivalent (FTE), which was clearly insufficient given the size of the site and the large workforce. There were 12 health and safety representatives at Casuarina Prison. These were custodial officers working in different parts of the prison to ensure coverage of all operational areas with regard to occupational health and safety. It was pleasing to note that six of the health and safety representatives had completed the OSH course as recently as November 2009.
- 3.61 The Inspectorate obtained minutes of the most recent OSH committee meetings at Casuarina Prison. These showed that the meetings were being convened regularly (seven meetings between May 2009 and February 2010) and were being appropriately recorded.⁵⁴ These meetings appeared to be well attended with the Departmental Coordinator for safety and health at the majority. This is a relatively new position that has been created to coordinate occupational safety and health matters across all prison sites. Feedback to the inspection team was most positive regarding this OSH coordinating role, especially regarding the support it gave the Business Manager.

54 Department of Corrective Services, Casuarina Prison Occupational Safety and Health Committee meeting minutes – 12 May 2009, 9 June 2009, 14 July 2009, 9 September 2009, 11 November 2009, 9 December 2009, 10 February 2010.

- 3.62 The Departmental OSH Coordinator had initiated an audit of occupational health and safety at Casuarina Prison, which was conducted in May 2009.⁵⁵ This audit was comprehensive and the audit team included external consultants. The audit clearly identified the key areas for improvement. This is a sound process, and one which the Inspectorate understands will be replicated across all prison sites in the State.
- 3.63 Given its size and function, Casuarina appeared to be performing well relative to other sites in terms of workers' compensation claims. At the time of the inspection there were eight staff being managed on Workers' Compensation, three of whom were on return to work programs.⁵⁶
- 3.64 The Business Manager had submitted a business case for a position to be established at Casuarina which would be responsible for risk management and the OSH system across the site. The OSH system at Casuarina Prison was under-resourced: there was no budget attached to the system, and local coordination was down to one uniformed officer on a part-time basis. This proposed OSH position therefore will be crucial if the prison is to ensure consistent application of identified controls to manage risks and to sustain provision of a safe and healthy working environment for staff. The need for this position was even more urgent given the impending construction of two new accommodation units.
- 3.65 Overall, the OSH system at Casuarina Prison was in a much better state than was reported at the previous inspection three years ago. OSH was still under-resourced, but was certainly better supported with RiskCover's expertise, an active committee, Departmental support, and the possibility of a new position to take responsibility for all the OSH matters and processes on site.

SECURITY AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

- 3.66 DCS carried out a comprehensive security review of Casuarina in February 2007; no significant issues were identified at that time.
- 3.67 The Inspectorate reviewed a new Security Business Plan 2010–2011, which had been recently developed and focused upon development of key areas such as dynamic security, risk management, and emergency procedures.
- 3.68 At the time of the inspection, the Inspectorate found Casuarina to be secure. Fences, cameras, and electronic detection systems were all working effectively with frequent checks being carried out. Indeed, 80 per cent of respondents to the pre-inspection staff survey reported that they felt the prison was effective in maintaining perimeter security, gates, grilles, locks and cameras.

55 Department of Corrective Services, Casuarina Prison – OSH Section Audit Report 2009/2010.

56 By comparison, in May 2010, Bandyup Women's Prison, which accommodates on average 260 prisoners (i.e 63 per cent fewer prisoners than Casuarina) and therefore has far fewer staff, was carrying 15 staff on workers' compensation.

-
-
- 3.69 Visitors were checked and randomly searched. A few weeks prior to the inspection, a process for random searching of staff had been introduced. Records reviewed indicated that all staff, including senior staff, were being checked on entering the prison, although not on leaving the prison.
- 3.70 Processes for checking contractors' tools in and out of the prison were in place and observed during the inspection. Protocols for carrying out security checks on contractors were established. However, these clearances are only valid for a year and the Inspectorate noted that the majority were out of date.
- 3.71 Prisoner counts are carried out at regular intervals each day and a number of these were observed at different locations during the inspection. Strict adherence to protocol was noted, with prisoners not being 'stood down' until a correct count was completed.
- 3.72 In the six months between 1 July 2009 and 31 December 2009, 99 drug prevalence tests were conducted with an 11 per cent positive return. During the same period, 103 of 341 targeted drug tests returned positive results. In the prisoner pre-inspection survey, 65 per cent of respondents (compared with 49 per cent in 2007) felt enough was being done to stop drugs coming into or being used in the prison, whereas only 22 per cent of staff felt the prison was effective in preventing entry of contraband. However, the drug prevalence test results represent an improvement on those elicited in the quarter prior to the last inspection (May 2007), the positive return rate of which was 20.6 per cent.⁵⁷
- 3.73 The inspection found that the Department's emergency management plan was being customised to Casuarina's needs. Emergency 'quick action' guides had already been developed and at the time of the inspection were being printed ready for staff distribution. The Assistant Superintendent Security has planned to conduct drills and staff training in emergency management and in the application of the guides. This will be timely because feedback elicited during the inspection and through the pre-inspection staff survey indicated that staff felt significantly less confident in their competence to deal with, for example, a fire emergency than with the use of restraints, chemical agents, and breathing apparatus.

SUSTAINABILITY

- 3.74 This area of activity has made very little progress since 2007. At that time, 'there was an absence of formalised or widespread sustainability practices... Other than the recycling of the reusable parts of blood spill kits... [there was] no systemic recycling or strategies to minimise the footprint that the prison makes on the environment.'⁵⁸ The Inspectorate therefore recommended that Casuarina develop a sustainability plan as a matter of urgency and engage prisoners and staff in a range of conservation and recycling activities.⁵⁹
- 3.75 Following the inspection in 2007, prison management demonstrated a commitment to moving forward in the area of environmental sustainability. They sought assistance

57 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 46.

58 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49, (March 2008) 15.

59 Ibid.

from Murdoch University. However, Murdoch University's proposals were unrealistic financially, and progress faltered. In June 2009, prison management decided to postpone the program for 12 months due to a lack of dedicated funding and the mounting population pressures.

- 3.76 At the pre-inspection briefing, prison management advised that sustainability efforts have been reinstated and Murdoch University has again been approached to assist with the development of a sustainability plan. This was encouraging, although without substantive Departmental support and commitment in terms of dedicated resources, it is likely that efforts will again falter.

Recommendation 3

Consistent with the intent of the Department's key business philosophies underpinning its strategic plan,⁶⁰ Casuarina Prison should explore and develop alternative, innovative strategies to demonstrably reduce the impact of its activities upon the environment. Where necessary, it may be appropriate for the Department to provide additional resources for this purpose.

60 Department of Corrective Services (DCS) *Strategic Plan 2008-2011*: 'We will fulfill our corporate social responsibility by contributing to community well-being through our service activities and by taking responsibility for the impact of our activities on clients, staff, the community, and other stakeholders, as well as the environment.'

Chapter 4

PRISONER MANAGEMENT

STAFF/PRISONER RELATIONSHIPS

- 4.1 Although prisoners expressed concern about some individual staff, relationships between staff and prisoners generally appeared positive. As is often the case, however, this was not consistent across the prison.
- 4.2 The prisoner pre-inspection survey findings indicated a relatively negative view about unit officer staff, especially when compared with other groups of staff, such as Vocational Support Officers (VSOs). For example, when asked how well they got along with unit officer staff, 47 per cent of prisoners said 'mostly good', while this went up to 70 per cent in relation to VSO staff. Furthermore, when asked how helpful prisoners found staff on the whole, VSOs were rated 'mostly good' by 61 per cent of respondents, whereas unit officers only elicited this rating from 45 per cent of respondents.
- 4.3 Of concern were the responses to the question about whether officer staff treated prisoners with dignity. Twenty per cent reported 'mostly yes', while 80 per cent of prisoners reported 'mostly no'.
- 4.4 A review of complaint activity only served to reinforce this negative picture. Of 126 written complaints received at the Ombudsman's office between 1 July 2007 and 31 January 2010, the highest number of complaints (19) concerned officer conduct (defined as harassment, threat, failure to assist, and rudeness).
- 4.5 Similarly, of the 50 complaints received at this Office between 1 July 2007 and 31 March 2010, 18 concerned allegations of staff misconduct/bullying of prisoners.
- 4.6 It has been widely documented that Casuarina's custodial officers have resisted active and extensive engagement with prisoners.⁶¹ Since at least the 2004 inspection both management and the senior officer group have acknowledged and lamented this resistance.⁶²
- 4.7 Numerous examples of this disengagement were evidenced at this inspection. First, staff regularly congregated in unit control rooms,⁶³ rather than making themselves available to prisoners in the units. This resulted in a constant stream of prisoners seeking the attention of the control officer, the response of whom would be highly variable and dependent to a large extent on the amount of pressure they were under at the time. Prisoners said that they had little opportunity to engage with officers (other than the control officer) and that officers rarely sought engagement with prisoners.
- 4.8 More positive staff/prisoner relationships have traditionally been noted in the protection unit. However, at this inspection, a considerable number of protection prisoners commented that recently, they had noted deterioration in the quality of their relationships with officers.

61 For example, K.W.Carter, *The Smith Report: The Report of Inquiry into the Incident at Casuarina Prison on 25th December 1998*, (1999), 'The Casuarina Prison Riot: Official Discourse or Appreciative Inquiry?' in *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, Vol. 12, No.3, March 2001, OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.11 (October 2001), *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.28 (June 2005), and, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008).

62 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.28 (June 2005) 1.

63 This had also been a finding of the DCS's Operational Compliance Review of Casuarina conducted in April 2008.

PHOTOGRAPHS



The multi-purpose educational facility nearing completion.



Ladder ‘rungs’ are built into the wall. They are not deep enough for a steady foothold. Moreover, the ladder is too far away from the bunk for the climber to reach their leg across. The bottom step is too low while the second step is too high to start from.

PHOTOGRAPHS



'New' bunk bed design installed in Unit 6 (protection) – this type of bed design has also replaced bunks in Unit 5. Note the chair commonly and strategically placed to enable the occupant to climb up to the upper bunk.



'Old' design bunks in the self-care unit. Prisoners climb on the chair to get in. Note that there are no guard rails to prevent 'roll out'.

PHOTOGRAPHS



This is the same bed as previously pictured but the photograph was taken from the opposite end to show the 'step' affixed to the wall to enable the occupant to climb up to the upper bunk.



Trundle beds are still used to enable double-ups in some cells.

-
- 4.9 Secondly, when officers were noted to leave the control room, they generally went to the lunch room or the spare unit office (located away from the wings), in which there was a computer for their use. Rarely was an officer noted to enter the wings for anything but official duties, such as custodial counts or the movement of goods into the unit.⁶⁴
- 4.10 Thirdly, senior officers were also rarely seen engaging with staff or prisoners, and were generally office-bound. They stated, as they had at the time of the last inspection, that the additional workload brought about by the increased population has tied them to their offices and prevented them from bringing about attitudinal and practice changes in their staff.
- 4.11 Fourthly, there was no supervision at mealtimes, when the potential for bullying is elevated. Serving practices observed often presented potential security, safety and wellbeing risks.⁶⁵
- 4.12 Further, during unit based recreation periods, officers having a cigarette were engaged incidentally with prisoners; however, this did not constitute active supervision or engagement.
- 4.13 Adding weight to these examples of officer disengagement elicited through direct observation and prisoner feedback, were findings of the prisoner pre-inspection survey. Significantly, staff attitudes were rated first out of the ‘three most negative things that don’t work’ in this prison. Fifty-seven per cent of prisoners reported having been very upset when they had first arrived at the prison, and of these around 60 per cent did not feel that the prison was effectively supportive over the first few days. Only six per cent of respondents said they would turn to unit officers if they needed support. Significantly, too, very few officers (12 per cent) felt their role included assisting prisoners. Moreover, 48 per cent of prisoners reported feeling unsafe all or most of the time. This is significant when compared with the findings of the staff pre-inspection survey, in which 99 per cent of respondents reported almost always or mostly feeling safe.
- 4.14 Arguably, the pressures of the increased prisoner population, combined with officer apprehensions, attitudes, and preoccupation with safety, security and control – many of which were brought about by, and remain firmly rooted in, the Christmas Day riot of 1998 – and unit design, are just some of the factors that may be contributing to, or creating, and perpetuating an environment that fosters officer disengagement.
- 4.15 Unit design at Casuarina emphasises the control room or ‘pod’ as the centre of activity. Prisoners are called to this ‘pod’, have to attend this space to find an officer, to enter or leave the unit, and to request forms and information. With all officer spaces and computers outside of the prisoner contact areas, the unit design has the effect of segregating officers from, and obstructing contact with, prisoners.

64 A similar situation was noted in the DCS’s Operational Compliance Review of Casuarina conducted in April 2008, which stated that it did not appear that any irregular checks, requiring officers to enter the unit or engage with prisoners, were being conducted.

65 This may partly explain why the prisoner pre-inspection survey findings indicated that only 28 per cent of Aboriginal respondents, as compared with 39 per cent of non-Aboriginal respondents, said they were mostly happy with the quantity of food provided at the prison.

- 4.16 Management and senior officers have attempted to mitigate some of the design barriers by removing spare seating from the control rooms, setting up officers in day rooms, and instructing officers to be present out in the unit when not specifically required elsewhere. Furthermore, the design of the prospective units is intended to promote officer engagement by purposefully locating offices internal to the unit.
- 4.17 Efforts to encourage increased officer engagement with prisoners to date though appear to have been ignored or circumvented (for example, chairs have been replaced in control rooms). This is not to say, however, that all officers have disengaged or actively avoid prisoner contact; some remain very active.
- 4.18 It will be interesting to see whether the design of the new units, being more aligned with contemporary thinking around dynamic security as an effective tool of custodial management, will foster improved officer engagement with prisoners. Addressing current disengagement should be one of the top priorities for the new substantive superintendent when in post.

DISCIPLINE AND PUNISHMENT

- 4.19 A range of clear, graduated incentives and sanctions are essential to ensuring the good order of a prison and to promoting positive prisoner behaviour. Good prisoner behaviour should be rewarded with access to privileges and lower levels of supervision, and poor behaviour may result in a loss of privilege and more intensive supervision.
- 4.20 Director General's Rule 3⁶⁶ itemises the privileges (such as access to recreation, approved items of personal property including a range of electrical items in the prisoner's cell etc) which can be granted to prisoners depending upon compliance with expected standards of behaviour. Likewise, contravention of these standards can result in privileges being withdrawn for a period.
- 4.21 Another means of rewarding or sanctioning behaviour is embodied in DCS's Policy Directive 3,⁶⁷ which provides for different types or levels of accommodation and regimes through which prisoners can be progressed and regressed.
- 4.22 Traditionally, the privilege and hierarchy of accommodation systems were both an effective incentive and management tool for prisoners and custodial staff respectively. However, overcrowding has served to erode some of the incentive and sanction options available. During the inspection, prisoners and staff alike raised concerns regarding the loss or serious reduction in one or both of these. Moreover, only 55 per cent of respondents to the pre-inspection staff survey believed there were sufficient mechanisms to promote positive prisoner behaviour.
- 4.23 Even at moderate levels of overcrowding (as seen in 2004 and to some extent also in 2007) the option of having a single cell was incorporated into the notion of hierarchy. At this inspection, though, all cells that could be doubled-up were, and a group of long-term prisoners had settled into the self-care unit (which also had its share of doubled-up cells).

66 DCS, Director General's Rule 3, Privileges.

67 DCS, Policy Directive 3, Hierarchy of Management (Privilege) Regimes and Close Supervision

Moreover, in excess of 3000 alerts limited the movement of prisoners around inside the prison. In reality, therefore, the prison was no longer able to run a hierarchical system of accommodation. The Inspectorate is hopeful that the new units may enable a reinstatement of incentive accommodation.

- 4.24 Similarly, with regard to the loss of privilege sanction, staff reported that enforcing the withdrawal of privileges was increasingly unwise, impossible or futile. For example, removing an electrical item – a commonly used sanction – such as a radio was pointless in doubled-up cells where each prisoner has one. Further, withdrawing the privilege of recreation in an environment in which other activities such as employment, programs and education are at a premium, would only serve to fuel boredom, frustration, and tension levels. It was not surprising, therefore, that at the time of the inspection, out of 691 prisoners only 30 prisoners had a currently recorded loss of privilege.⁶⁸
- 4.25 Notwithstanding the above, given the size of the population and the level of overcrowding, a relatively low number of incidents occurred. In the six months between 1 July 2009 and 31 December 2009, there were 167 assaults (a fight between two prisoners is counted as two assaults), with eight staff assaulted during this time. There had been no noticeable increase in misconduct reports attributable to the overcrowding and/or the greatly reduced prospects of parole. A number of senior officers expressed the view that the advent of an additional visit session and additional recreation, meant that prisoners had little to complain about, despite the overcrowding.

THE MULTI-PURPOSE, SPECIAL PURPOSE, AND SPECIAL HANDLING UNITS

- 4.26 The Multi-Purpose Unit (MPU) serves three functions. First, it is used for placement of prisoners undergoing punishment.⁶⁹ Secondly, it provides for those prisoners undergoing a close supervision regime.⁷⁰ Thirdly, a separate wing of the MPU, which is called the Special Protection Unit (SPU), accommodates special protection prisoners. Special protection prisoners have been assessed as requiring extra protection from other prisoners. This may be because of the nature of their offences or professions⁷¹ prior to conviction. Alternatively, it may be because of their vulnerability to pressure from other prisoners to participate in unlawful behaviour because of the sensitive nature of their employment within the prison.
- 4.27 There was a period during 2009⁷² when the rapid increase in prisoner population and the sheer volume of prisoner charges caused long delays for prison charges to be heard, and further, for punishment to be meted out. The punishment wing of the MPU was overflowing. As a temporary management strategy, the over-spill of prisoners was

68 Information provided at the prison management briefing prior to the inspection (13 April 2010).

69 For example, under Section 36 of the *Prisons Act* 1981, the Superintendent may use his/her powers for the good order and management of the prison.

70 DCS Policy Directive 3 states that close supervision could be used as ‘a management option to maintain the good order and security of a prison. It is not intended as a punishment or as a part of a punishment. Its purpose is to temporarily remove prisoners from the mainstream population because they pose a threat to other prisoners, staff or the security of the prison and require a greater degree of supervision and management than general prisoners.’

71 For example, police or prison officers.

72 As noted during an OICS liaison visit on 2 July 2009.

accommodated in the west wing of the Special Handling Unit (SHU), with the east wing reserved for the 'real' SHU prisoners.

