Short presentation
CUSTODIAL TRANSPORT THEMATIC REVIEW

By Cliff Holdom

The Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services has this month begun inspection of Custodial Transport Services as part of a Thematic Review of Custodial Transport due for publication by November 2006.

Changes in scope to the recently renewed CS&CS Contract have induced significant changes in the arrangements for the transport of persons in custody since the Office’s first round Inspection of Adult Prisoner Transport Services in 2001. Juvenile metropolitan transport is excluded from the contract, as is transport for medical purposes and funerals, with responsibility for these areas returning to Juvenile Custodial Services and individual prisons respectively. There have also been significant developments in contract management, fleet replacement, demand management, coordination and understanding of issues (such as the inappropriate use of restraints).

Transport activities are by nature diffuse – not contained in a single facility or even a single system – and there appear to be significant inter-systemic issues affecting future custodial transport arrangements. As such the Office believes a thematic review is a more appropriate modality for inspection of custodial transport activities.

To date the following themes have been identified:

- Policies, assessment procedures, decision-making and coordination impacting on demand for custodial transport including for court appearances, funerals, medical escorts, section 94’s, home leave, inter-prison visits, inter-prison transfers;
- Contract management and monitoring of CS&CS services;
- Cost of custodial transport services;
- Quality and fitness of the existing fleet of vehicles, and fleet renewal;
- Recruitment, training, support and conditions for AIMS staff, especially in regional areas;
- Increased re-engagement in transport services by DoJ, including for juveniles, minimum security prisoners and high-security escorts;
- Issues relating to security, escapes and appropriate use, or non-use of restraints;
- Timeliness of transport services;
- Capacity of services to meet demands for transport services;
- Length of journeys, access to amenities and other comfort issues for persons-in-custody;
- Quality of care and communication with persons-in-custody;
• Management of special needs in transport, including the disabled, mentally unwell, those at-risk of self-harm; traditional Aboriginals, women, juveniles, those in need of protection;
• Impact of court policies and the use of video conferencing on demand for custodial transport;
• The impact of capital developments on custodial transport including at East Perth Lockup, Royal Perth Hospital, Central Law Courts and other regional justice centers;
• Transport home for persons released from custody;
• Arrangements for transport of juveniles in regional areas;
• Potential for closer integration of services with other agencies, especially with Police;
• The place of air transport for persons in custody in WA.

Exploration of these themes will be through various methodologies including: a literature review and visit to transport facilities in the Eastern States to identify best practice and relevant standards; Metropolitan and Regional field visits; desktop analysis of transport records, TOMS, incident reports etc; interviews with persons in custody engaged or previously engaged with transport services; and the involvement of expert consultants in specialist areas such as financial, medical, vehicle standards and security areas.

It is hoped that the Custodial Transport Thematic Review will develop a base-line costing methodology for custodial transport and identify opportunities for continuous improvement of existing services, or systemic changes to increase the efficiency or humanity of custodial transport services.
Research used in Inspections

By John Acres

The main concern of the Office of the Inspector is to ensure the human rights of prisoners and detainees - it is therefore primarily concerned with the treatment and conditions experienced by prisoners and detainees.

In order to assess and make findings on these matters it inspects custodial services and places of custody where prisoners and detainees are held.

Prior to an inspection, a considerable amount of logistical planning is necessary and during this process statistical information is collected and analysed relating to prisoner numbers, programs, medical/dental services, etc., in addition, a literature search may be undertaken for aspects of qualitative information relevant to a particular inspection. This may focus on a particular strength or perceived weakness of the service or custodial place.

At the inspection proper, considerable research and information gathering occurs.

If we take for example, the theme of prisoner safety this will be assessed from a number of sources, including:

Prior to an inspection:

1. The regular reports made by Independent Prison Visitors from their discussions with prisoners;
2. The quarterly visits made to the prison by the inspections officer who is designated as the Prison Liaison Officer for that particular prison and who contributes to a Monthly Report on all institutions and significant events;
3. The security and intelligence reports regularly compiled by the Prisons Division;
4. Surveying staff or prisoners;

During and inspection:

5. The provision by prison management of relevant evidence, if available;
6. Face to face interviews with staff and prisoners about how safe they feel;
7. The number of allegations of unfair, disrespectful or otherwise poor treatment (although specific complaints may be referred to the Ombudsman for investigation);
8. Assessing the adequacy of written policies regarding bullying etc., and the extent of their implementation
9. Observing the adequacy of staff supervision of prisoners during a range of activities; and
10. Comparing the percentage of protection prisoners over time and with similar prison populations.

Thus, from this single example it evident that inspections involve on-site observation, information collection, investigation, surveys, interviews (both structured and unstructured), analysis, findings and conclusions.

I don’t think that it is important whether these activities are collectively called inspections, assessments, evaluations or research. The important issue is that there be sufficient evidence to make accurate findings and draw conclusions.

Inspections, in the sense in which we may think of a commanding officer inspecting the tidiness and cleanliness of a barracks is but a small part of most inspections which triangulate information from a number of sources.

The Inspectorate often comes at a ‘problem’ from a different direction from the Department of Justice. The Inspectorate is interested in outcomes - what is the outcome for prisoners (eg is the prison grievance system delivering the outcome we are expecting?); for staff (eg staff ARE going to go into a smoke filled room to rescue a prisoner, so are they suitable equipped and trained?); for the community (eg does the Department have sufficiently robust measure of the dangerousness of prisoners and their risk of escape to give the community near an open prison confidence in their safety?). So when we see that prisoners are not using the grievance system, staff are extracting prisoners from cell fires using escape hoods and the community has concerns about their safety we ask “why is this the case”? We collect examples from other jurisdictions or prisons where this is not the case and explore the differences, we ask staff, prisoners and the community for their views, we fossick around in documentation and records to see if we can back up our suspicions and significantly we go to the site and LOOK.