- 4.28 However, by the time of this inspection, the Inspectorate found that the backlog had been cleared and that the prosecution process was again efficient, transparent and fair as had been found in 2007. Charges were being dealt with expeditiously and punishment, where appropriate, was being enforced in a timely manner.
- 4.29 The use of the SHU was an effective short-term accommodation solution to the problem of delayed punishment at Casuarina. Its use had been possible because there were unprecedented low numbers in this highest security unit in Western Australia. It is a credit to the staff and management who had worked together to safely return to mainstream as many of these prisoners as possible.
- 4.30 Nonetheless, the SHU's first priority for accommodating prisoners should be in its capacity as a state facility providing for those prisoners requiring a level of security beyond the capability of a mainstream maximum security prison. To use the SHU as a solution to Casuarina's overcrowding problem limits flexibility in terms of prisoner behaviour management options.
- 4.31 In view of the planned increase in population at Casuarina, the Department was asked to provide information to this Office in its pre-inspection submission, regarding its expansion plans for its statewide facilities such as the SHU, SPU and MPU. No such information was provided.
- 4.32 At the pre-inspection briefing, however, Casuarina management explained that they have been exploring accommodation/management options for a growing contingent of prisoners who require separate confinement of more than 30 days (that is, who fall outside the criteria of Section 43 of the *Prisons Act 1981*). They explained that the prisoners whom they were considering were those who have chronic behaviour, personality or mental health issues and who require more therapeutic input as opposed to a punitive environment, in order to be successfully reintegrated into the mainstream. Management advised that the west side of the SHU could be considered as a possibility for this kind of initiative.
- 4.33 The fact that management had identified that a long-standing behaviour management practice for a contingent of prisoners was ineffective and then took a constructive and considered approach to problem-solving was indeed laudable. Moreover, it demonstrated a strong belief on the part of management that effecting positive behavioural change in prisoners was possible. If one strategy was not working, it did not mean that other methods should not be tried.
- 4.34 The Inspectorate believes that there is certainly a need to explore alternative behaviour management strategies for this particular group of prisoners. But it does not believe that the SHU, as the most secure area for the state's most risky prisoners, is the appropriate place. The capacity and role of the SHU has been established as such for good reason. Spare capacity must always be available within the SHU so that it can provide a responsive service as required, or have flexibility within its own management regimes to accommodate a diverse

population. The need for a different accommodation/management regime for a particular group of prisoners should not be at the expense of this specialist statewide facility, and just because there is overcrowding at Casuarina and across the rest of the prison estate.

SHU Prisoners

- 4.35 The regime in the SHU is necessarily highly focused on security and consequently, particularly restrictive. Staff elect to work within this special regime and many staff have been there a long time. As a group, the staff argued that the claustrophobic nature of the unit and the temperament of its prisoners warrant consistency and continuity of staffing.
- 4.36 While each of the prisoners in the SHU should have an exit plan, the remaining five prisoners accommodated there posed significant and long-term risks if placed into mainstream. At least two prisoners were unlikely to ever be returned to normal discipline due to the nature of their offences and behaviour within and outside the prison.
- 4.37 The Assistant Superintendent Special Units visits the unit daily and health staff, including a psychologist, visit all but one prisoner on a regular basis.
- 4.38 The Inspectorate interviewed all prisoners in the unit. They each understood that it had been their own actions that had resulted in their detention in the unit. They expressed satisfaction with their treatment by staff. Somewhat ironically, despite the relative isolation, the mundanity, and the limited work and education options, they were relatively comfortable in the unit and were aware that there were very few prisoners at Casuarina who had single cell accommodation. They also expressed satisfaction with the food, which was cooked by one of the prisoners in the unit.

PROTECTION PRISONERS

- 4.39 Unit Six is the designated protection unit at Casuarina, housing those prisoners who have been assessed as at risk of harm from other prisoners because of their offence profile,⁷³ their personal history with other prisoners, or their vulnerability because of mental illness, or intellectual and/or social disability.
- 4.40 In 2007, the Inspectorate found that a system had been implemented for the regular review of each prisoner's status with the aim of assessing their potential for reintegration into the mainstream. In reality, though, and particularly in overcrowded times, this process has become increasingly meaningless.
- 4.41 The return of a protection prisoner to the mainstream population at Casuarina is technically possible and has occurred on rare occasions in the past. However, all prisoners in the unit tend to be labelled, by association, as sex offenders by the mainstream population. This label does not go away, and prisoners who enter protection seldom exit because the risk of prisoner assault is too high. In these overcrowded times, with enforced cell sharing for all but the most disturbed or dangerous, this risk is even more elevated.

73 Offenders against children, particularly sex offenders, are the main target of other prisoners.

- 4.42 Ensuring equity of access to services by protection prisoners poses a particular challenge to prison operations, the logistics of which become even more complex in the context of an overcrowded environment. Staff must facilitate access to visits, education, canteen, training, recreation, medical, library, counselling, and programs, while keeping protection prisoners physically separated from mainstream prisoners.
- 4.43 Since the last inspection, the visits regime – which had recently seen the integration of the mainstream and protection prisoners’ schedule – had embedded well. With high levels of supervision and good management, any apprehension had proven to be unfounded.
- 4.44 A PCS staff member is assigned and regularly attends Unit Six providing counselling, and support, and risk assessment services. In addition, the Inspectorate’s independent visitors regularly attend the unit following which, they meet with management and advocate on behalf of prisoners.
- 4.45 On the other hand, however, protection prisoners’ ability to source support via peer support, and the Aboriginal Visitors’ Scheme (AVS) had deteriorated considerably. At the time of the inspection, there were no peer support prisoners in the Unit. Furthermore, Prison Support Officers were not regularly visiting.
- 4.46 Unit Six prisoners do not have access to mainstream employment options and as such, access to trades and work experience options are highly limited. Although they have experienced an increase in employment with access to unit employment, the laundry and the kitchen, protection prisoners’ options remained significantly restricted relative to mainstream prisoners.
- 4.47 Similarly, though Unit Six prisoners have access to education, this is by no means equivalent. In this regard, prisoners in protection are probably disproportionately and further disadvantaged by the Department’s withdrawal of personal computers.⁷⁴
- 4.48 Further, in terms of external vocational training, unless there is a critical mass of protection prisoners who wish to attain certification in a course for which providers need to be outsourced, such as forklift truck driving, the cost is prohibitive and access is impossible.
- 4.49 Protection prisoners advised the Inspectorate that although limited, access to other services, such as oval recreation, the library, the canteen, and the gym, was available on a scheduled basis. Access to the oval had been stopped for a period because of poor take-up related to protection prisoners experiencing verbal abuse by mainstream prisoners (despite being escorted by officers). By the time of this inspection, though, their use of the oval had been reinstated on Sunday afternoons. The Inspectorate observed protection prisoners accessing the oval accordingly.

74 Further to an alleged security breach, all personal computers were withdrawn from all prisoners in January 2010. They had been scheduled to be withdrawn by 31 January 2011 anyway. No official determination as to if or when the computers will be returned has been made. Moreover, according to the Department’s website, Policy Directive 2, *Use of Personal Computers by Prisoners* remains in use and was last modified in March 2010. This withdrawal disproportionately impacts upon protection prisoners, because they have less access (only once a week) to the education centre’s computers.

- 4.50 Although few protection prisoners ever return to mainstream, and separate access to other areas/services at the prison is a challenge for staff to facilitate, this inspection did not find that overcrowding has disproportionately impacted upon protection prisoners.

MINIMUM SECURITY PRISONERS

- 4.51 There are a considerable number of prisoners classified as minimum security at Casuarina, the reasons for which have been discussed earlier in this report. Ordinarily, if they were placed in a minimum security facility, these prisoners would access services appropriate to their risk and stage of their sentence.- Even allowing for those who had been transferred to Casuarina to undertake programs, the number of minimum security prisoners was still much too high.
- 4.52 In addition to the issue of value for money, which has been discussed earlier, the cost to the prisoner is quite considerable. The inspection found that minimum security prisoners at Casuarina were significantly disadvantaged compared with their minimum security counterparts in minimum security facilities because they lacked access to those services and privileges that prepare prisoners for release.
- 4.53 For regional prisoners, and in particular Aboriginal prisoners, their inability to be located in their home locations caused a great deal of distress and emotional trauma, and was a risk to their well being. These prisoners were not even able to access transfers for visits on an annual basis.⁷⁵
- 4.54 Prisoners classified as minimum security have generally 'earned' this status and in turn the privilege of a more casual environment, improved and more natural visit conditions with family, more trusted work conditions, cells remaining unlocked at night, better access to recreation and other such privileges. This was not the case for these prisoners at Casuarina; conditions were consistent with those set for maximum security prisoners.
- 4.55 Further, these minimum prisoners did not have access to the normal array of programs that such prisoners should have access to in order to prepare for reintegration back into the community, such as home leave, Section 95 employment or recreation.⁷⁶
- 4.56 In the long-term, if the Department's predictions are accurate, the need to accommodate as many minimum security prisoners should reduce. Nonetheless, those who are still placed at Casuarina will continue to experience significant disadvantage compared with their counterparts in minimum security facilities. The Department should explore the ways in which such disadvantage can be minimised for those minimum security prisoners who continue to be placed at Casuarina and in other maximum security environments.

75 For more information about temporary transfers see Chapter Five.

76 Section 95 of the *Prisons Act* 1981 provides the legal mechanism for the Superintendent of a prison to authorise prisoners' leave for the purposes of community-based reparation, study, recreation and work. Section 95 employment, recreation, or study can assist in the gradual re-integration of prisoners into society.

Chapter 5

OFFENDER SERVICES

STRUCTURAL FRAMEWORK

- 5.1 Since 2003 a group of services classified as ‘Offender Services’ have been managed on site at Casuarina, Hakea and Bandyup Women’s Prison by an on site Manager of Offender Services (MOS). These services include Prison Counselling Service (PCS), peer support and treatment program delivery. They are respectively administered by counsellors, Prison Support Officers (PSOs) and clinical intervention officers. The MOS reports to the Superintendent as well as the Manager of Clinical Services within DCS. According to the MOS at Casuarina this arrangement ‘allows for maintenance of clinical and professional standards, whilst ensuring the position is a part of the prison management team’.⁷⁷
- 5.2 To date this arrangement has worked well at Casuarina. In the context of a large maximum security environment, programs and support services are of key importance. The MOS, PCS and PSO staff expressed the view that having representation at prison management level enhanced their effectiveness and ensures their essential service profile was maintained within the security focussed operations of a maximum security prison.
- 5.3 As a relatively cohesive group, this set-up has also enabled some cross-fertilisation of skills. Inter-service secondments between PCS and programs personnel have provided valuable learning opportunities for staff and enabled greater flexibility in service delivery.
- 5.4 However, a recent review of the structure of ‘Offender Services’ within prisons recommended that the MOS positions be moved off site (as well as those of PCS and programs staff) to be located within the recently created Community Justice Services hubs. Staff would then attend prison locations to provide the required services, and be potentially available for continuity of service in the community. This would also provide a variety of work for staff.
- 5.5 The MOS and PCS staff were strongly of the view that while based on site, the MOS is able to reinforce and maintain PCS’s acceptance as an essential service and its integration within the prison. They believe that without the MOS constantly representing PCS, security imperatives would supersede clinical need and ultimately have an adverse effect on the service provided to prisoners. The input of the MOS into management level meetings about prisoner management was also seen as important. The MOS can contribute valuable information to decision making in relation to issues that affect prisoners’ behaviour and management needs, about which other staff may be unaware.
- 5.6 Interestingly programs staff did not hold this strong view. They believed the location of the MOS would not fundamentally impact on programs as these are scheduled from outside the prison and have to occur regardless of a MOS. They currently experienced some issues with suitability of accommodation for programs (see below) so did not think it would erode any further by having a MOS absent from site.
- 5.7 Both groups of staff, however, were critical of the lack of communication about the forward plans for ‘Offender Services’. They were told 12 months ago that all staff would move to community hubs but at the time of the inspection had heard nothing else. They had lots

⁷⁷ DCS, *Offender Services Casuarina Prison – Overview* (April 2010), 3.

of questions and, despite being cohesive staff teams, the lack of answers was having an unsettling effect.

- 5.8 Following the on-site phase of the inspection the Inspectorate followed up these issues with the Director Offender Services.⁷⁸ The Director Offender Services acknowledged the anxiety about the removal of the MOS positions from Casuarina, Hakea and Bandyup Women's Prison and was preparing a response for distribution. Some PCS staff were briefed during the first week of June 2010 about the movement of staff to the hubs and apparently a comprehensive communication strategy has been developed to ensure that all staff are appropriately briefed. Plans at the time of writing were that the first service delivery team is tentatively due to open in Midland in October 2010. Programs staff will be moving to the hubs, but PCS and PSO staff will remain in the prisons.

Prisoner Counselling Service (PCS): Staffing Arrangements and Support

- 5.9 At the 2007 inspection the Inspector found that '[T]he PCS at Casuarina has become acutely under-resourced since the number of positions in the team was frozen at the end of 2006 and two positions were transferred to regional prisons.'⁷⁹ At that time there was concern that as prisoner numbers increased, resources had decreased down to 6.2 operational staff. Staff were becoming more stressed, while at the same time demand for services was increasing due to prisoner stress associated with rising prisoner numbers.⁸⁰
- 5.10 The 2010 inspection induced a sense of déjà vu. Staff numbers were identical to those at the time of the last inspection (still reflecting a prisoner population of 397) and the prisoner population had increased even more rapidly. Moreover, the Inspectorate was advised that DCS Offender Management had acknowledged that it had to focus its attention primarily on the programs area until it was functioning to a better standard. As such, while programs resources had improved (see below) PCS had been left to cope.
- 5.11 The PCS team consists of a number of part-time staff and with other absences, the team is often without its full complement on site, leaving services further stretched. In addition to increased population stressors causing an increased demand for service, an increase in parole denials and more displaced prisoners has also had a significant impact on prisoner distress and risk.
- 5.12 PCS staff from other prisons are co-opted to fill any longer term absences. This system of coverage, however, moves staff shortages around the system and is not sustainable. A more systemic approach to managing absences and leave (such as a pool of casual staff or similar) is required. This would reduce the risk of long term absences placing undue stress on staff and enable consistent levels of essential service delivery.
- 5.13 However, there have been two specific areas of improvement. First, staff access to clinical supervision has been increased to two hours fortnightly on a small group basis. Secondly, the staff have been able to access some professional development opportunities, something that they reported had not occurred for many years.

78 E-mails exchanged between Director Offender Services and Inspectorate 24 May 2010 and 7 June 2010.

79 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 45.

80 Ibid.

-
- 5.14 The team also stated that whilst their working conditions and resources within the prison had not been a focus for head office management, they were now feeling that PCS issues would be addressed. The Director Offender Services confirmed via contact with the Inspectorate at the beginning of June 2010, that with the new accommodation units (256 prisoners) the staffing complement will increase by an additional clinical supervisor, three additional PCS staff and an additional PSO. Three of these positions will be introduced in October 2010, and the remaining two in January 2011. However, this increase will fail to address the pre-existing shortfall already identified in 2007, and the addition to that shortfall caused by the continued increase in prisoner population in the interim.
- 5.15 DCS must not let staff become disillusioned by not acting on these undertakings, and must turn its attention towards progress in this area. While not even bridging the resource gap caused by previous population increases, the creation of extra positions, which has been promised with the additional 256 prisoners, is a start. Further professional development support and open dialogue with staff about the future structure and operation of 'Offender Services' within the prison will also be essential in managing this group of staff well.

PCS: Service Provision

- 5.16 Historically, the focus of PCS work was two-pronged: prisoner risk and needs assessment, and therapeutic intervention in the form of preventative care/counselling. However, in an environment of increasingly stretched resources, and overcrowded conditions causing increased stress and risk behaviours in prisoners,⁸¹ the inspection found that counselling is becoming a 'luxury'.
- 5.17 As such, out of necessity, a crisis management approach⁸² has been adopted. PCS staff stated that they spend most of their time meeting the reporting requirements of the At Risk Management System (ARMS)/Prisoner Risk Assessment Group (PRAG), the new young offender assessments, and the prisoners in the Crisis Care Unit (CCU). The demands of the core service – providing assessments and reports – have increased to such an extent that the demand for more ongoing support cannot be met. Statistics on new referrals showed a huge increase from January 2009 (21) to April 2009 (146) and peaked in August 2009 (215). The comparison in January 2010 to the previous year was also stark with 139 new referrals.⁸³
- 5.18 PCS staff explained that the stresses and emphasis of their role do not allow them to identify clients that potentially have problems. And yet, ongoing planned, therapeutic intervention in the form of counselling can play a key role in preventing issues becoming problems and escalating into crisis.
- 5.19 It is almost impossible to evaluate the extent to which the lack of such a service may contribute to a situation deteriorating into a crisis. Nonetheless, as counselling as a preventative tool increasingly becomes an unmet need, the potential risk to individual

81 Plus other factors identified above – parole denials and increased prisoner displacement.

82 A term used frequently throughout the inspection by different classifications and disciplines of staff was 'post management'. Staff qualified the meaning of this term by explaining that because of limited resources they can often only act when a crisis is actually occurring or has occurred. They may be able to see that a situation is escalating, but because of competing and conflicting demands, they cannot step in until it has become a crisis.

83 DCS, *Offender Services Casuarina Prison – Overview* (April 2010), 8.

prisoners' safety and well-being becomes elevated.

- 5.20 Another mechanism that has been prevention rather than crisis-management based has been the Support and Monitoring System (SAMS). This system facilitates the identification and monitoring of prisoners with ongoing risks. However, PCS staff at Casuarina expressed concern because although as a team they had continued to monitor the SAMS prisoners, no official interdisciplinary meetings had been held since December 2009. Notwithstanding the fact that there had been no resources allocated to PCS or the prison for SAMS implementation, the Department has deemed it worthwhile and introduced it across the prison estate. It is therefore essential that the prison invigorates this process urgently.
- 5.21 The PCS team strongly felt that DCS measures PCS's success in terms of a lack of suicidal deaths.⁸⁴ PCS staff expressed the view, however, that it is mostly luck and the quick reactions of staff when events do occur, which prevent deaths, and not good planning or systems. PCS staff accepted that their primary focus has to be crisis management, what with the number of prisoners reaching crisis point increasing because of the double bunking and the difficulty in securing parole. They did not accept, however, that low suicide rates should be the indicator of success for the service as a whole.
- 5.22 The way in which PCS has progressively shifted to primarily performing a crisis intervention function has been described above. However, the ailing prison infrastructure is even putting PCS's crisis intervention role at risk. It is impeding PCS staff's ability to carry out their roles, and increasing the risk of self-harm for prisoners. Once a prisoner is placed on ARMS, the PCS may make a number of recommendations as to their placement within the prison, their accommodation and access to certain services. Because of overcrowding, it is often impossible for the prison to facilitate these recommendations (such as single cells or admission to MPU). PCS reported instances of prisoners 'acting up' on purpose in order to get a placement in MPU away from their shared cell as a form of 'time out'. For a prisoner to act out in this way poses a serious risk to themselves, other prisoners, staff and the good order of the prison.
- 5.23 With the system wide focus on the improvement of programs, prisoner counselling services have mostly been put to one side. As such the issues identified regarding these services at Casuarina at the last inspection in 2007 remain in 2010. In particular the number of staff has not increased and more than ever they struggle to meet demand for services.

Programs

- 5.24 For some years treatment programs had been in a parlous state across all prisons in Western Australia,⁸⁵ with resource limitations having forced the cancellation of a large range of low and medium intensity programs, leaving only a skeleton program of high intensity interventions. The situation at Casuarina in 2007 reflected this, with only an average of 16 program contacts per month that year, and not a single program running at the time of that inspection.

84 Since July 2007, there have been three deaths at Casuarina. The Coroner automatically enquires into all deaths in custody. The investigation into all three deaths continues.

85 See OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 53.

-
- 5.25 Government and Departmental policy saw a concerted focus on programs commence in September 2008. High intensity programs remain the focus of delivery; however, medium intensity programs are also back in the schedule as are programs from a separate unit that provide interventions specifically designed for Aboriginal participants. The result is a marked increase in intervention program delivery and participation by prisoners. This is a very positive outcome and reduces one stressor for many prisoners who had been unable to access any programs for many years.
- 5.26 At the time of the inspection, two violent offender programs had recently been completed; a medium intensity violence program had recently commenced (and was the third such program in 12 months); an Indigenous anger and substance use program had concluded; by June 2010, four Pathways programs would have been completed for 2010; and an intensive sex offender treatment program (SOTP) finished in March 2010. Another SOTP was scheduled to start in June 2010. Cognitive Skills programs had also increased in delivery, with seven to be completed in the 2009–2010 financial year.⁸⁶
- 5.27 Figures provided by Casuarina further exemplified this improvement. Program participation hit a low in 2007 with only 120 prisoners commencing participation in a treatment program. This increased slightly to 164 in 2008. By the end of 2009 the new focus on programs was being reflected in participation rates when 251 prisoners had commenced a program.⁸⁷
- 5.28 The Department has done well to begin to address the deficit in service delivery. However, unmet need remains: that is, the number of prisoners assessed as requiring programs exceeds supply. Offender Services need to address the issue of ‘pedalling backwards’: as quickly as it increases the number of programs being scheduled to catch up with years of under-supply, the number of prisoners increases further.
- 5.29 The basis on which prisoners are chosen to participate does not seem to be consistent and is almost on a first come, first serve basis. That is, if prisoners are assessed as needing a program, and a place is still available within the required time frame, then the prisoner can participate. If there is none available then the prisoner misses out. Whether this is the most appropriate way to decide access cannot be assessed by this Office in the context of this Inspection. To its credit, the Department is currently piloting a project to look at the assessment practices within the prison environment, but ‘will continue to adopt the risk and need principle in assessment for program suitability and will focus resources on high risk and high needs offenders as a priority.’⁸⁸
- 5.30 With a potential additional 256 prisoners from October 2010, it has been impossible to predict what the extra demand for programs will be. While a schedule for 2011 delivery had almost been finalised at the time of the inspection, it was inevitable that this would change and more programs would need to be added. Scheduling, however, is highly dependent on the availability of appropriate rooms for program delivery. Rooms for programs have

86 DCS, *Offender Services Casuarina Prison – Overview* (April 2010) 14.

87 *Ibid.*, 19.

88 Email from Director of Offender Services 27 May 2010.

apparently been built into the design of the two new units. However, at the time of writing, construction had still not commenced; presumably the 2011 program schedule could not be truly finalised.

- 5.31 Programs staff are accommodated in an area in the amenities building outside the prison perimeter fence. The team's staffing levels fluctuate depending on the program schedule, but include psychologists, social workers, uniformed staff, and also individuals from the specific Aboriginal programs team, which moves between prisons.
- 5.32 The Department has done well in its recruitment of additional programs staff. However, staff have found it increasingly difficult to maintain pace with the schedules. This has resulted in instances of staff being instructed: to start screening for a new program, when another program is still in progress; to shorten report-writing processes at the end of courses from four to two weeks; and to acquit leave, but then have applications refused because of program delivery imperatives. At inspection, staff were feeling under pressure.
- 5.33 Uniformed staff who work within the programs area are also in need of greater support. The staff are not officially seconded to Offender Services and so have dual responsibilities to program delivery but also to their prison. Uniformed staff can be withdrawn from programs to work on shift if required and also be called in to do unit shifts on weekends after having worked in programs all week. Unlike psychologists, these officers do not receive clinical support, and do not have access to program-related professional development.
- 5.34 On a positive note, programs staff were appreciative of the additional professional development opportunities that have been made available in recent times. Staff who are psychologically trained were also positive about the increased access to clinical supervision, a serious deficit previously identified. In the absence of sufficient clinical supervisors, however, the MOS has been taking on some of this responsibility. The recruitment of an additional clinical supervisor (as mentioned earlier) either later in 2010 or early in 2011, however, should mean that such an arrangement will only need to continue in the short-term. Additionally, staff who are not psychology trained reported that they receive no supervision at all. They were under the impression that they had to fund this in their own time, although this was refuted by the Director, Offender Services. It is important that the details of this entitlement are effectively communicated to staff.
- 5.35 In summary, the Department has done well to expand program delivery. However, demand continues to outstrip supply even with the current population. Although there are plans to continue to expand program delivery at Casuarina, there were few concrete plans at the time of the inspection. Moreover, a number of major barriers, such as availability of staff and suitable program delivery rooms, have to be overcome before further expansion can occur.

Chapter 6

WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO PRISONERS

MAINTAINING FAMILY AND COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS

- 6.1 Most prisoners will be released from prison – the only question is when. Maintaining familial and social connections and minimising the impact of imprisonment on outside relationships is therefore critical and must be a key focus of custodial management.

Social Visits

- 6.2 Custodial officers book visit sessions and process all the requisite paperwork for visits between 8.00 am – 5.00 pm, seven days a week. In recognition of the significant increase in workload brought about by the higher prisoner population, and further to complaints⁸⁹ from callers about difficulties getting through on the phone and being kept on hold for long periods, a dedicated bookings officer position has recently been approved.
- 6.3 Staff described the way in which visitors frequently make bookings but do not attend, which could mean a missed opportunity for other visitors. However, staff have developed a waitlist system, such that if sessions in the main visits area are fully booked, they take further bookings for visits in available non-contact cubicles. After 20 minutes of the commencement of a session, if visitors booked into the main visits area have not arrived, those waitlisted visitors in the non-contact cubicles can move into the main visit area for a contact visit.
- 6.4 The Special Handling Unit (SHU) has a visits area integral to the Unit. However, as part of the capital works program this was being remodelled and remained unfinished at the time of the inspection. Meanwhile, however, prisoners from the SHU have continued to be able to receive visitors in the Official Visits area.
- 6.5 Two visit sessions are held each day Monday to Friday, at 1.45 pm and 4.15 pm. Six visit sessions are held on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays. The first visit session each day, Monday to Friday, is a recent addition brought about by the higher prisoner population. However, the frequency of and limited seating on the prison bus service has remained unchanged. This was a source of frustration for visitors⁹⁰ who described having to forego preferred visit times because all the seats on the bus were fully booked, or having to wait over an hour (often with young children) after a weekend visit was over before they could catch the scheduled return bus.
- 6.6 Depending on privilege status, prisoners are either entitled to two or four, one-hour visits. Flexible configuration of these visits can be arranged depending upon individual circumstances. For example, a prisoner can have a double-visit session instead of two, hour-long sessions. Management and staff at the prison explained, however, that given the current prisoner population, it is only because of the large number of prisoners accommodated at Casuarina, who are too far from home for their families and friends to be able to visit, that the prison has been able to honour the vast majority of visit requests. There are a total of 484 visits slots available each week. If each prisoner requested their

89 The inspection team reviewed social visitors' complaints forms and noted four complaints about the booking system had been received to date in 2010; complaints about this matter were common in 2009 also.

90 Noted in review of the social visitors' complaints file and through interview of visitors during the inspection.

minimum entitlement of two, one-hour sessions per week, a total of 1380 pre-scheduled slots would be required (based on a population of 690). This would mean a potential shortfall of at least 896 visit slots. Management explained that with the prospect of an extra 256 prisoners, the number of visit sessions will again have to be reviewed and revised.

- 6.7 Outcare is the contracted service provider of welfare, childcare, and family support services from its outpost in front of the gatehouse at Casuarina. All social visitors to Casuarina have to pass through this building. Visitors interviewed expressed high levels of satisfaction with Outcare's services.
- 6.8 Outcare employs a childcare worker between 1.00 pm and 5.00 pm on Saturday and Sunday to supervise the play area, make activities and toys available, escort children to the toilet and so on. Outcare staff explained that formerly, the childcare worker would take the children back to the Outcare building half way through visit sessions. The childcare worker would entertain the children for the remainder of the session, and this would enable the visitors to have exclusive time with prisoners. Outcare staff explained that this had been really valued by visitors and prisoners alike. Often there were issues that required private discussion or that could only be satisfactorily resolved without children present. However, this service has not been offered for some time and neither Outcare staff nor prison management knew the reason for its withdrawal.
- 6.9 Children under five years and over 10 years are not allowed to access the play area. They are not allowed (for security reasons) to take toys or activities of their own into the visit area and can only access these items when the childcare worker is on duty. When the childcare worker is not on duty, an hour or two-hour visit session can be very long and stressful for all concerned. Officers said that they do not access the cupboard in which the toys and play activities are stored. Their primary focus has to be managing the visit session and ensuring safety, security, and good order. Arguably, however, actively promoting a pro-social environment in which children are happily occupied could assist officers in achieving these security imperatives.
- 6.10 With the exception of family incentive visit sessions, which are held once a month, prisoners are prohibited from playing with their children in the play area. At the last inspection and at this one, the prison could not adequately justify why prisoners could interact with their children in this area on some occasions and not others. To permit interaction with their children more frequently could greatly assist prisoners in maintaining positive family relationships.
- 6.11 The play area is largely exposed to the elements. Although there is a shade sail, the area is reportedly inordinately hot in summer and provides little shelter from rain. With the prospect of an additional 256 prisoners, a funding bid for a new visit centre had been submitted. If approved, careful consideration will need to be given to the design of the children's play area.

Security During Visits

- 6.12 Two Senior Officers share the management of visits, with four supporting officer staff rostered through each day covering the prisoner check-in and changing area, the visit room, the visitor entry area, and the lobby/camera monitoring. These staff, as well as the gatehouse staff, were all noted to act in a professional manner and to treat visitors with respect.
- 6.13 Since the last inspection security technology has been significantly augmented. Iris scanning and electronic trace detection has been introduced, complementing metal detection and the use of drug detection dogs, which are used seven days a week. The use of these dogs continues to be a major bone of contention for visitors. Of 27 social visitors' complaints received to date in 2010, 13 related to contesting the accuracy of the process, and in turn the unfair consequences of being 'sat on'. Frustration of a similar nature was expressed to the team by visitors during the on-site phase of the inspection.

Mechanisms for Dislocated Prisoners to Maintain Family and Social Connections

- 6.14 Back in 2005,⁹¹ this Office highlighted that a large number of prisoners were accommodated at Casuarina who were a long way from their homes and families. This disproportionately affected Aboriginal prisoners placed at Casuarina who, where the beds available, would usually be accommodated elsewhere in regions closer to their homes and families. This was still the status quo in 2007⁹² and again in 2010 (see Table 1 in Chapter Two).
- 6.15 Mechanisms for easing the trauma of separation from home and families include provision of a weekly remote phone allowance, video link visits, and temporary transfers. Staff in the orientation unit (Unit 5), Prison Support Officer staff, and peer support prisoners provide information about these mechanisms in oral and written forms to newly received prisoners.

Remote Phone Allowance

- 6.16 At this inspection, prisoners were well informed about their entitlements to, and satisfied with the crediting process to their accounts of, the remote phone allowance. Nonetheless, they identified the inequity in the amount of telephone contact they were able to have with loved ones because of the ongoing disparity between the cost of overseas calls and Subscriber Trunk Dialling (STD) calls. Given the vast numbers of prisoners across the prison estate who are dislocated and who need to make STD calls, the Department should explore options for redressing this inequity.

Videolink

- 6.17 The use of video link for social visits at Casuarina is a relatively well used mechanism to ease the trauma associated with being isolated, although its use has not increased proportionately with the increased numbers.⁹³ This could be attributed to the following: first, there has been no position dedicated to social visit video link administration; secondly, video link facilities

91 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.28, (June 2005) 3.

92 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49, (March 2008) 40.

93 In the first three months of 2010, the prison facilitated 29, 18 and 29 video link visits respectively. Figures provided by Casuarina personnel during the inspection.

are also used for court hearings and can only be used for social visits in the afternoons; and finally, there appears to have been a misunderstanding among prisoners about payment for this service.

- 6.18 The inspection team was advised at the time of the inspection, however, that prison management has recognised the need to ramp up the use of video link in light of the proportionate increase in the numbers of prisoners from outside of the metropolitan area. Accordingly, they had applied for and received approval for the creation of two VSO positions dedicated to managing video link processes. This ownership should ensure that the video-link facility is coordinated such that its use is maximised when it is not being used for court hearings, that it is actively promoted, and that prisoners are furnished with accurate information regarding costs. If initiated at the prison, Casuarina does not charge the prisoner or visitor for video link connection irrespective of length and there are no limits on the frequency of such visits.

Temporary Transfers

- 6.19 Temporary transfers to local regional prisons for visits are another mechanism by which those prisoners who are a long way from home can relieve the trauma of separation from family and friends. Prisoners make an application, which is processed at Casuarina and then a recommendation is sent to the proposed receiving prison for approval. Up to four, one-week, or two, two-week, or one, four-week transfers can be recommended in any one year. Unfortunately, the gridlocked prison and transport system makes temporary transfers a relatively low priority. Only four temporary transfers had occurred to date in 2010.⁹⁴

Funeral Attendance

- 6.20 Approval to attend a funeral depends upon prisoners being able to meet certain criteria, which includes demonstrating a blood, marital, or cultural/kinship relationship to the deceased. Security, logistics and victim issues are also taken into account in the approval process.⁹⁵ It is not surprising given Aboriginal peoples' lower life expectancy and their over-representation in prison, that Aboriginal prisoners make the vast majority of funeral applications at Casuarina.
- 6.21 Moreover, frequently a number of prisoners will apply to attend the same funeral.⁹⁶ When this occurs, the prison authorities approach the family outside and ask for their preferences regarding prisoner attendees. At Casuarina, during the first quarter of 2010, 69 funeral attendance applications were received; 30 were approved.
- 6.22 The Department bears the cost of prisoners attending funerals. The inspection found that for those applications for funerals which are to be held in remote areas, the cost of getting there under escort, which can also involve having to charter a plane, is frequently prohibitively expensive. For example, if a prisoner has a funeral in Turkey Creek, they would need to fly from Perth under escort to Broome, from where a plane would have to be

94 Figures provided by Casuarina personnel during the inspection.

95 See Department of Corrective Services Policy Directive 9, *Permit for Absence*.

96 For example, in January 2010, 13 prisoners applied to attend five funerals (statistics provided by prison personnel during the inspection).

WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO PRISONERS

chartered to get to Turkey Creek. The cost of the plane and escort from Broome to Turkey Creek alone is \$7,038.⁹⁷

- 6.23 Prison staff advised and prisoners verified that services in honour of the deceased are held at the prison for those prisoners unable to attend the funeral proper.

FOOD

- 6.24 At the last inspection, low levels of satisfaction with food were reported. At the time, Casuarina management had submitted a business case for minor works funding in the 2007-2008 budget to upgrade the kitchen. This proposal was successful, minor works were completed and at the time of this inspection, all meals were being prepared on site.⁹⁸ However, in the time period between the business case submission and the works being carried out, the prisoner population continued to rise from 580 to 690 and additional staff, to whom food also needed to be supplied, were engaged to manage the increased numbers.
- 6.25 Only 23 per cent of respondents to the pre-inspection survey reported that they were 'mostly happy' with food quality. Further, food (along with health services) was identified as the third of the three 'most negative things that do not work' at the prison.
- 6.26 It is not surprising that satisfaction with food quality remained at similar levels compared with the previous inspection findings. It is acknowledged that the upgrades have enabled all meals to be cooked on site, with the positive by product of also having provided additional employment and training opportunities to prisoners. However, even before commissioning, the upgrade plans were anachronistic because they were developed based upon the numbers for whom food needed to be prepared being considerably lower. One thousand meals now have to be prepared at each mealtime for prisoners and staff in a kitchen that was originally built to provide for the food needs of around 400 prisoners and their supporting staff.
- 6.27 At the time of the inspection 20 prisoners (supported by between three to four staff) were employed in the kitchen at any one time. Staff and prisoners commented, and the Inspectorate observed, that given the space constraints, work practices have to be carefully organised and monitored to ensure that safety is not compromised.
- 6.28 Management and staff described the way in which they have been evaluating a range of kitchen designs with a view to providing a new kitchen on site. However, at the time of the inspection, no plans or funding had been approved.

PRISONER PURCHASES

- 6.29 Prisoners at Casuarina are able to make purchases at the canteen from their own money or from the accumulation of gratuities.
- 6.30 VSO staffing levels in the canteen are similar to those in place during the 2007 inspection. Two VSOs and four self-care prisoners operate the canteen – a major exercise in

97 Information provided during on-site phase of inspection by staff responsible for processing funeral applications.

98 Previously, the meat/protein portions of main meals were cook/chill prepared at Hakea and transported in. The vegetable, salad, and bakery requirements of the prison have always been supplied by the on-site vegetable preparation workshop and the bakery

organisation. The Casuarina canteen has a turnover of approximately \$1.3 million per annum,⁹⁹ which is likely to increase to over two million dollars when the population increases by 256. The profits from this represent a modest but useful contribution to the prison's budget.

- 6.31 Despite the increase in prisoner numbers and a relative erosion in staffing resources available to operate the canteen, the pre-inspection survey found that satisfaction with access to the canteen service were at similar levels to those reported in 2007 (57 per cent of respondents reported being 'mostly happy'). Furthermore, in the 2010 survey, prisoners rated the canteen as third out of the 'three most positive things that work' at Casuarina.
- 6.32 Space in the canteen is at a premium and the physical layout does not facilitate efficient work flow and there is very limited storage capacity. Good management has minimised stock losses.¹⁰⁰ The VSOs reported having requested access to further storage space external to the prison, but this was refused. This means that despite carrying a wide range of items, some have to be left to run out before stock can be replenished, impacting upon availability and sales.
- 6.33 The Inspectorate found that for each unit's scheduled canteen period, the canteen is operating at absolute capacity, with the storage space for packed orders full, and workers wholly engaged. Given the space constraints and the building's awkward configuration, it would seem that all possible workflow efficiencies have been exhausted and that there is no space available for more workers.
- 6.34 It is impressive that staff have managed to provide the level of service that they have to date. For such a service to be sustainable, especially with the prospect of an additional 256 prisoners, considerable expansion of the existing canteen or a second canteen site, and additional staffing would be required. However, no approved plans for expansion of the canteen were available at the time of the inspection.