This is our ‘triangulation’ procedure for establishing why the outcome we looked for wasn’t found. From there we go to the Department and point out the policy or procedure or practice (or combinations there of) that we believe is not delivering the required outcome and challenge them to do better. Sometimes, particularly where it is glaringly evident, we will point the Department in the direction we believe they should go, but generally we will step back from that and let the Department do its business (which is delivering on the outcome through fixing the “why”).

This in turn requires from the Department standards, compliance/performance measurement and at times research into why what it put in place didn’t deliver the outcome they were looking for. So our Office has a place as a change agent for the Department in improving the quality, quantity and focus of the Department’s
research, through ensuring our challenge to them is strongly grounded in the realities of custody and well backed up through our research.
Research for prison superintendents and some system-wide research questions suggested by the *Standard Guidelines for Corrections in Australia 2004*

By Bill Cullen

Given the small amount of time available to me (15 minutes) I will attempt to reduce complex matters down to a digestible size. In doing this there is the danger of becoming superficial. I shall try to avoid such superficiality but clearly what I have to say will be indicative rather than definitive.

I should also point out that I will be using the notion of research in its broadest possible sense of information and data collection and analysis as undertaken both by specialist researchers and also by anyone who uses an evidence base for making decisions, policy or plans.

I will focus upon the role of:

1. Research as a tool for superintendents; and
2. broader research questions suggested by the *Standard Guidelines for Corrections in Australia 2004*

1. Research as a tool for superintendents in the management of individual prisons

When faced with the complex task of running a prison, prison superintendents need, at minimum, a basic toolkit of research information that is updated on a weekly basis, in order ensure that they are delivering the service outcomes required of them.

The fundamental part of the toolkit is an updated population analysis. The exact categories will vary according to the type of the institution but taking as an example an all male minimum-security prison such as Karnet, the following are likely to be most useful sub-populations that it will be necessary to know:

- Aboriginal prisoners by Noongar, Wongi, (looking for in or out of country) etc.;
- Sex offenders (critical mass/antagonistic groups etc)
- Prisoners who have been on protection elsewhere in the prison system;
- Prisoners requiring education classes;
- Prisoners requiring light-duty work assignments;
- Prisoners with specialist skills (cooking, maintenance, etc.);
- Prisoners who are Anglican, Catholic, Muslim, etc.;
- Prisoners with a self-harm alert;
- Prisoners with a drug conviction;
- Etc.

This information needs to be recorded in a table and graphed so that the picture of population changes emerges each month and over 12 months. This will establish benchmarks for routine operations.

### Prison Population Profile

**week commencing 21 November 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noongars</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wongis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Aboriginal</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected Bully/Predators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Harmers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offenders</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenders</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other protection</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other significant groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### November weekly population analysis

![Graph showing population analysis for different categories over weeks 31/10/2005 to 21/11/2005]
Importantly, this information should be used to drive the deployment of multidisciplinary staff teams, the utilisation of differentiated accommodation and the provision of services.

It also becomes important for ensuring that the structured day provided by the prison meets the needs and requirements of the current prison population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structured Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abattoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of staff deployment, the graph for November indicates an increasing number of drug offenders in the prison which may have implications for more drug programs, a change to urine analysis strategies (targeted and random) and perhaps an increase in fence line patrols. In terms of ensuring an appropriate and equitable allocation of accommodation, the decreased population of sex offenders may mean that the previous allocation of accommodation is no longer appropriate. (targeted intelligence strategies may be indicated)
When the Inspectorate visits a prison, this is the sort of active analysis it is looking for, as a sign that management is actively monitoring the prison population demands and is able to make rational decisions about:

- sub-populations;
- facility capacity;
- the conditions (regimes) intended;
- varying services and programs; and/or
- make budgetary requests to enable the prison to meet the needs of a changing prisoner profile.

Often trend information can be derived from the operation of the ‘structured day’. This should include some analysis about planned services versus delivered services and also around the achievement of certain outcomes such as learning, skill, employment, offender behaviour programs, and self-development through recreation/chaplaincy, etc.

Finally, significant operational risks should be monitored and charted to guide decision-making and operational responses. This could include the following:

- All acts of violence (prisoner on prisoner or between staff and prisoners and all occasions where restraints are used);
- Substance abuse (including alcohol, petrol or glue sniffing, etc.);
- Self-harm and suicide;
- Security breaches (simple/complex, contraband, etc.)
USING THE **STANDARD GUIDELINES FOR CORRECTIONS IN AUSTRALIA 2004** PRISON CORNERSTONE/OBJECTIVES TO GUIDE THE FOCUS AND SUGGEST RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR PRISONS

1. **Research Questions to maximise the effectiveness of CUSTODY**
   - What is the most effective measure dangerousness?
   - Given that many escapes are impulsive acts to resolve personal issues, what welfare services could be provided to prisoners to reduce impulsive escapes?

2. **Research Questions to maximise CARE AND WELLBEING**
   - How can we measure the quality of prison life? (replicating the Alison Liebling study)

3. **Research Questions to maximise REHABILITATION**
   - What employment opportunities exist in each region (a case for regional employment audits)?
   - Longitudinal recidivism studies by Aboriginality and other significant sub groups of prisoners;
   - Longitudinal study of recidivism among Re-Entry and Transitional Accommodation Program participants and a control group;
   - What works with whom?

4. **Research to maximize REPARATION**
   - What community work does the community most value?
   - What community work do prisoners find the most satisfying?