RECREATION

- 6.35 A good recreation program reduces stress and boredom in the prisoner group, promotes physical and mental activity and encourages positive association between prisoners. During periods of overcrowding its importance to maintaining good order is further heightened.
- 6.36 While not without its limitations, recreation was an indisputably positive aspect of this inspection. The quality and quantity of recreation have improved considerably since the 2004 inspection. At this inspection, as with the 2007 inspection, survey findings indicated that prisoners rated recreation as first out of the 'three most positive things that work best' at Casuarina. This is no mean feat in the context of an environment that has continued to become increasingly overcrowded.
- 6.37 Three highly motivated recreation officers supervise and drive the program, employing prisoners from each unit to assist and coordinate activities. Despite the growth in prisoner numbers, the number of recreation officers has not increased since the last inspection.

99 DCS Canteen Stock Summary (1/1/09 – 31/12/09).

100 DCS Canteen Stock Adjustment printout.

- 6.38 The program, which is based upon prisoners' surveyed input, comprises a varied range of well organised passive and physical, and individual and group activities. Supervised recreation is available external to the units for two sessions per day and three on weekends. The morning session of each week day is designated for unemployed prisoners. Their feedback in the internal survey carried out by recreation staff, indicated that despite the increased population, unemployed prisoners were as satisfied with recreation as their employed counterparts. Furthermore, activities for protection prisoners have expanded.
- 6.39 Security imperatives require that the numbers and management of prisoners at any recreation site is strictly controlled. Prisoners have to apply in advance for activities external to their units and to attend promptly on the day to maximise their chances of a place, because demand often exceeds supply. Once an area that prisoners have elected to attend is full, the surplus prisoners have to return to their units; they cannot opt into another activity. Typically, therefore, prisoners apply for multiple activities, which makes planning and resource allocation complex.
- 6.40 While still limited, opportunities for passive recreation have increased, with more provision of board games and improved access to the library. Each unit is allocated a timeslot for access to the library; a supply of books is separately provided to prisoners in the infirmary and the SHU. Although there is spare capacity for more books, there is little surplus space to increase the number of prisoners attending at any one time. Legal resources remain limited with only two computers and legal content no longer being updated on compact disc (CD).¹⁰¹
- 6.41 With the exception of Unit 1,¹⁰² prisoners can take part in physical activity within the fenced areas in front of their units on a daily basis. The Inspectorate noted that more prisoners seemed to be actively engaged in unit-based activity. This could be due to the 'overflow' from oversubscribed external activities forcing prisoners back to their units. It could also be testament to recreation prisoners actively promoting and organising unit-based activities.
- 6.42 Recreation officers described attempts to increase passive recreation options for older prisoners, with varying degrees of success. However, this group of prisoners remains under-serviced in terms of recreation. These prisoners are spread across units, and with cross-unit activity prohibited on the grounds of security, this lack of critical mass and limited resources makes frequent provision of organised recreation for this group of prisoners unviable. This cohort of prisoners is growing across the prison estate. Casuarina management and the Department need to give further consideration to planning for this group's particular needs, including those of recreation.
- 6.43 The recreation officers have been proactive in representing the needs of prisoners through the preparation of business cases for different initiatives, albeit with little success. Given this demonstrated commitment, it is particularly disappointing for the Inspectorate to find that

101 This predominantly impacts upon remandees who accounted for 52 (7.4 per cent) of the total population of 694 (TOMS 20 April 2010).

102 See Chapter Seven for an explanation of this exception.

they have not been invited to offer input into the population expansion plans, inasmuch as they relate to the provision of recreation.

- 6.44 Overall, recreation has improved since the 2004 and 2007 inspections despite the increased prisoner population and the very limited increase in resources for recreation. While stretched, infrastructure and equipment supports the safe participation of prisoners in recreational activities. However, with the prospect of 256 additional prisoners, this is not sustainable unless extra infrastructure and equipment is provided. At the time of this inspection, there were no approved plans regarding the future of recreation.

Chapter 7

ABORIGINAL PRISONERS

GENERAL

- 7.1 At the time of the inspection 327 Aboriginal prisoners were placed at Casuarina, representing 47 per cent of its total prisoner population.
- 7.2 It was particularly disappointing, therefore, that throughout the inspection, the Aboriginal flag was not raised at the entrance to the prison's gatehouse, even more so, because there was a flag pole specifically available for this purpose. Although the matter was raised on the first day of the inspection, no remedial action was taken and neither management nor staff could provide an explanation regarding the flag's absence. At the exit debrief, the Inspector made the point that to raise the flag or not should not be a matter for individual prisons to decide, and that practices should be standardised across the state.
- 7.3 Two hundred Aboriginal men (over 60 per cent of the prison's Aboriginal population) were being held 'out of country'. This represents a significant increase as compared with the count at the time of the last inspection. At that time, 106 Aboriginal prisoners (almost 40 per cent) were being held 'out of country'.
- 7.4 At the 2007 inspection, the Displaced Prisoners Unit was being established in Unit 1. Its purpose was to ease the increased level of stress and trauma, and therefore lower the risk of self-harm and suicide experienced by prisoners who were being held a long way from home, kin and country for extensive periods.¹⁰³ It was envisaged that this would be achieved by keeping countrymen together, and offering culturally appropriate activities and a structured day.
- 7.5 During the inspection, there were 93 Aboriginal prisoners (out of 97) in Unit 1, the majority of whom were from the Kimberley, Pilbara, Eastern Goldfields, and 'the lands'. The remaining 107 displaced prisoners and other Aboriginal prisoners were dispersed throughout the prison.
- 7.6 Despite the very high numbers of Aboriginal prisoners, this inspection found that little training in culturally appropriate custodial management had been provided to staff.¹⁰⁴ Prison Support Officer (PSO) staff expressed the view that cross-cultural training should be provided on an ongoing basis. They explained that the feedback they receive from prisoners indicated that many custodial staff are ignorant about the cultural significance of, for example, funerals and grieving, norms and expectations in relation to male/female interaction, and so on.
- 7.7 Casuarina employs a Coordinator Aboriginal Prisoner Services Programs. The current post holder commenced in her position in February 2010. With the exception of her responsibilities to the Displaced Aboriginal Program (see below), and notwithstanding the fact that the Coordinator had only been in post for two months, there was a lack of clarity about any other duties that fall to this position.

103 The opportunities available to displaced prisoners to maintain family connections, including attendance at funerals, temporary transfers, phone calls and video link, are discussed under the relevant headings earlier in this report.

104 See also Chapter Nine regarding the way in which health staff become culturally aware.

- 7.8 The inspection found that the Coordinator also holds overall responsibility for Unit 1 but exactly what duties and tasks incorporated into this was unclear. Apart from the lack of clarity, it raises the question about equity of access to a service, particularly for the other 107 displaced prisoners who are dispersed across the prison.
- 7.9 At the time of the inspection the Coordinator had not yet explored and capitalised upon the benefits of, and linkages with Prison Support Officers (PSOs), the chaplaincy, and the Aboriginal Visitors Scheme (AVS) in terms of providing comprehensive support, ensuring continuity of care and well-being, minimising service duplication, and developing new initiatives.
- 7.10 Without coming to a firm conclusion in this regard, the Inspectorate does have some concerns over the placement of a female Coordinator Aboriginal Services in a role in which she must work closely with Aboriginal males from remote regional areas. The strong cultural mores that guide interactions between men and women in traditional Aboriginal culture may impact on the coordinator's capacity to influence and effect positive change in the lives of the prisoners in Unit 1.

ABORIGINAL PRISONER EMPLOYMENT

- 7.11 According to a Total Offender Management Solutions (TOMS) Aboriginal Employment Profile report of 23 April 2010, only 211 (65 per cent) Aboriginal prisoners were employed, compared with 300 non-Aboriginal prisoners (82 per cent). Moreover, the majority of employed Aboriginal prisoners was concentrated in lower paid positions¹⁰⁵ (67 were paid at gratuity level four). Despite there being an almost equal split between the numbers of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal prisoners at Casuarina, only 23 Aboriginal prisoners (seven per cent), as compared with 100 non-Aboriginal prisoners (27 per cent) were paid at level one.
- 7.12 Nonetheless, the Inspectorate was especially encouraged by the predominance of (mostly 'out of country') Aboriginal prisoners in the essential and highly successful vegetable processing workshop (see Chapter Eight below). Twenty-six of 29 prisoners, who were employed in this workshop were Aboriginal, five of whom were paid at level one and six of whom were paid at level two. Management and staff alike were highly complimentary of these prisoners' work ethic and work standard. This illustrates that providing relevant work experience and training options is the key to prisoner engagement. It also serves to disabuse the myth that 'Aboriginal prisoners don't like to work' – a mantra the Inspectorate frequently hears within prisons.
- 7.13 Prisoners employed in this workshop attain Food Star accreditation and Certificates I and II in food processing. The TAFE tutor who oversees these certificates attended the pre-inspection community service provider consultation forum convened 10 March 2010. He reported that provision of this training and work experience was currently particularly relevant to prisoners from regional and remote Western Australia. The resources boom and the associated demand for hospitality personnel at mine sites had enhanced Aboriginal

105 Prisoners receive modest gratuities on a scale of Level One to Level Six (Level One being the highest rate) depending on the nature and intensity of engagement in employment, education or programs.

prisoners' prospects of employment upon release. The tutor reported that he had been trying to facilitate connections between businesses in the North-West of the state and the prison, with a view to establishing employment pathways for prisoners upon re-entry. He had been unsuccessful to date because the Department had been unable to identify a suitable contact person. This constitutes a wasted opportunity to improve the prospects of successful re-entry for Aboriginal prisoners being released back to regional and remote areas.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

- 7.14 The inspection found that Aboriginal prisoners' participation in education in terms of numbers was encouraging. At Casuarina during 2009, there were 960 different students enrolled in education, 493 (51 per cent) of whom were Aboriginal. Aboriginal students' completion rates were 63 per cent as compared with 60 per cent among their non-Aboriginal counterparts.¹⁰⁶
- 7.15 In September 2009, DCS advertised as permanent seven Aboriginal Education Worker (AEW) positions across seven prison sites statewide, including Casuarina. The AEW position is intended to provide a supportive role in encouraging and maintaining Aboriginal students once they have enrolled in education and vocational training courses.¹⁰⁷
- 7.16 The AEW at Casuarina delivers a number of Aboriginal programs including Keep Your Culture, Keep Your Job; Hands on Learning program (HOLP); and Deadly Foods.¹⁰⁸ In view of the large number of Aboriginal prisoners at Casuarina, a second position would be very useful, especially if as is expected (and discussed in Chapter Eight below) delivery expands across multiple locations in the prison. An additional position may also go some way towards addressing the generally narrow focus of current educational provision, with its attention overly weighted in favour of safety education and training (see Chapter Eight for a more in-depth discussion of this matter).

FOOD

- 7.17 During the inspection, prisoners and PSOs repeatedly expressed dissatisfaction about the type, quality and quantity of food. They said that food portions were small,¹⁰⁹ and that they would like culturally appropriate food, which included stews, kangaroo, and damper, to be provided more regularly. A number of prisoners from regional and remote areas believed that the lack of a familiar diet made them feel unwell.
- 7.18 Over the years, this Office has made numerous comments and recommendations regarding the food provided to Aboriginal prisoners,¹¹⁰ and progress has been patchy. The provision of culturally appropriate food should not be up to individual prisons to decide. Consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (which

106 Enrolments by Venue and Registration Status Unit Start Date between 1/1/09 and 31/12/09.

107 *Education and Vocational Training at Casuarina Prison, 2010 Overview* (15/4/10), 12.

108 DCS, AEW Timetable for 2010.

109 The prisoner pre-inspection survey findings indicated that only 28 per cent of Aboriginal respondents, as compared with 39 per cent of non-Aboriginal respondents, said they were mostly happy with the quantity of food provided at the prison.

110 Two examples include OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Roebourne Regional Prison*, Report No. 24 (October 2004) 16 and *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.28 (June 2004) 54.

Australia explicitly supports)¹¹¹ the Department should seriously address the cultural diet requirements of its Aboriginal prisoners.

PEER SUPPORT

- 7.19 Aboriginality is a mandatory qualification for the position of Prison Support Officer (PSO). PSOs are employed throughout the state and their primary role is suicide prevention with their service extending to all prisoners.
- 7.20 The report of the inspection conducted in 2007 identified a need for a further expansion of the peer support scheme, and additional Prison Support Officer (PSO) staff to meet the demands of the increased population. At that time, there were two PSOs and the population stood at 580 prisoners. At this inspection the population had inflated to an average of 690 but the staff resources had remained unchanged.¹¹²
- 7.21 Within this higher population, the proportion and numbers of displaced prisoners have respectively increased by 20 per cent and 100. The impact of displacement upon prisoners' wellbeing has already been alluded to earlier. Becoming 'sick for country' or 'longing for country' is a recognised condition affecting Aboriginal people who are separated from their homelands for extended periods. Moreover, 'western' mental health approaches have only limited capacity to engage with the emotional and psychological problems arising out of displacement of this kind.
- 7.22 As shown earlier¹¹³ the great majority of displaced prisoners are classified as minimum or medium security and expressed bewilderment to the Inspectorate as to why they were in a maximum security prison so far from home. The PSOs made particular comment on the fragile mental state of the displaced prisoners and explained that as PSOs, they spend a considerable amount of time helping these prisoners to deal with the stress and trauma associated with separation.
- 7.23 The PSOs were sensitised to the problems particularly experienced by displaced prisoners and were doing what they could to provide them with support. However, when issues of well-being begin to manifest themselves clinically in the form of deteriorating mental health status, the PSOs are not able or qualified to provide clinical support. Furthermore, as explained in Chapter Nine, there are no Aboriginal health/mental health professionals employed at Casuarina.
- 7.24 This reinforces the point made in the last inspection report and again in Chapter Nine, that Casuarina needs a culturally competent mental health service.

ABORIGINAL VISITORS' SCHEME

- 7.25 Until recently two visitors representing the Aboriginal Visitors' Scheme (AVS) attended the prison. The team has been expanded to four visitors, who each attend the prison four

111 United Nations *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (13 September 2007) Articles 8 & 11.

112 See Chapter Five above regarding confirmation of an additional PSO position, which will be introduced either late 2010 or early 2011.

113 See Figure 1.

days a week. They also provide an on-call service.

- 7.26 At Casuarina, the AVS staff spend the majority of their time out in the prison with prisoners. They also have administrative and reporting responsibilities but have never been provided with a base from which they can make phone calls, write notes and so on. Historically, the natural tendency – because of the overlap of the AVS and PSO roles in terms of their suicide prevention focus – has been for AVS staff to use the PSO office. This was already wholly unsatisfactory when there were only two AVS staff. The office was barely big enough for the two PSO staff, particularly if they needed to see prisoners. Maintaining prisoner confidentiality was significantly challenged, and there was insufficient equipment, furniture, and amenities. Such conditions compromised efficient working. With the additional staff, the inadequacy of the environment has been brought into even sharper focus. Management and staff could not confirm any future accommodation plans for either AVS or PSO staff.
- 7.27 It is to the AVS and PSO staff's credit, therefore, that despite the challenging work environment, they were noted to have established a cooperative and integrated approach, sharing information, and frequently meeting together. Management and prisoners alike commented positively on the work of the AVS staff.
- 7.28 This group of staff provides an essential service and the provision of space and equipment is critical to enable them to continue to fulfil their roles. Such provision would also reflect the value of these staff and the contribution they make to the smooth running of the prison and to the well-being of prisoners.

CULTURAL CENTRE

- 7.29 The last inspection report¹¹⁴ noted that a business case to build an 'Indigenous Activity Centre' in front of Unit 1 had been lodged with the Department. At that time, the prison was looking for appropriate industry and work options for regional prisoners, to run training and skilling activities in the future activity centre thus providing employment for some of the Unit 1 prisoners. The Inspectorate had been optimistic that this would be an important cultural centre for Aboriginal prisoners.
- 7.30 This inspection found that although the centre's construction was nearing completion, its intended role and function as a space predominantly for Aboriginal prisoners' use has been substantially diluted. In reality, the inspection team was told that the centre is more likely to function as a multi-purpose education facility to meet the educational needs of all prisoners.¹¹⁵
- 7.31 The Inspectorate understands that prison administration has had to become increasingly imaginative with regard to the use of space within the prison. Over the years the infrastructure has not been extended consistently with population increases and there is a lack of space to meet prisoners' needs. Nonetheless the Inspectorate is disappointed

114 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No. 49 (March 2008) 35.

115 See a discussion in Chapter Eight regarding Casuarina's Educational and Vocational Training Unit's (EVTU) infrastructure requirements and the negotiations in process for space within the centre for use by the EVTU.

that ‘imaginative’ solutions to space constraints have been found at the expense of an initiative that demonstrated recognition that Aboriginal prisoners’ experience of incarceration is fundamentally and unarguably different to the wider prisoner population. Providing such a space for Aboriginal prisoners represented a positive attempt to improve the focus on, and service to Aboriginal prisoners.

UNIT 1

- 7.32 Unit 1 was intended to help displaced prisoners feel more at home in the metropolitan prison environment, to provide a ‘structured’ day, and to keep countrymen together.
- 7.33 The inspection found that the reality for the Aboriginal men in Unit 1 was that 35 (37.6 per cent) were unemployed and 17 (18.2 per cent) were (under) employed as unit cleaners.¹¹⁶ There were insufficient jobs for the prisoners. Staff and prisoners alike explained that displaced prisoners prefer outdoor work, but such opportunities are limited. It was also unclear (see below) how many were engaged in the Displaced Aboriginal Prisoners program, although numbers would not have exceeded 15 at the time of the inspection.
- 7.34 Despite having relatively more time on their hands, however, Unit 1 prisoners are disadvantaged in terms of leisure and recreational space. Unlike the other accommodation units, Unit 1 has no enclosed yard at the front.
- 7.35 When Unit 1 was converted into a designated unit for displaced prisoners, two fire pits, work stations (with power and water available), a barbeque and prisoner toilets were installed in an enclosed area behind the unit, which was also decorated with murals. The prisoners told the inspection team that they felt particularly comfortable in this space. However, they explained that it is only opened when structured music and art classes are running and access is therefore heavily restricted. Furthermore, the fire pits had not yet been used in 2010.
- 7.36 The inspection found that it was becoming increasingly unlikely that the aforementioned activity centre was going to be for the predominant use of Aboriginal prisoners. At the time of the inspection, the Unit 1 prisoners represented the most disadvantaged and marginalised group in the mainstream prison. They received no visitors, often spoke little English, and were rarely employed. It would seem logical, therefore, to allow the men to claim and develop the area in Unit 1 as a cultural space. It would also go some way to redressing some of the isolation and disadvantage that they currently experience.

Recommendation 4

Using a consultative approach, the Department and the Prison should develop and implement a detailed strategy with measurable outcomes, for the culturally appropriate management of all Aboriginal prisoners. Consultation could involve volunteers and elders, Prison Support Officers, Aboriginal Visitor Scheme staff, and the Coordinator Aboriginal Services.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ TOMS Aboriginal Employment Profile 23 April 2010.

¹¹⁷ Issues to be addressed could include but should not be limited to those outlined above.

DISPLACED ABORIGINAL PROGRAM

- 7.37 The principal responsibility of the Coordinator Aboriginal Prisoner Services Programs is to oversee the Displaced Aboriginal Program (DAP). According to the written overview provided by the Education and Vocational Training Unit (EVTU) at Casuarina Prison the program:
- was set up to provide the opportunity for displaced Indigenous prisoners to interact with others from the same geographical and cultural background. It aims to provide activities, programs and education to support and reinforce their Indigenous culture and to help prisoners to cope during their placement in the metropolitan area, where they are cut off from the support of family, friends and community. The timetable is highly structured and students engage with a mix of approaches including cognitive skills, vocational skills, educational skills, and recreational skills. On completion of the DAP program students may progress to the Hands On Learning Program (HOLP) or to other mainstream education centre programs. The students for the DAP program are chosen by the Coordinator Aboriginal Prisoner Services Programs with the guidance of Unit 1 staff.¹¹⁸
- 7.38 The program runs for eight weeks, four times a year, for up to 20 prisoners at a time. Participation is conditional upon signing and meeting the terms of a contract, and upon residence in Unit 1. Breach of the contract may result in eviction from the program and from Unit 1.
- 7.39 A program was being run at the time of the inspection, although there was some confusion regarding the actual numbers of prisoners participating. The numbers provided ranged from five to 15. The prison's inability to provide exact enrolments was of concern in itself. Furthermore, whether there were five or 15 participants, at worst this represents only two and a half per cent of the Aboriginal displaced prisoners, and at best, seven and a half per cent. This was a very disappointing take-up rate for a program that only allows for a small quota of prisoners anyway.¹¹⁹
- 7.40 This disappointment and concern was further reinforced by the feedback provided to the Inspectorate by prisoners, who indicated that they had been led to believe that participation and completion of the course would increase their chances of, if not guarantee, parole. Furthermore, they felt strongly that the course was not useful or relevant, and indicated a level of shame in having to do 'kindy' level literacy and numeracy.
- 7.41 There were high hopes for the DAP at the time of the last inspection. Plans included adding senior first aid training, a men's health 'Pit Stop' program, and accredited training in rural horticulture TAFE courses, and extending the cognitive skills component of the course to groups of Noongar prisoners. Regrettably, in the intervening three years these plans have remained just plans.

118 *Education and Vocational Training at Casuarina Prison, 2010 Overview* (15/4/10), 13.

119 Figures provided by the Coordinator Aboriginal Services showed that in 2008, there were 85 DAP completions, and in 2009 there were 92.

- 7.42 The inspection found that the DAP program is failing to meet the needs and expectations of those prisoners at whom it is aimed. The conditions of participation and the program's quota limit the number of prisoners who are eligible and who wish to participate. Further, staff or volunteers or elders from the home locations of these prisoners have not been contacted or invited to be involved.
- 7.43 In summary, the DAP program has not delivered on stated intentions, its relevance is questionable, and there has been no broadening or content development.

Recommendation 5

Review the aims, objectives and content of the DAP program and revise the program accordingly.

Chapter 8

DOING TIME OR USING TIME?

SENTENCE MANAGEMENT AND CASE MANAGEMENT

- 8.1 Sentence management should be a continual and dynamic process that ensures prisoners' needs are assessed and subsequently met throughout their term of imprisonment. Adult Custodial Rule 18¹²⁰ details the procedures involved in 'the initial and ongoing assessment and sentence management of prisoners'.¹²¹
- 8.2 The first stage involves a variety of assessments and the development of an Individual Management Plan (IMP) (for qualifying prisoners, for others a Management and Placement [MAP] checklist). To this end, Casuarina is meeting the requirements of the Rule and OICS Inspection Standard 120.¹²²
- 8.3 Subsequently, the process consists of an ongoing series of assessments and meetings to discuss how the plan is being progressed, how the prisoner is managing their time in prison, and if applicable, the need for the formulation of other reports (such as for parole).
- 8.4 Case and sentence management should be an integrated process. Uniformed unit staff should monitor and assist prisoners in achieving the goals set out in their original assessment plans. Under Policy Directive 51 (PD51), individual case officers should be responsible for 'encouraging assigned offenders to achieve the requirements of their [IMP] with the aim of successfully reintegrating into the community'.¹²³ Highlighted within the PD is that there should be a 'cooperative relationship established between the prisoner and his/her case officer'.¹²⁴
- 8.5 This inspection found that while the sentence management function is operating well, in the overcrowded environment at Casuarina, case management is mostly siloed from meaningful integration with the overall sentence management process. Many prisoners are void of guidance outside of structured case conference meetings unless they are particularly proactive in seeking out the assistance of uniformed and other staff.¹²⁵
- 8.6 Staff and management involved in the functioning of sentence and case management were interviewed during the course of the inspection. They unanimously expressed the view that because of the way case management has been operationalised, its functioning is relatively meaningless, especially in the context of an overcrowded environment.
- 8.7 Prisoners are no longer appointed a single case manager (as is stated in PD51, Appendix 1 [5.2]). At the beginning of each month the unit manager allocates contact reports to be completed by uniformed staff within the unit. This random allocation does not properly encourage the 'communication, responsibility and focus' on engagement that the PD envisages.¹²⁶

120 DCS, *Adult Custodial Rule 18: Assessment and Sentence Management of Prisoners* (5 April 2009).

121 Ibid, 1.

122 OICS, *Code of Inspection Standards For Adult Custodial Services* Version 1 (19 April 2007).

123 DCS, *Policy Directive 51: Case Management* (10 August 2009) 1.

124 Ibid, Appendix 2, 1 (preamble).

125 Hence the prison is not fulfilling the outcomes desired by OICS Inspection Standard 121.

126 DCS, PD 51, [5.1].

- 8.8 The lack of a dedicated case manager combined with the overcrowding serves to undermine the depth and integrity of the case management process. First, while uniformed staff do their best with the cases they may be allocated for the month, those interviewed stated that with double-bunking, their ability to get to know individual prisoners is challenged, and they may not have had contact with the prisoner allocated to them outside of the contact report meeting. Secondly, a large number of staff are new and their knowledge of prisoners and process is less developed. Content of the reports can only rely, therefore, on the information available on the Total Offender Management Solutions (TOMS) database and that which the prisoners choose to share. Finally, the progress of an IMP may be impeded because there are insufficient education or program places available, or there are no places at the prison to which a prisoner is supposed to transfer.
- 8.9 During case conferences, which the Inspectorate observed during the inspection, a number of prisoners demonstrated a lack of understanding about, or could not remember the contact meeting. Those who were familiar indicated that their level of engagement in the process depended on how well they knew the assigned officer.
- 8.10 This level of prisoner engagement in the case conference process was consistent with pre-inspection survey findings. While around 65 per cent of prisoners stated they had attended a case conference, 30.5 per cent stated they had not, and the remainder did not know if they had. Of these, 48 per cent of prisoners felt they had ‘been given a chance to have their say’ in the process. The sentence management team uses the contact reports in the case conference process. However, in some respects the sentence management team duplicates the process of the contact meeting, checking all relevant reports for the case conference they conduct. Beyond receiving the report there is no further interface between the two processes. Ideally, the interaction between them should be more dynamic and so result in less duplication.
- 8.11 The sentence management team at Casuarina functioned as a cohesive unit with proactive management from the responsible Assistant Superintendent. The uniformed officers assigned to the team demonstrated a sound knowledge of process, and conscientiousness about the quality of reports they are required to write. These include classification reports, re-socialisation reports, IMPs, organisation reports and parole reports (with the last taking priority over others).
- 8.12 Prisoner survey results cited earlier indicated a significant level of disengagement from the case conferencing process. However, review of documentation and observation of case conferences indicated that sentence management staff are active in their attempts to engage and inform prisoners. This fulfils a significant component of the DCS Rule requirement that ‘the prisoner has a key role’ and ‘[is] encouraged to make a contribution to how they will be managed during their imprisonment’.¹²⁷
- 8.13 As with most service delivery areas, resources for case management and sentence management have not been increased to cope with the increased prisoner population levels. Although unit staffing has been increased, levels have not been increased commensurate

127 DCS, *Adult Custodial Rule 18: Assessment and Sentence Management of Prisoners* (5 April 2009) 1.

with the number of prisoners for whom contact meetings and reports have to be completed. Moreover, additional infrastructure necessary to complete the task – such as additional office space, interview rooms, and computer access – has not been provided.

- 8.14 Sentence management staffing levels have remained as they were when the prisoner population was 397. But it is not just the higher population that has increased the workload. Parole denials have generated an increase in the need for new classification assessments and IMPs, and the *Dangerous Sex Offenders Act 2006* has placed onerous and ongoing reporting obligations upon prison administrations.
- 8.15 At the time of the inspection, the sentence management team consisted of two senior officers and six writers. The Assistant Superintendent had requested a significant number of additional staff in light of the additional 256 prisoners expected. However, if approved, this will only bridge the existing deficit in resources. As with other service areas, there is a lack of essential and appropriate infrastructure to accommodate the additional staff (if approved).
- 8.16 At the time of the inspection, there had been no decision communicated to the Assistant Superintendent and her team regarding additional resources. There was a fear amongst the staff that as they have ‘coped’ to date they will be expected simply to do so into the future. They expressed concern that this will seriously place at risk the quality of the reports and outcomes for prisoners.

CASUARINA AS A RELEASING PRISON

- 8.17 As at the time of the 2007 inspection, and as discussed at length earlier in this report, Casuarina accommodates a large number of minimum and medium security prisoners. Despite being a maximum security prison, medium and minimum security prisoners comprised 80 per cent of the prisoner population at Casuarina at the time of this inspection.
- 8.18 It has become a reality for many of these men that they will never be transferred to an appropriate classification of prison before the end of their sentences and so will be released from Casuarina. Not only is Casuarina trying to prepare these prisoners for release, but also a large number of other prisoners who have not reduced their rating to this level.
- 8.19 As a consequence, one of Casuarina’s key functions has become that of a releasing prison. Indeed, in the first three months of 2010 it had directly released 79 prisoners to freedom and had transferred a further 30 to regional prisons for release purposes. This is a total of 109 releases in just over 13 weeks. All of these prisoners released to freedom, whether minimum security or higher, will have required significant support in preparing for release. Practical requirements – such as a place to stay, transport arrangements, securing a job or a source of funds on release – are critical to preventing the quick return to prison for many. Other matters with which prisoners may need assistance include reconnecting with families, and referring to programs, support groups, and medical agencies.
- 8.20 Another key area of need for prisoners relates to their applications for early release to the Prisoners Review Board. Prisoners often require support and assistance with preparing parole plans. This need has increased during the last year as the Prisoners Review Board has

taken a stricter approach to parole. Without any systemic provision of assistance with preparing parole plans, most prisoners rely on other prisoners for help and some will ask certain officers who they believe may help. The lack of resource for this area of need should be addressed.

- 8.21 The position of Transitional Manager (TM) was created and introduced to all Western Australian prisons in 2008. The primary purpose of the role is to facilitate prisoner access to a range of providers who offer practical assistance pre- and post-release. In addition, and of critical importance, the TM provides help with sourcing identification documents, such as birth certificates; applying for Medicare cards; obtaining/resolving issues with vehicle licensing; and arranging accommodation, transport, and an array of other needs. This is a significant theoretical improvement for Casuarina compared with the services that were available at the time of the 2007 inspection.
- 8.22 The TM position at Casuarina, however, had been vacant for approximately nine months with a new manager only starting in the role the week prior to this inspection. As a result, the evidence gathered during the inspection was of a prisoner group in the same situation as in 2007 – essentially left to their own devices in terms of release planning. While two prisoners retained employment as transitional clerks and endeavoured to help prisoners with some of these needs, these prisoners do not have the access to the resources that a staff member can have when assisting prisoners and could not provide the full array of required services.
- 8.23 The Inspectorate interviewed groups of prisoners nearing release, along with minimum security prisoners. It transpired that only those assertive, confident prisoners, who knew the system well, managed to effectively plan for their release. Many prisoners interviewed stated they had no idea where to seek help with many of their issues and having approached uniformed staff, who said it was not their role to assist, had been at a loss as to what else they could do.
- 8.24 An issue specifically identified during the lapse in TM position was the particular disadvantage faced by prisoners who had been transferred to Casuarina from regional areas. They had nobody to act as a conduit with services in their home region and many were worried about what they would experience when they were released. Part of the problem was one identified in 2007 and not addressed by the Department – that prisoners are being transferred back to their home locations only at the last possible chance before release and cannot connect with services, or in some cases their families, prior to release. This is a situation that sets some prisoners up to fail as they have few supports upon release.
- 8.25 With the commencement of the new TM it is hoped that this situation will improve. However, given the high numbers of prisoners released from Casuarina (see above) this will be a challenge. By comparison and by way of illustrating the significance of these figures, Karnet Prison Farm – a designated minimum security, re-entry facility – released 47 prisoners during the first three months of 2010.¹²⁸ Proportionately, in terms of the total number of prisoners in each prison, the percentage of prisoners released from both prisons was broadly similar (15-16 per cent). However, the Inspectorate believes that in terms of

128 Figures provided by staff at Karnet Prison Farm.

actual numbers of prisoners and the volume of service required at Casuarina, one full time equivalent position is insufficient. The TM's workload at Casuarina is likely to be unmanageable, even with the TM clerks providing assistance. To its credit, the Department advised in its pre-inspection submission that 'discussions [were] taking place over appropriate manning levels' with regard to prisoners' release planning.

- 8.26 Aside from potential workload management issues, the problem that the new manager is facing is similar to that of most other staff and service providers within the prison – lack of infrastructure. At the time of the inspection, the new manager had been unable to initiate scheduled weekly orientation meetings with new prisoners, at which information about the service the TM can provide is shared. She had been told that there were no rooms available in the prison at any time. This is not acceptable and such meetings should be immediately integrated into the prisoner orientation process.
- 8.27 Other programs that the TM needs to conduct are also on hold until the accommodation issues can be resolved. As with other areas of operation examined, it is positive to have a resource available for this service, but is pointless if that service cannot actually deliver what it is intended to deliver, or do it with integrity, in the way that it is supposed to be done.
- 8.28 As a releasing prison and at the time of this inspection, Casuarina was struggling to appropriately provide the services prisoners require for successful re-entry to the community. An extended period without a Transitional Manager, combined with a high population requiring pre-release services, a security environment which does not allow for minimum prisoners to participate in programs that graduate their return to the community (such as home leave), and a bursting infrastructure have resulted in a lack of prisoner access to programs, and have overwhelmed what services have been available.

Recommendation 6

The Department and Casuarina work together to put better systems and resources in place for the release planning and re-entry into the community of displaced prisoners. In particular, where security allows, displaced prisoners should be given more opportunity to spend more time at a prison closer to home before release.

PRISONER EMPLOYMENT

- 8.29 In 2007, the inspection found that

[t]he increase in prisoner population at Casuarina has had serious implications for the implementation of a structured day and the ability to keep prisoners occupied. While uniformed staffing numbers have been increased to account for the current and future population increase, the same has not occurred for civilian staff in any service area... The inspection found that while staff in these areas were dedicated and providing a good standard of activities for prisoners, there was an inability to provide the sheer number of places required to accommodate the ever-growing numbers.¹²⁹

The findings at this inspection in 2010 could be described as 'déjà vu'.

129 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No. 49 (March 2008) 59.

- 8.30 Prisoner employment is one of the key performance indicators against which the success of all Australian prisons in reducing the risk of re-offending is measured.¹³⁰ Employment should offer prisoners relief from boredom, a chance to earn modest gratuities, and an opportunity to learn new skills and work ethics. From the prison service's point of view, prisoners can offset some of the costs of imprisonment by undertaking work that would otherwise have to be 'bought in'. Moreover, offering prisoners constructive activity, including employment serves as a useful management tool in preserving the good order of the prison.¹³¹ From the community's point of view, employment provides a mechanism by which prisoners can repair some of the harm resulting from their offending.
- 8.31 The Department's website describes the way in which work is set up within WA's prisons thus:
- Industries...are operated in a realistic, businesslike, customer-focussed work environment which closely replicates the outside world. Industries within prison give prisoners opportunities to become work-ready and develop vocational skills that will increase their chances of gaining and retaining work on release.¹³²
- 8.32 However, providing employment opportunities in a way that closely resembles mainstream working environments and equips prisoners with skills, knowledge, and experience that are relevant and can be applied post-release is not as straightforward as it may first seem.
- 8.33 The chaotic lifestyles that many prisoners have lived prior to imprisonment often make for low skill/literacy levels and limited employment histories, with limited time available (because of the transient nature of the population) to offer relevant opportunities that will make the prisoner work-ready.
- 8.34 Moreover, operational imperatives of the prison regime such as custody counts, officer shift patterns, meal times, and medication rounds, can run counter to the creation of realistic work environments and routines. Therefore, the potentially rehabilitative benefits of employment can be diluted.
- 8.35 These are just some of the many challenges that ordinarily face custodial managers in relation to prisoner employment. However, in the context of an overcrowded environment, staff shortages, and a lagging infrastructure, which are characteristic of Casuarina Prison, these challenges become exaggerated.
- 8.36 At the time of the last inspection, there was a 'dramatically inadequate availability of work'¹³³ for prisoners. A recommendation was made that '...the Department and Casuarina provide a structured day to all prisoners including...contemporary and relevant employment and training opportunities...'¹³⁴ At that time, the Department supported this recommendation in principle, subject to funding. However, it stated that '...strategies for managing [an elevated] prisoner population ...are viewed as a temporary measure for two

130 *Report on Government Services* Chapter 8. <http://pc.gov.au/gsp/reports/rogs/2009>.

131 See for example *Report of the Inquiry into the incident at Casuarina Prison on 25 December 1998* [compiled by Mr L.E.Smith...[et al]] 61.

132 <http://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au/P/prisonindustries>.

133 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 61.

134 *Ibid*, 70.

to three years. As a result it would not prove cost effective to invest in long term industry expansion at Casuarina prison.¹³⁵

- 8.37 Prior to this inspection in its description of progress against that recommendation, the Department conceded that '[i]ncreases in population render the initial response void. The prison continues to try and identify employment opportunities for prisoners...where possible.' So, the Inspectorate was not surprised by its findings at this inspection.
- 8.38 Although the number of prisoner employment positions has increased, the range and types of prisoner employment at Casuarina has remained largely unchanged. Productivity, however, has had to increase in particular areas (for example, in the kitchen and vegetable preparation areas) consistent with the increased demand brought about by the inflated prisoner population.
- 8.39 The prison has 18 workshops undertaking a diverse range of activities producing goods and services for both internal supply and external commercial contracts.¹³⁶ Activities include catering, baking, and vegetable preparation, boot and clothing manufacturing, cabinet making, and market gardening to name a few. There are also a number of work parties that carry out activities around the extensive campus, such as building and grounds maintenance, and cleaning. In addition, prisoners are employed to assist in peer support, recreation, the infirmary, unit cleaning and food preparation, re-entry, and education.¹³⁷
- 8.40 The Employment Officer interviews all prospective prisoner employees and allocates a work area as appropriate and available. Vocational certification (such as White Card and Forklift Truck Driving) and traineeships linked to employment are also offered; 35 prisoners were pursuing traineeships at the time of the inspection.¹³⁸ Prior to starting work, every prisoner completes a basic safety course; subsequently, safety training specific to the type of employment is also completed.
- 8.40 Vocational Support Officers (VSOs), who are generally qualified tradespeople, manage the safety and productivity of their specific workshop, supervise the prisoners, and provide training as appropriate. At the time of the inspection there were 41 approved VSO positions – these included seven newly created positions, nine vacant positions, and nine contracted positions. Although there were eight more VSO positions than at the time of the last inspection, the numbers of vacancies were similar.¹³⁹ Arguably, attracting VSOs in a strong employment market is a continuing challenge. Nonetheless, the Inspectorate was told of long delays in contracted staff securing permanency, of contracts being repeatedly renewed,

135 Ibid.

136 DCS, *Prison Industries Casuarina Prison – A Summary of Current Issues and Drivers that will Influence Planning for the Future Direction of Prison Industries at Casuarina Prison*, March 2010.

137 At Casuarina, the proportion of minimum security prisoners has consistently been on a par with the proportion of maximum prisoners for over three years. And yet there is no provision for these prisoners, who may be suitably approved under the Prisons Act, to access section 95 work. The Inspectorate understands that as a maximum security prison, Casuarina is not set up for section 95 work. Yet more reason, therefore, to be baffled by the decision to allocate more maximum security accommodation places at Casuarina. Notwithstanding provision having been made for extra work camp places, the shortfall in minimum places will remain, particularly in the regions.

138 Figures provided by Employment Officer during the on-site phase of the inspection.

139 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49, (March 2008) 60.

and of staff leaving for substantive positions elsewhere because of the uncertainty associated with the long-term nature of their temporary status at Casuarina. This protracted uncertainty for contracted staff does little to inspire loyalty and commitment, results in a loss to the organisation of good people, and puts pressure on the stability of the permanent staff team.

- 8.42 In total 289 prisoners were employed in industries, with 67 reserve positions and a further 173 in other locations throughout the prison. There were 160 prisoners (27 per cent) who were not engaged in any kind of constructive activity – not even education or programs.¹⁴⁰
- 8.43 Despite the lack of employment, prisoners who do work were generally positive about their experience. Notably, prisoners' relationships with VSOs were qualitatively different to those with custodial staff. This was also reflected in the pre-inspection survey findings: 61 per cent of respondents to the pre-inspection survey ranked VSO staff at the top in terms of being helpful or supportive. By comparison, only 45 per cent of respondents said that unit officers were helpful or supportive.
- 8.44 Pre-inspection prisoner survey responses indicated that if they were employed, prisoners spend an average of 27 hours per week at work.¹⁴¹ However, the VSOs expressed the view, which was endorsed by prisoners at inspection and confirmed through observation that only about half of the 'working' prisoners were actually working in a way that resembled, to some extent, a real-life work experience; the rest were being 'minded'. They attributed this to lack of infrastructure (that is workshop space and equipment), lack of suitable employees,¹⁴² and lack of staff. Arguably, therefore, if those 145 'working' prisoners who are 'minded' are added to the 160 who are not engaged in any kind of activity, over 300 prisoners (approximately 45 per cent) have little or no constructive activity.
- 8.45 Significantly, however, and perhaps testament to the qualitative difference in their relationships with VSOs, prisoners interviewed said that they prefer to be under-occupied in the Industries area than under-occupied in their units.
- 8.46 Half of the work areas are only allocated one VSO, so if that person is absent due to annual or sick leave the position is not covered. Closing workshops severely exacerbates an already critical situation with regard to prisoner activity. It also reflects the value attributed to VSOs' work, and may be a crucial factor in the retention of these staff.
- 8.47 Proportionately, the level of prisoner inactivity is not dissimilar to the inspection findings of 2007. At that time, this Office acknowledged the good intentions of management and staff to develop additional employment opportunities but argued that it seemed 'impossible to provide the adequate level of activity required with current infrastructure and resourcing

140 Figures provided by the Department prior to the inspection. Staff have identified the need for occupational therapy for an estimated 50-100 prisoners, whom they describe as having special needs and who cannot be employed to undertake mainstream work.

141 This figure may have been expressed as extraordinarily high because respondents may have counted the hours of being at work as hours actually worked.

142 The high prisoner population has impacted upon all areas of service delivery, including education. The education service has increased its accessibility to all prisoners by reducing the maximum amount of time it can offer to an individual. However, if an industry employee is absent for more than a day or two half-days per week pursuing education, their productivity when they are in the workshop is often markedly reduced because their skills are less honed.

provided'.¹⁴³ It was encouraging, therefore that in the year following the last inspection, a \$1 million minor capital works program was approved, providing for extended workshop facilities, and additional toilets, office space and classrooms. At this inspection, however, this capital works program was yet to be finished. When the new areas are finally commissioned they will have limited impact in terms of increasing employment capacity and will still fall well short of current requirements because they were approved based on a prisoner population of around 580. Prisoners will continue to experience unemployment and under-employment.

- 8.48 It is to the Department's and prison management's credit that they have recognised that the capability of the existing infrastructure to cope with any further population increases has been exhausted.¹⁴⁴ In March 2010, a preliminary plan was developed. This outlined the way forward for prisoner employment at Casuarina, in terms of infrastructure/equipment requirements, and the types of industries and vocational training that could be developed. Consistent with imperatives expressed in this Office's 2007 inspection report,¹⁴⁵ training and employment proposals for prisoners are aligned with the contemporary needs of the Western Australian economy.
- 8.49 However, without firm approval of either staffing or infrastructure requirements and the prospect of an additional 256 prisoners looming all too quickly, it seems reasonable to expect that again services will lag several years behind prisoner employment demand. That said, unless the Department plans to outsource those essential industries, such as vegetable preparation that currently contributes massively to the self-sustainability of the prison to the tune of \$6 million per annum, there can be no time lag.¹⁴⁶ This industry, as well as the kitchen and bakery, are stretched to capacity already. The production areas, infrastructure, and equipment are inadequate and unsustainable with 690 prisoners, let alone with an increase to 950 prisoners. For example, an independent review of the vegetable preparation area commissioned by prison management and conducted in January 2010 has revealed that regulatory requirements are being breached under current conditions. The review report concluded that 'the facility is in need of upgrade or relocation as it is not able to sustain the level of facility standard required by the Food Standards code.'¹⁴⁷

Recommendation 7

In order to address the problem of unemployment and under-employment the Department should:

1. *ensure all eligible prisoners at Casuarina are offered full-time, meaningful employment and/or skill development activity; and*
2. *review and realign its employment and skill development activity at Casuarina to ensure an optimal balance between safety, improving the employment prospects of prisoners, offsetting the costs of imprisonment and benefiting the community.*

143 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No. 49 (March 2008) 60.

144 Department of Corrective Services *Prison Industries Casuarina Prison- A Summary of Current Issues and Drivers that will Influence Planning for the Future Direction of Prison Industries at Casuarina Prison* March 2010, p3.

145 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No. 49 (March 2008) 61.

146 Report of Special Process Surveillance Audit conducted by SGS Australia Pty Ltd 7/1/10.

147 Ibid.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Infrastructure

- 8.50 At the time of the last inspection, a lack of available teaching space posed a major challenge to the education service at Casuarina. With the continued population increases in the interim, this lagging infrastructure has reinforced the difficulties staff have had to face in providing education and training to prisoners.
- 8.51 The education centre's capacity remains as it was in 2007. It can still only cater for 60 (8.6 per cent of the total prisoner population) prisoners at any one time due to limited toilet facilities. Additional prisoner toilets, staff access to water in their lunch area, and a space reconfiguration in the learning area of the workshops were identified as desperately needed at the time of the last inspection.¹⁴⁸ They have not been provided.
- 8.52 Much of the education though is delivered at locations outside of the education centre.¹⁴⁹ Education staff were hopeful that when the extra classroom space currently under construction as part of the minor works program¹⁵⁰ is finally commissioned the availability of teaching areas will improve markedly.
- 8.53 The Activity Centre, which at the time of the inspection was also still under construction adjacent to Unit 1, had originally been intended as a cultural centre predominantly for the use of Aboriginal prisoners. Somewhat controversially, (as discussed in Chapter Seven) education staff were negotiating to make use of the two classrooms, workshop, and office space within this centre for general usage.
- 8.54 The Education Service had also identified other infrastructure options, which included converting the vocational skills workshop to make space for two classrooms, obtaining three demountable classrooms, and relocating the program rooms/PCS area to extend the education centre. Approval for these infrastructure requirements and for requests for additional staffing and funding had not been given at the time of the inspection.
- 8.55 These budget, staffing, and infrastructure requests were developed on the basis of the proposed expansion in population of 256 prisoners. But many of these requests were identified as needed for previous population increases. With this pre-existing shortfall in infrastructure, budget and staffing requirements, if approved these requests will provide only for current unmet need, not for the projected population expansion.

Education Provision

- 8.56 Since 2007, the education program has been modified to increase access to more students.¹⁵¹ As a result full-time education is no longer offered; all students are now part-time, up to a

148 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 59.

149 For example, to protection prisoners in Unit 6, to the displaced Aboriginal prisoners in Unit 1, to the general population in the Units, to prison industries, to the prisoners in the Special Handling Unit, and to the prisoners in the Infirmary.

150 See paragraph 1.5 above.

151 DCS, *Education and Vocational Prisoner Training at Casuarina Prison* (15 April 2010).

maximum of three days per week. At Casuarina, 38 per cent of the population participates in education and training in an average month.¹⁵²

- 8.57 Classroom-based education remains focused on the delivery of literacy and numeracy programs. Given the large numbers of prisoners who have never completed basic schooling, this focus is appropriate. However, although there were 639 unit enrolments in a range of adult literacy and access courses during 2009, most students only completed one or two units, with large numbers (96) only completing one reading unit.¹⁵³ Moreover, hopes for prisoners to take up the next stage of study beyond basic programs had not come to fruition. None of those students who had enrolled in the higher level literacy courses completed a single reading, writing, or arithmetic unit.
- 8.58 The Hands On Learning program (HOLP) had been used at Casuarina for some years. Working in practical carpentry, prisoners with low literacy who would normally be resistant to classroom education were introduced to literacy and numeracy. However, a funding application for continued provision was unsuccessful and so HOLP has been on hold during 2010. The course had been designed to offer support primarily to Aboriginal prisoners, often following completion of the DAP (see Chapter Seven). Along with the loss of the Indigenous Tuition Assistance Scheme (ITAS) funding in January 2009, which provided part-time students with the option of individual tuition and educational support, Aboriginal prisoners have therefore been dealt a double blow.
- 8.59 External education traditionally offered at Casuarina had included full-time options. However, increasing the number of prisoners who can access education and reducing the number of days they could participate, has resulted in a reduction in the options available to prisoners and in turn, the numbers of prisoners pursuing full-time external study.
- 8.60 Additionally, the pursuit of external education has been further challenged across the prison estate with the withdrawal from prisoners of their personal computers (see Footnote 74). This has disproportionately impacted upon prisoners in the SHU and Infirmary, and to a lesser extent protection prisoners, because communal computers have also been withdrawn. Unlike those in mainstream, prisoners in these areas cannot even access communal computers in the education centre.¹⁵⁴
- 8.61 The inspection also found that the Local Area Network (LAN) that was established to allow for information technology (IT) training to simulate e-mail and networking is no longer fully operational. This was preventing IT students from completing their qualifications, and creating inefficiencies for teachers because they are unable to mark work without students present.
- 8.62 In terms of vocational training, the education centre offers a number of vocational courses in information technology, art and music. However, safety training represented a large

152 Enrolments by Venue and Registration Status Unit Start Date between 1/1/09 and 31/12/09.

153 Ibid.

154 Protection prisoners can access the education centre's computers once a week.

proportion of the 3844 recorded unit enrolments in 2009.¹⁵⁵ Apart from those prisoners undertaking traineeships and certain short courses (see employment above) much of the other vocational training is restricted to safety units. As an illustration, during 2009, there were 232 enrolments for Certificate II in General Construction, Certificate II in Engineering, Certificate II in Assets Maintenance, Certificate I in Business, and Certificate II in Laundry Operations. However, the only unit enrolled in for each of these courses during the whole of 2009 was the Occupational Health and Safety unit.

- 8.63 This safety training was provided in addition to the 1101 enrolments in the Follow Workplace Safety Procedures, Safety Awareness Training, and White Card courses.
- 8.64 Safety is obviously an important operational issue for Industries and the prison as a whole. However, this concentration of single unit delivery masks the level of vocational training offered in most areas. There is an array of industry areas, which must surely have other training needs that can be credited to prisoners. Further, it points to the possibility that most of the 1018 who participated in training in 2009 would have done no more than one or two safety courses.
- 8.65 The courses available are useful. But if very small numbers of units are offered, they will be insufficient to have any significant impact on prisoners' labour market prospects on release. Given that some prisoners will spend considerable time at Casuarina, providing significant chunks of training would be much more beneficial in terms of building skills for employment.
- 8.66 On a positive note, despite the increased population, education services have continued to be provided – an achievement in itself. The centre prioritises services to ensure that those prisoners nearing release, those with very low literacy, and trainees receive adequate services. This is sensible although a short-term, unsustainable approach to managing restricted resources.
- 8.67 An external audit of the education centre's status as a registered training organisation and of its compliance with the Australian Quality Training Framework elicited a positive report. However, Casuarina offers a clear example of the results of trying to stretch limited resources around more and more prisoners. While there is an appearance of service delivery and a small number of people receive the sort of education and training service that would be expected, most prisoners in reality receive little or no access to education and training beyond an initial assessment and some safety training.

Recommendation 8

Implement a human resource management and infrastructure plan that will ensure that all eligible prisoners are offered education and training that is relevant, is evenly weighted across a range of employment skills, and can substantively benefit prisoners in terms of skill development and employability upon release.

155 STATS – Unit Completions between 1/1/09 -31/12/09.

Chapter 9

HEALTH SERVICES

ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

- 9.1 The Health Services Directorate forms part of the Offender Management and Professional Development Division of DCS. It provides the human resource management and clinical management framework for health service delivery across the prison estate, including the juvenile detention centres.
- 9.2 Each facility has a health centre and care delivery is organised around four key areas: primary care, chronic disease, infectious disease and co-morbidity (mental health and alcohol and substance abuse).
- 9.3 In addition to its health centre, Casuarina also runs a 15-bed infirmary, which is a statewide resource. Between December 2009 and March 2010, the role of the infirmary, along with health services as a whole, was the subject of an internally directed review. Prior to the inspection, senior management from the Health Services Directorate advised that there were early indications that a restructure at head office level would occur as a result of the review, and that human and physical resources would need attention.
- 9.4 At the time of the inspection, the review and the related report and recommendations had been completed. However, they were yet to be signed off by the Commissioner's Executive Team (CET) and were not provided to the Inspectorate.
- 9.5 At Casuarina, in-house services are provided by doctors, psychiatrists, clinical and mental health nurses and pharmacists, who are supported by medical records staff, medical receptionists, and medication assistants, and an infirmary care worker.¹⁵⁶ External services are provided by visiting General Practitioners (GPs) and allied health professionals.
- 9.6 Casuarina also has a 12-bed Crisis Care Unit (CCU), one of three in metropolitan Western Australia, which is managed by the Adult Custodial Division. Its function, again as a state resource, is to provide care for prisoners who are at risk of self-harm and require psychological services.¹⁵⁷ Health services clinical staff provide input into the management of at-risk prisoners.

BACKGROUND TO THE INSPECTION OF HEALTH SERVICES AT CASUARINA

- 9.7 Prisoners have much the same range of health conditions as the general community. Chronic disease conditions, therefore, such as diabetes, asthma, hepatitis, and cardiovascular disease are common. At Casuarina and across the prison system these conditions prompt the development of a specific care plan. In addition, there are certain conditions recognised as

¹⁵⁶ Prison-based health service management advised that this position was in the process of being officially created, and as such there was no applicable job description nor was there a capacity for the post holder to claim penalty rates under a relevant employment award. Meanwhile, the current post holder was rostered to work three, 12-hour weekday shifts one week, and four, 12-hour weekday shifts the following week. In her absence, her duties are additionally picked up by the rostered clinical nurses.

¹⁵⁷ Observation cells are available at other prisons and are used to accommodate those prisoners who require close monitoring of their psychological well-being. Should the prisoner's condition deteriorate to a point where the prison can no longer provide the level of care required, the prisoner may be transferred to Casuarina for more intensive support. If necessary, they may be transferred to the Frankland Centre for acute psychiatric care. Post-acute care may again be provided at Casuarina prior to the prisoner's return to the originating prison.

being much more prevalent amongst prisoners than in the general community. At Casuarina, this phenomenon is further exaggerated because of the high numbers of Aboriginal prisoners and because of the role the prison plays as a health resource for the whole of the Western Australian estate. These conditions include mental health conditions, blood borne viral disease (mainly Hepatitis C), drug and alcohol addiction, and dental disease.¹⁵⁸

- 9.8 Inspection findings indicated that the capacity of the health service to deal adequately with current demand is falling well short of a comprehensive response. Staffing levels have remained largely unchanged over recent years despite the increased population, and there has been a dearth of professional development opportunities. As a consequence, staff feel that they provide a barely adequate service in response to day-to-day demand, but are not able to undertake preventive measures, or adequate reviews of prisoners requiring follow-up. Many expressed concern that the impending increase in population of a further 256 prisoners will stretch them beyond their capability.
- 9.9 In the pre-inspection survey, prisoners ranked health services equal to food as third of the three 'most negative things that do not work in prison'. The majority of prisoners felt that their access to and the quality of general health services, medical specialists, dental care, psychiatric care and medications was 'mostly poor'. However, they ranked health service and other staff second to VSOs in terms of their supportiveness and helpfulness,¹⁵⁹ which reflected the Inspectorate's findings of a committed and professional group of staff.
- 9.10 Prior to the inspection, the Inspectorate invited the Department to share any plans it has for the expansion of service delivery at the infirmary and CCU, especially given their role as a statewide resource. The Department's submission stated that:
- Casuarina...deals with some of the most disturbed prisoners within the Western Australian system...within Crisis Care. These prisoners are invariably either a potentially serious threat to others or to themselves and in the absence of sufficient facilities in the state to cater for the mentally ill, much of this impacts upon Casuarina.
- 9.11 However, no detail as to the nature of any plans was provided other than 'upgrade to health centre.'
- 9.12 On the other hand, senior management from the Health Services Directorate advised at their briefing to the Office that three additional clinical offices will be needed to meet current and planned demand. Management were in the process of exploring different options for the way in which this could be achieved. Moreover, they advised that approval had been given for additional staffing according to 'per prisoner per day levels', including a medical officer, two clinical nurses, and one medical receptionist.

158 Almost 50 per cent of prisoners at Casuarina have a diagnosed mental disorder, and staff reported an estimated 80 per cent of prisoners have or have had drug and/or alcohol problems.

159 Forty-eight per cent of prisoners found health service and other staff helpful and supportive.

CLINICAL ASSESSMENT, CARE PLANNING, AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

- 9.13 Most initial assessments are carried out at Hakea Prison and consist of a nursing assessment within 24 hours of reception and a doctor's assessment within 28 days or earlier as indicated by the nurse.
- 9.14 Routine screening or reassessment for health issues which may have arisen or changed since initial assessment does not occur on arrival at Casuarina. The initial assessment screens for mental illness, blood-borne viral (BBV) diseases, and alcohol and substance abuse.
- 9.15 Screening for other conditions, which bring potential communication, behaviour and coping problems, such as acquired brain injury, intellectual disability, or disorders on the autistic spectrum, does not occur. Detection of these conditions depends upon informal pick-up by the assessing doctor or nurse. It is likely that many go undetected, and as a result, prisoners may not necessarily be given support for their dysfunction. Behavioural issues related to their disorders may also be misunderstood by staff and attributed to insolence, disrespect, or disobedience.
- 9.16 Custodial staff reported that they had not had, but would welcome, training about the way in which mental health disorders, or any other condition, including diabetic hypoglycaemia, acute infection, severe pain, intellectual disability, autism, acquired brain injury, and medication side effects can cause behaviour problems.
- 9.17 All the primary care nurses employed at Casuarina health service are employed at clinical nurse level. Somewhat bizarrely they have not been allowed to undertake nursing assessments and make recommendations for diet modification, special mattresses and other nursing matters. This rule is a legacy of former Departmental health service management and needs to be rescinded. Nurses have the training and skills to deal with nursing matters.
- 9.18 A specific care plan is developed for those prisoners diagnosed with mental health disorders, or one of the four designated chronic diseases (asthma, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, or Hepatitis C). No specific care plans are developed, however, for those prisoners with diagnoses outside of the four designated chronic diseases, such as acquired brain injury, intellectual disability, or other physical or progressive disability.
- 9.19 Nurses alert custodial staff via the Total Offender Management Solutions (TOMS) database to prisoners' conditions that may result in abnormal behaviour, self-harm or other acute medical exacerbation. Confidentiality imperatives limit the detail of this information. Moreover, such alerts do not include any details of signs and symptoms that custodial staff should be aware of nor any information regarding effective behaviour management strategies. This is potentially problematic given that custodial officers have not been provided with any training in these matters. The risk that situations are managed as behavioural, as opposed to medical, events increases.
- 9.20 In October 2009, the electronic health information system (ECHO) was rolled out across the prison health services. Health professionals at Casuarina and other prisons consistently express high levels of frustration with the system. They complained about its sluggish

response, its limited functioning in terms of the number of simultaneous users allowed, and the absence of health information pre-dating the EcHO implementation. As with any new system, there is always an adjustment and troubleshooting period. In any case, therefore, there should be an evaluation of the effectiveness of the system built into the implementation process and mechanisms by which users can provide feedback regarding problems so that these can be resolved accordingly.

ACCESS

- 9.21 In 2007, the Inspectorate found that issues relating to accessibility, confidentiality, and timeliness were undermining the integrity of the medical appointment system. A recommendation was accordingly made: ‘That Casuarina monitors and assesses its medical appointment system to guarantee the confidentiality of prisoner-patients and to improve the certainty and timeliness of prisoner-patient appointments.’¹⁶⁰ To its credit, the Department took action and implemented a new appointment system.
- 9.22 The new appointment system that was implemented works as follows: the prison provides each prisoner with a white card with a printed personalised bar code. When the prisoner wishes to see a doctor/nurse/dentist/specialist etc on a non-emergency basis, they place this white card into a medical appointments box located in each unit. The staff administering medications regularly clear these boxes, and medical receptionists schedule ‘triage’ appointments for prisoners with the nurse, in the order that the cards were received. The appointment system is, therefore, very much managed on a ‘first come, first serve’ rather than on a needs basis. As such, it carries potential risks because reception staff are not clinically qualified and do not know whether a prisoner might need prioritising over another.
- 9.23 When the prisoner-patient eventually sees the nurse, this is his first opportunity to explain what service he requires. The nurse then makes a decision about next steps. This could include making an appointment for the prisoner-patient to see the doctor or dentist.
- 9.24 The inspection found that this modified appointment system continues to be a source of frustration for prisoner-patients. While the confidentiality issues previously identified have been eliminated, timeliness and accessibility problems prevail.
- 9.25 During the on-site phase of the inspection, prisoners reported long delays between submitting their cards and being called to attend an appointment with the nurse. They also pointed out that they have no record or proof of the date they submit their card and so complaints about long delays can never be substantiated. Prisoners frequently described becoming even more frustrated because following the appointment with the nurse, there was generally a further wait of unknown length to secure an appointment to see the doctor or other professional.
- 9.26 The Office of Health Review’s analysis of complaints received between 2009–2010, which was provided to this Office stated that ‘A large proportion of complaints...concern delays in seeing a doctor or a dentist, delays in receiving prescribed medication after seeing the

160 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49 (March 2008) 42.

doctor, or delays in seeing a specialist.¹⁶¹ Findings from the pre-inspection survey indicated that the majority of prisoners were not happy with their access to general health services, medical specialists, dental care, psychiatric care and medications.

MENTAL HEALTH

- 9.27 During the inspection, there were 330¹⁶² prisoners (almost 50 per cent) with identified mental health disorders ranging from depression, anxiety and personality disorders, to major psychoses. Coupled with the risk of self-harm, mental illness is understandably the highest priority for all health care staff.
- 9.28 The dedicated mental health staff comprise an acting senior mental health nurse (on a three-month renewable contract), and two mental health nurses, both from a nursing agency. One of these agency nurses is shared between mental health and the addictions co-morbidity nurse. In the past, mental health nurses provided a seven-day a week service but this has been reduced to five days, occasionally six. A psychiatrist and a psychiatric medical officer provide twice a week consultation on site.
- 9.29 The mental health nurses monitor prisoners in the CCU, administer depot psychotropic medications to prisoners during the week, review at-risk prisoners twice a week, and otherwise respond to incidental occurrences, as time permits.
- 9.30 Given the numbers of prisoners with mental health disorders, this staffing level is patently inadequate. In the context of prisoner health, the 'per prisoner per day levels' referred to earlier are clearly an inappropriate tool for assessing Casuarina's staffing requirements. It has already been established that prisoners experience a higher incidence of certain conditions and this is magnified at Casuarina because of its statewide service obligations.
- 9.31 These inadequate staffing levels are challenging enough without the added uncertainty that long standing temporary staffing arrangements inevitably generate. Furthermore, PCS staff, who play a key role in suicide prevention and supporting prisoners with mental health problems, have also been plagued by actual and proportionate staffing cuts, and this has been discussed at length earlier in this report.
- 9.32 The CCU is managed by custodial officers, not mental health staff. With the exception of the PRAG meetings, at which information is shared and decisions are made about CCU prisoners' well-being, all staff involved with prisoners with mental health problems work independently of each other. Heavy reliance is placed on custodial officers' awareness of changed prisoner behaviour to call in assistance or to transfer a prisoner to CCU.
- 9.33 Back in 2007, the Inspectorate suggested that the '...service model should be more integrated and reflect the practice in the community where a multi-disciplinary team provides for the holistic care of the patient.'¹⁶³ It also made a recommendation that the Department secure funding to provide appropriate needs-based mental health services to

161 Letter received 16 March 2010.

162 Prison Population Statistics for Casuarina Inspection: Report Produced by Strategic and Executive Services Performance and Statistics Branch.

163 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison*, Report No.49, (March 2008) 44.

prisoners in Western Australia. Although business cases for funding were submitted in 2007–2008 and 2008–2009, neither was successful.

- 9.34 The Inspectorate acknowledges that mental health is a high priority focus at Casuarina and taken very seriously by all. Custodial staff are prompt to transfer any prisoner who is exhibiting unusual or risk warning behaviour to CCU. Mental health and PCS staff work with custodial staff to attend to such prisoners. The focus is clearly on prevention of self harm. However, there is no dedicated mental health facility,¹⁶⁴ independent reviews of ‘near miss’ suicides¹⁶⁵ are not undertaken, and mental health nurses are inadequate in number, have no dedicated service base, and are not included as natural partners in other health areas. Staff attributed this latter point to the fact that the mental health nurses do not report to the nurse manager on site, rather to a manager at head office. Structural staffing arrangements, or any other such impediments to collaborative working, should be addressed expeditiously in the best interests of the prisoner-patients.
- 9.35 The inspection found that mental health services and resources generally are stretched to capacity at Casuarina. Management and staff reported that the CCU is frequently full and that this situation is often prolonged because discharges to the infirmary for post-acute care often have to be delayed because that facility is also full.¹⁶⁶
- 9.36 Management and staff have identified an area connecting the CCU to the infirmary where a further four CCU beds could be created. However, at this stage their idea is still just that and management and staff stated that they were unaware of any expansion plans.

ALCOHOL AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE

- 9.37 There is a 1.5 full time equivalent staffing allocation to this area of service delivery. A half-time agency nurse assists the full-time co-morbidity nurse in overseeing the pharmacological substitution (Methadone) program for 60 prisoners. In addition, they provide as much support as they can to the estimated 80 per cent of prisoners¹⁶⁷ who have or have had alcohol and/or drug problems.
- 9.38 This staffing level does not allow for provision of counselling or organisation of support groups. This illustrates again, given the disproportionately high numbers of prisoners who require support in this service area, that the application of a standardised formula for determining staffing levels is completely inappropriate.

164 The last OICS Report No.49, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison* (March 2008) 44, expressed the view that ‘...a psychiatric ward within the prison system is long overdue...’

165 The Inspectorate understands that in the event of a death in custody, the matter is automatically investigated by the police and coroner but with regard to the point above, an independent review following ‘near miss’ suicides does not appear to be automatic. During the inspection, a suicide was attempted but prevented just in time by the swift actions of staff. However, this did not prompt an independent investigation to assist internal review, for lessons learned. The gravity of a near-miss is similar to the circumstance of a ‘successful’ suicide, warranting detailed review, with comprehensive recording and discussion to identify required improvements. These identified improvements should be taken very seriously, both within the prison, and in the Department. The Department’s input may be necessary to rectify deficiencies that cannot be resolved at site/operational level.

166 OICS Liaison Visit Notes 8/12/09.

167 This estimation largely correlates with the findings of the Australian Government’s Institute of Health and Welfare *The Health of Australia’s Prisoners 2009*, 56–58.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH CARE

- 9.39 At the time of the last inspection, the lack of an Aboriginal Health Worker and an Aboriginal mental health worker were described as ‘major deficits’. Commonly, between 45 per cent and 50 per cent of prisoners at Casuarina are Aboriginal, with well over half at any one time from ‘out of country’ or displaced from the Kimberley, Pilbara, eastern Goldfields, the ‘lands’ and the South-West.¹⁶⁸ With such a high number of Aboriginal prisoners, and particularly more traditional men from ‘the lands’, the need for suitably qualified professionals with a good understanding of the relevant cultural issues was described as ‘acute’ and urgent three years ago¹⁶⁹ and formed the basis of a recommendation.¹⁷⁰ The Department supported this recommendation, ‘subject to funding’, and stated that it would ‘continue to seek funding for these positions’.
- 9.40 To date, however, Casuarina still has no Aboriginal health/mental health Workers. The Inspectorate is well aware that there is a shortage of such staff within the community. However, at a meeting with the Health Services Directorate prior to the inspection, senior management acknowledged that they had not made discrete and proactive efforts to recruit Aboriginal health services staff.
- 9.41 In the intervening three years, with the population continuing to increase, there has been a corresponding increase in the numbers of Aboriginal prisoners, including displaced prisoners. Displacement creates a particular set of problems in terms of trauma and distress as discussed in Chapter Seven. This reinforces further the critical and even more urgent need for Aboriginal health/mental health staff at Casuarina.
- 9.42 Not only were there no Aboriginal health workers, but also there were few male health staff, making it additionally difficult for Aboriginal prisoners to seek help, as culturally, they are reluctant to talk to female staff about some matters. Furthermore, a considerable number of Aboriginal prisoners at Casuarina do not have English as their first language. The lack of Aboriginal staff to assist prisoners in their appreciation of health issues in their preferred language, calls into question whether Aboriginal prisoners can truly give informed consent.
- 9.43 The inspection found a paucity of training provision for health staff. Of particular significance, given the lack of Aboriginal health staff to provide services to Aboriginal prisoners, was the lack of training in the provision of culturally sensitive health care. Staff reported that they learned by experience rather than being provided with training.
- 9.44 The availability of culturally relevant and appropriate assessment tools¹⁷¹ would go some way to redressing the deficits in staff knowledge, but a ‘one size fits all’ approach currently applies.

168 TOMS data indicated that at the time of the inspection there were 327 Aboriginal prisoners, 200 of whom originated from outside of the Perth Statistical Division.

169 OICS Report No.49, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison* (March 2008) 42.

170 Ibid, Recommendation 12: ‘That as a matter of priority Casuarina secures the services of an Aboriginal Health Worker and an Aboriginal Mental Health Worker’.

171 See Dr Tracy Westerman ‘Indigenous Best Practice’, www.youtube.com/watch?v=bn1QjGn4xnM for a discussion about the limitations of mainstream assessment for indigenous populations. She highlights the way in which certain Aboriginal cultural beliefs and behaviours can be misunderstood and interpreted as psychotic if assessed using mainstream assessment tools.

HEALTH SERVICES

- 9.45 Aboriginal prisoners have a different perception, understanding, and response to health issues as compared with their non-Aboriginal counterparts. A standardised assessment tool that makes no allowance for cultural differences is inadequate in terms of facilitating accurate diagnoses and the development of appropriate treatment plans. Moreover, its use potentially opens up the Department to litigation if conditions are not diagnosed or mis-diagnosed, and go untreated or mistreated.

DENTAL SERVICES

- 9.46 A single dentist and small team service the needs of Casuarina Prison, and two other prisons – a caseload of 1300 to 1400 prisoners.
- 9.47 Many prisoners have very serious dental decay and gum disease, partly attributable to previous neglect, and commonly (among drug users) to methamphetamine. Major procedures of multiple extractions are not uncommon, and often require alternative techniques to general anaesthesia so that prisoners can be returned safely to their cells post operatively.
- 9.48 The inspection found that higher needs of prisoners with regard to dental care (estimated to be four times higher than people in the community) limits the extent to which the dentist can effectively service his caseload. However, urgent requests can be honoured and waiting times for non-urgent work are averaging two months.
- 9.49 This provides further illustration, however, that using a standardised general community-need focussed formula to determine staffing levels in the area of prisoner health care delivery is nonsensical, given prisoners' differential health status and needs in particular areas.

PHARMACY

- 9.50 The central pharmacy at Hakea Prison supplies all prisons with medication for all prescriptions received during the previous seven days. Unless the prescription is marked 'urgent' there is no flexibility for delivery outside the once a week arrangement. If the on-site imprest system contains the prescribed medication, it can be dispensed temporarily by the nurse, and replaced when the pharmacy supply arrives. Otherwise, prisoners cannot access their needed medication for up to a week. This arrangement causes much concern to nursing staff, and frustration to the visiting doctors and prisoners alike. It is particularly difficult to manage changing clinical conditions, such as diabetes, and psychosis if daily adjustments are necessary, but medications cannot be changed daily.
- 9.51 A long standing source of prisoner and staff complaints, and one not exclusive to Casuarina, is the issue of the supply of over the counter simple analgesia for ad hoc pain relief. With the changeover of management in Health Services, the Inspectorate is optimistic that a speedy resolution to this issue will be achieved.

-
- 9.52 Nurses reported concern about the relatively recent introduction of medication assistants, whose sole duty it is to administer medications to prisoners from the Webster pack system.¹⁷² They explained that these assistants are not trained or authorised to administer paracetamol on request, nor are they trained to assess the reason for a prisoner refusing their medication. At the time of the inspection, the assistants were also not passing on such information to the nurses. Nurses were keen to maintain their management of medication rounds, so that they could pick up on potential problems for prisoners with mental health or addiction problems, know who is in pain or who may need monitoring.
- 9.53 The Health Services Directorate is charged with the responsibility of making good business decisions and ensuring safe care delivery to prisoners. In this respect, therefore, it is outside the scope of the Inspectorate to comment regarding the Directorate's decisions about the way the roles and responsibilities of its staff team are organised at operational level. Unless, of course there is a risk that prisoner health care is being compromised. The Inspectorate does not favour nurses administering medications over medication assistants, or vice versa. However, if the medication assistants have been adequately trained in the system they are using, are clear about the parameters of their roles, and have clear protocols about keeping nursing staff fully informed of all exceptions when they occur, then there should be no reason they cannot continue to perform this duty.

THE INFIRMARY

- 9.54 At the time of the inspection, the infirmary contained prisoners with a wide range of health conditions: post hospital recovery, altered mental state/dementia, mobility problems requiring wheelchair or aids, degenerative neurological disease, and terminal illness.
- 9.55 The infirmary is staffed by one or two clinical nurses (depending on availability) on each shift. In addition, a care worker has recently been appointed and works full-time on a 12-hour weekday shift basis (three days one week, four days the next). In the absence of the care worker, the clinical nurses additionally take on her personal and social care duties, which is not a good use of senior nurse resources. A part-time physiotherapist attends the prison health centre two days a week and attends those assessed as needing input at the infirmary. However, there is no occupational therapist and no diversional therapy provided to the prisoner-patients. With the exception, therefore, of the recently appointed care worker, the staffing model is heavily weighted to senior nursing positions.
- 9.56 Although called an infirmary, in its pre-inspection submission the Department stated that it is 'equipped to provide comprehensive assisted care, including outpatient arrangements'. However, at the pre-inspection meeting with Health Services management, the Director acknowledged that in order for the infirmary to function as an assisted care unit, it needed to be able to respond to the fluctuating demands for medical versus social care. The Director added that a more flexible model of care, therefore, needed to be developed, with an increased emphasis on social care.

172 This is a multi-dose blister-pack system of medication, which is dispensed by pharmacists but can be administered by non-clinically qualified staff. In signing off on administration of the medication, staff are signing to say that the contents of the blister pack has been administered; they are not signing off on the administration of individual drugs.

-
-
- 9.57 The inspection found that not only is the infirmary not functioning as an assisted care unit, but also it is not functioning as an infirmary. An infirmary should be specifically for post-acute care, intermittent illness, palliative care, and exacerbation of chronic illness requiring nursing or medical care.
- 9.58 In order to determine the future role and function of the infirmary as it is currently known, however, there needs to be a system-wide focus on optimal arrangements for the prisoner groups requiring different sorts of health care. Four distinct service areas are required: an infirmary for sick prisoners; a dedicated mental health unit; an adequately designed outpatients clinic, with enough space for current and future demand; and given the small but gradually increasing cohort of older prisoners across the estate, a geriatric and long term care unit. The capacity of Casuarina to meet its statewide health obligations must be taken into account, as well as its in-house capability requirements.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.59 The inspection found that morale amongst health service staff had improved significantly in recent months. There had been a changeover of management at Departmental level and the dialogue and lines of communication between Head Office and prisoner health care services at Casuarina were open. The Inspectorate noted positive relationships between custodial staff, PCS and health staff, which were serving to limit risk levels.
- 9.60 Staff were demonstrably committed and professional, and doing as best they could. This enormous commitment of staff compensated to some extent for the wholly inadequate resourcing arrangements, but this was not sustainable.
- 9.61 Going forward, therefore, the Department will need to commit to careful health service planning to bridge the existing resourcing gaps, as well as to ensure that sufficient provision is made for the additional 256 prisoners. In doing so, the Department will also need to take into account the role Casuarina's health service will continue to play across the wider estate.

At a strategic level, it is recommended that the Department undertake the following:

Recommendation 9

Develop a staffing model that (1) is based on prisoners' evidenced health needs; (2) facilitates collaborative working between disciplines and continuity of prisoner-patient care; (3) provides options for career progression; and (4) provides comprehensive and ongoing professional development.

Recommendation 10

In view of Casuarina's statewide obligation to provide infirmary and Crisis Care Unit services, the fact that there has been no increase in capacity of these services since the prison opened, and that the population has risen exponentially, it is recommended that the built environment should be reviewed and that there should be significant investment in expanded, appropriate and different facilities.¹⁷³

173 Areas to be addressed could include but should not be limited to those outlined above.

Recommended actions at an operational level are as follows:

Recommendation 11

- *Review and revise assessment and care planning tools to ensure that they facilitate more comprehensive identification of and support for health issues, particularly those impacting upon behaviour.*
- *Review assessment tools for their cultural relevance and develop or obtain alternatives accordingly.*

Recommendation 12

- *In order to enhance custodial staff's confidence, and to assist in ensuring appropriate responses to prisoners, provide training to custodial staff in how to challenge and change behaviour and in the common causes of behavioural problems.*
- *Provide initial and ongoing training to all health care staff to ensure culturally relevant and appropriate health care delivery.*

Recommendation 13

Review and revise appointment practices across the prison estate and implement a system or systems that improve timeliness and communication.

Recommendation 14

Recruit Aboriginal Health and Mental Health Workers.

Appendix 1

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2010 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Response
Administration and Accountability of DCS	Supported – existing departmental initiative
1. Advise Casuarina management and staff about the additional resources which will be provided to expand the infrastructure, staffing levels, and service provision to meet Casuarina's obligations to all its prisoners.	<p>There has been an ongoing process of communication from the commencement of the expansion project and the information provided in this report will be of assistance in improving the communication process.</p> <p>Staff at Casuarina Prison have been briefed by the Assets, Project Manager and the Superintendent as to progress on the Casuarina Expansion Project and the supporting infrastructure. Daily work schedules are distributed to all relevant parties and a "Notebook" has been set up on the Casuarina Portal. The Notebook advises staff of the progress of the current works and supporting infrastructure as approved. Negotiations continue with Health, Programs and Industries in relation to the design of improvements and staffing requirements. Project Control meetings are held on a monthly basis to progress current works. A project officer has been appointed to document an overall plan for Casuarina Prison including the new facilities and the proposed staffing model.</p>
Administration and Accountability of DCS	Supported – existing departmental initiative
2. In order to inspire confidence of all staff in the Performance Assessment Development System it should be reviewed and revised to ensure that (1) it facilitates accurate assessment of performance; and (2) it facilitates the identification of employee training needs and accordingly ensures provision of the requisite training.	<p>This is supported as an existing Departmental initiative. The Performance Appraisal and Development System (PADS) was rolled out across the entire Department, a component of which was tailored specifically for prison officers. The Department is of the view the current system is sound. However, the human factor will influence the effectiveness of the system. It has always been understood that the introduction of a PADS process is a journey that will require continuous improvement and cultural change in any organisation. This type of change will not happen overnight and is widely accepted as being a significant challenge.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2010 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Response
<p>Administration and Accountability of DCS</p> <p>3. Consistent with the intent of the Department's key business philosophies underpinning its strategic plan, Casuarina Prison should explore and develop alternative, innovative strategies to demonstrably reduce the impact of its activities upon the environment. Where necessary, it may be appropriate for the Department to provide additional resources for this purpose.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>This is supported as an existing Departmental initiative. Consistent with our sustainability policy, this will be actioned.</p>
<p>Racism, Aboriginality, and Equity</p> <p>4. Using a consultative approach, the Department and the Prison should develop and implement a detailed strategy with measurable outcomes, for the culturally appropriate management of all Aboriginal prisoners. Consultation could involve volunteers and elders, Prison Support Officers, Aboriginal Visitor Scheme staff, and the Indigenous services Coordinator.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>The Department strives to provide culturally appropriate services to all prisoners, including Aboriginal prisoners within existing constraints. The Department has a number of corporate and local initiatives to enhance the cultural appropriateness of services to Aboriginal prisoners and maintains a continuous improvement ethos.</p>
<p>Racism, Aboriginality, and Equity</p> <p>5. Review the aims, objectives and content of the DAP program and revise the program accordingly.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>This is supported as an existing Departmental initiative as it is intended that changes and improvements to the Displaced Aboriginal Program (DAP) will be identified and implemented through ongoing reviews which is part of normal business. Performance indicators related to the DAP are currently being developed and will be incorporated into regular reporting.</p>

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Response
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>6. The Department and Casuarina work together to put better systems and resources in place for the release planning and re-entry into the community of displaced prisoners. In particular, where security allows, displaced prisoners should be given more opportunity to spend more time at a prison closer to home before release.</p>	<p>Supported in principle</p> <p>Whilst every effort is made to return prisoners at the earliest opportunity to releasing prisons, Broome and Eastern Goldfields have limited ability to accommodate secure prisoners for any extended period of time. All prisoners leaving Casuarina Prison have Centrelink and extended travel arrangements in place prior to transfer. It is not just a matter of security but the availability of prisoner accommodation and services.</p>
<p>Reparation</p> <p>7. In order to address the problem of unemployment and under-employment the Department should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ensure all eligible prisoners at Casuarina are offered full-time, meaningful employment and/or skill development activity; and 2) review and realign its employment and skill development activity at Casuarina to ensure an optimal balance between safety, improving the employment prospects of prisoners, offsetting the costs of imprisonment and benefiting the community. 	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>A statewide review of adult offender employment was completed in February 2010. Recommendations from this review include the development of a strategic vision for offender employment and the need to adopt a commercial approach to the conduct of industries. The Department is committed to providing constructive and meaningful activity to all eligible prisoners.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2010 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Response
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>8. Implement a human resource management and infrastructure plan that will ensure that all eligible prisoners are offered education and training that is relevant, is evenly weighted across a range of employment skills, and can substantively benefit prisoners in terms of skill development and employability upon release.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>The annual strategic asset planning process already considers all the infrastructure requirements across the prison system and staffing and service delivery is considered within the constraints of allocated resources.</p>
<p>Care and Wellbeing</p> <p>9. Develop a staffing model that (1) is based on prisoners' evidenced health needs; (2) facilitates collaborative working between disciplines and continuity of prisoner-patient care; (3) provides options for career progression; and (4) provides comprehensive and ongoing professional development.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>This is supported as an existing Departmental initiative as a review was recently undertaken in relation to Health Services and is currently in the consultation stage with relevant stakeholders including the Department of Health and the Mental Health Commission.</p>
<p>Care and Wellbeing</p> <p>10. In view of Casuarina's statewide obligation to provide infirmary and Crisis Care Unit services, the fact that there has been no increase in capacity of these services since the prison opened, and that the population has risen exponentially, it is recommended that the built environment should be reviewed and that there should be significant investment in expanded, appropriate and different facilities.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>This is supported as an existing Departmental initiative and is currently being considered in line with the expansion of the prison and the Health Services Review 2010.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2010 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Response
<p>Care and Wellbeing</p> <p>11. (1) Review and revise assessment and care planning tools to ensure that they facilitate more comprehensive identification of and support for health issues, particularly those impacting upon behaviour.</p> <p>(2) Review assessment tools for their cultural relevance and develop or obtain alternatives accordingly.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>See Recommendation 10. The Department will consider this in line with the Health Services Review.</p>
<p>Care and Wellbeing</p> <p>12. (1) In order to enhance custodial staff’s confidence, and to assist in ensuring appropriate responses to prisoners, provide training to custodial staff in how to challenge and change behaviour and in the common causes of behavioural problems.</p> <p>(2) Provide initial and ongoing training to all health care staff to ensure culturally relevant and appropriate health care delivery.</p>	<p>Supported in principle</p> <p>Discussions have commenced with the Mental Health Commission to improve the services both to offenders and possible opportunities for staff training.</p> <p>The Department supports ongoing cultural awareness training for health care staff and will implement this part of the recommendation</p>
<p>Administration and Accountability</p> <p>13. Review and revise appointment practices across the prison estate and implement a system or systems that improve timeliness and communication.</p>	<p>Supported – existing departmental initiative</p> <p>This is supported as an existing Departmental initiative as a number of changes have already been implemented and will continue to be monitored.</p>
<p>Racism, Aboriginality and Equity</p> <p>14. Recruit Aboriginal Health and Mental Health Workers.</p>	<p>Supported in principle</p> <p>The Department supports this recommendation, however, notes there are difficulties across the sector in recruiting Aboriginal Health Workers.</p>

Appendix 2

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation No.	Recommendations By Type of Recommendation/Duration Report No. 49	Assessment of the Department's Implementations				
		Poor	Less than acceptable	Acceptable	More than acceptable	Excellent
1.	<p>Administration and accountability of DCS</p> <p>That the Department reassess the funding model to Casuarina to ensure that the time lag between the demand for extra services due to population increases and the supply of extra resources to provide those services is minimised, thereby improving service obligations at the prison</p>		•			
2.	<p>Administration and accountability of DCS</p> <p>That the Department and Casuarina undertake joint infrastructure replacement and maintenance planning, especially keeping in mind the impact of use by an unforeseen number of prisoners and the difficulty in performing maintenance in a prison at excess capacity.</p>		•			
3.	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>That the Department provide adequate increases to the number of civilian staff at Casuarina to provide the required services to prisoners, and that forward planning is undertaken immediately to provide adequate staff when future planned population increases again occur. This is necessary in all service areas including the Prisoner Counselling Service, prisoner treatment programs, education, health and Prisoner Support Officers.</p>		•			
4.	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>That the Department incorporate an understanding of the Standard Guidelines for Corrections in Australia into the recruit prison officer training and that the Training Academy and prisons incorporate this into refresher training for all prison officers.</p>			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2007
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation No.	Recommendations By Type of Recommendation/Duration Report No. 49	Assessment of the Department's Implementations				
		Poor	Less than acceptable	Acceptable	More than acceptable	Excellent
5.	Staffing issues That the Department provide the policies and guidelines required for the Superintendent of Casuarina to properly address the allegations of bullying at the prison, including the embedding of staff performance management systems and disciplinary procedures. The Superintendent must then address the allegations in a timely manner to ensure that Casuarina provides a safe and respectful working environment for all staff.			•		
6.	Correctional value for money That Casuarina develops a sustainability plan as a matter of urgency and that it engage prisoners and staff in a range of conservation and recycling activities.		•			
7.	Custody and security That Casuarina management ensure that prison policies and procedures emphasise and encourage interaction between staff and prisoners and that support is provided to staff to maximise their opportunities to do this, with the Department monitoring this through incorporating a measure into its standards and compliance framework.		•			
8.	Care and wellbeing That the Department should not adopt a position where double-bunking of prisoners becomes an accepted norm in the Western Australian prison system.			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2007
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation No.	Recommendations By Type of Recommendation/Duration Report No. 49	Assessment of the Department's Implementations				
		Poor	Less than acceptable	Acceptable	More than acceptable	Excellent
9.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity That the Department and Casuarina work together to put better systems in place for the release planning and release back into the community of displaced prisoners. In particular, they should be given more opportunity to spend time at the home prison before release.	•				
10.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity That Casuarina ensures equity of access to services to all prisoners who are entitled to them and to improve communication with prisoners to safeguard against perceptions of bias and inequity by any prisoner group.		•			
11.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity That Casuarina management ensure all displaced prisoners are provided information regarding their entitlement to free telephone calls regardless of their ethnicity or cultural background.			•		
12.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity That as a matter of priority Casuarina secures the services of an Aboriginal health worker and an Aboriginal mental health worker.	•				
13.	Health That Casuarina monitors and assesses its medical appointment system to guarantee the confidentiality of prisoner-patients and to improve the certainty and timeliness of prisoner-patient appointments.		•			

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

<i>Recommendation No.</i>	Recommendations By Type of Recommendation/Duration Report No. 49	<i>Assessment of the Department's Implementations</i>				
		<i>Poor</i>	<i>Less than acceptable</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>More than acceptable</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
14.	Health That the Department assess the mental health needs of prisoners within the system generally, and specifically at Casuarina, with a view to putting a business case forward to secure funding to provide appropriate needs-based mental health services to prisoners in Western Australia.		•			
15.	Care and wellbeing That the Department urgently assess the risk created by the inadequate number of Prison Counselling Service staff at Casuarina and provide the appropriate number of Prison Counselling Service staff to address this risk.		•			
16.	Rehabilitation That the Department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take immediate steps to restore the delivery of intensive programs at Casuarina and elsewhere. • Take immediate steps to ensure positive supervision and support for program staff at Casuarina. • Take immediate steps to ensure that barriers to expansion of the Think First program are removed and that the indigenous version is utilised. • Review its objectives in relation to offending behaviour programs, develop an operational strategy to meet these objectives, and bid for resources required to implement this strategy for the growing prisoner population across the state. 			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

<i>Recommendation No.</i>	Recommendations By Type of Recommendation/Duration Report No. 49	<i>Assessment of the Department's Implementations</i>				
		<i>Poor</i>	<i>Less than acceptable</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>More than acceptable</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
17.	Rehabilitation That the Department and Casuarina provide a structured day to all prisoners, including constructive activity, contemporary and relevant employment and training opportunities and the prisoner offending behaviour programs it has assessed prisoners as requiring for rehabilitation.		•			

Appendix 3

THE INSPECTION TEAM

Professor Neil Morgan	Inspector of Custodial Services
Natalie Gibson	Acting Deputy Inspector of Custodial Services
Bill Cullen	Director Strategic Operations
Lauren Netto	Acting Director Operations
John Acres	Principal Research and Strategy Officer
Janina Surma	Inspections and Research Officer
Elizabeth Re	Inspections and Research Officer
Joseph Wallam	Community Liaison Officer
Dr Harry Blagg	Expert Advisor, Research Consultant
Dr Penny Flett	Expert Advisor, Health
Cheryl Wiltshire	Expert Advisor, Department of Training and Workforce Development
Caroline Heffer	Expert Advisor, Office of Health Review
Jenny Langford	Expert Advisor, Office of Health Review

Appendix 4

KEY DATES

Formal notification of announced inspection	14 January 2010
Pre-inspection community consultation	9 March 2010
Start of on-site phase	18 April 2010
Completion of on-site phase	29 April 2010
Inspection exit debrief	29 April 2010
Draft Report sent to the Department of Corrective Services	16 July 2010
Draft report returned by the Department of Corrective Services	17 August 2010
Declaration of Prepared Report	24 August 2010

Appendix 5

ACRONYMS

Acronym	Meaning	Acronym	Meaning
AEW	Aboriginal Education Worker	MOS	Manager Offender Services
ARMS	At Risk Management System	MPU	Multi-Purpose Unit
AVS	Aboriginal Visitors Scheme	OICS	Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services
BA	Breathing Apparatus	OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
BBV	Blood Borne Virus	PADS	Performance and Assessment Development System
CCU	Crisis care Unit	PCS	Prison Counselling Service
CD	Compact Disc	PD	Policy Directive
CET	Commissioner's Executive Team	PRAG	Prisoner Risk Assessment Group
CPR	Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation	PSO	Prison Support Officer
DAP	Displaced Aboriginal Program	SAMS	Support and Monitoring System
DCS	Department of Corrective Services	SHU	Special Handling Unit
EcHO	Electronic Health Information System	SOTP	Sexual Offender Treatment Program
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent	SPU	Special Purpose Unit
HOLP	Hands On Learning Project	STD	Subscriber Trunk Dialling
IMP	Individual Management Plan	TAFE	Technical And Further Education
IT	Information Technology	TM	Transitional Manager
ITAS	Indigenous Tuition Assistance Scheme	TOMS	Total Offender Management Solutions
LAN	Local Area Network	VSO	Vocational and Support Officer
MAP	Management and Assessment Plan	WAPOU	Western Australian Prison Officers' Union



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR
OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

www.oics.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