



Report No.

47

October 2007

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

REPORT INTO THE ANNOUNCED INSPECTION
OF KARNET PRISON FARM



Report into the Announced Inspection
of Karnet Prison Farm

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

www.custodialinspector.wa.gov.au

October 2007

ISSN 1445-3134



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

Contents

THE INSPECTOR'S OVERVIEW

THE PROPOSAL TO CLOSE KARNET PRISON FARM AMOUNTS TO CORRECTIONAL AND FINANCIAL VANDALISM.....	ii
---	----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: THE INSPECTION STORY	1
Karnet Prison Farm	1
Inspection Planning.....	1
Surveys	2
Consultation with Community Agencies	2
Strategic Briefings by the Department.....	3
Rethinking the Inspection.....	4
A Final Prelude: the Bikie Drug Ring Report	4
The Inspection.....	4
Consultation with Community Representatives.....	5
Inspection Debrief.....	5

CHAPTER 2

OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE: A PRISON THAT WORKS.....	7
Resources and Systems.....	7
Custody	13
Care and Wellbeing	18
Reparation, Rehabilitation and Re-entry.....	27
Summary	35

CHAPTER 3

STRATEGIC CONTEXT: SECURING THE FUTURE	38
A question of Sustainability	38
Land Use Contestability	39
Conclusion.....	40

APPENDIX 1

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS	42
---	----

APPENDIX 2

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2005 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	49
--	----

APPENDIX 3

THE INSPECTION TEAM.....	53
--------------------------	----

APPENDIX 4

KEY DATES	54
-----------------	----

The Inspector's Overview

THE PROPOSAL TO CLOSE KARNET PRISON FARM AMOUNTS TO CORRECTIONAL AND FINANCIAL VANDALISM

Karnet is a very good prison. This was so at the time of our first inspection in 2001, and although by the time of the 2004 inspection it had slipped back a little, even so it was satisfactory. By 2007 it had pulled itself back again and had exceeded the 2001 standard. This was exemplified in many ways. More prisoners proportionately do meaningful work and training than in any other prison in the State. Prisoners who have to live in a protected enclave in other prisons have for many years been carefully and successfully integrated with the mainstream population. Community acceptance is deep and widespread; it goes beyond simply being used to having the prison there to the point of its being positively welcomed. Visiting rates are high and re-entry programs good. The productivity of the farming activities meets or exceeds the District average.

In such an environment staff attitudes are positive, and there is a real element of respect by prisoners. This fact was epitomised by an incident that occurred on 9th February 2007, a few days before our inspection commenced. An officer and three prisoners were working with a herd of cattle when an enraged bull charged and tossed the officer, badly injuring him. The three prisoners acted bravely and with considerable coolness to save him from further attack – one distracting the bull, the second rendering first aid, and the third using the officer's radio to call for help. This sort of thing simply does not happen in a prison that has lost its way.

So it is a continuing source of dismay that the Department seems so ambivalent about the prison's future and indeed, in some quarters, determined to close it down. The Strategic Asset Plan for 2007/17 includes an item of more than \$120 million for a "new minimum security prison (replace Karnet)". The Plan suggests that this would provide a nett gain of 80 minimum security beds. This seems a remarkably expensive way of achieving that objective, working out at \$1.5 million per extra minimum security bed – certainly the most expensive per bed cost in any correctional system anywhere in the world. Apart from that, a highly efficient working farm would be lost – a farm that is the centrepiece of the prison food chain in Western Australia. On the 2001 inspection the Agriculture Department, as our expert advisor, estimated that the farm contributes in truly costed terms more than \$4 million per annum to the expense of running the WA prison system. Presumably, by now allowing for cost-of-living increased in food produce, the value is now nearer to \$6 million per annum.

An alternative approach would be to invest in Karnet rather than to destroy it. Minimum security beds can be built to robust domestic accommodation standard, which is much cheaper than the cost of secure beds. Two 60 bed units could readily and relatively inexpensively be added to Karnet. One of those units would replace an existing unit that has passed its use-by date; the other would provide additional accommodation at a time when the prison system is crowded almost to breaking point. In addition, some necessary additions to the Education and Programs areas could be made. The likelihood is that all of these things could be done for \$10 million or so – much better value than the Department's own preference.

These matters all seem so self-evident that it is almost incomprehensible that they have not gone ahead or at least reached the planning stage. As discussed in Chapter 3 of this Report, however, the unacknowledged underlying premise seems to be that a major mining company might like to take over the site or, at the very least, take over other sites within a noise and pollution circumference of Karnet. There are veiled suggestions from some official sources that

THE PROPOSAL TO CLOSE KARNET PRISON FARM AMOUNTS TO
CORRECTIONAL AND FINANCIAL VANDALISM

the company may offer a land swap for Karnet. If either of these matters is correct, there is no transparency about them; they are not part of the public record. Moreover, there is no sensible basis upon which such a valuable State asset should in effect be given away.

The Department's response to Recommendation 21 – that Karnet should be developed and improved rather than closed down – is disingenuous. “Environmental considerations” are cited as a basis for closing it down – yet we refer to an environmental report that specifically confirms that its viability for a population of up to 300 could permanently be achieved for an outlay of less than \$2 million on water, sewage and electricity infrastructure. Whilst there seem to be some technical arguments about the details of the environmental report, it would not seem that any of the supposed problems are insuperable.

The Department also claims that there is no call for more minimum-security beds. This also is not correct. Several metropolitan prisons accommodate prisoners who are rated minimum-security. Specifically, as of today there are 47 such prisoners at Hakea, 25 at Casuarina and 55 at Acacia – a total of 127. Of these, 46 have already been assessed as ready to move when a space becomes available. In that context, our proposal for an increase of 60 in Karnet's capacity seems about right. Moreover, this Office's current project concerned with the Classification and Assessment of prisoners suggests that an appropriately calibrated instrument would increase somewhat the number of prisoners eligible for minimum-security.

In summary, there are no credible arguments for not developing Karnet. The Government has spent about \$10 million on fencing the prison. Paradoxically, that increases the justification for making further investments in the site. Good prisons that carry out their tasks effectively are few and far between. It would be correctional and financial vandalism to throw away such an asset.

Richard Harding
Inspector of Custodial Services
22nd August 2007.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION: THE INSPECTION STORY

KARNET PRISON FARM

- 1.1 Karnet Prison Farm (Karnet) is located approximately 80 km south of Perth on the edge of the Keysbrook State Forest and is one of only two male minimum-security releasing prisons for the metropolitan region. At the time of the inspection, undertaken on 12–16 February 2007, Karnet accommodated a full capacity of 174 prisoners, 37 per cent of whom were sex offenders.
- 1.2 Karnet was established in 1963 on the site of a former alcohol rehabilitation centre and many of the original buildings are still being used. Much of the 405 hectare site is devoted to farming activities such as grazing, market gardening, orchards, egg production, aquaculture, abattoir and dairy. At the time of the inspection, Karnet supplied the bulk of the prison system's requirement of dressed meat, processed meat, dairy products and eggs.
- 1.3 Functionally little had changed from the previous inspection;¹ however, the prison's appearance was radically altered by the new perimeter fence which encompasses the main buildings. The fence was built in response to two high profile escapes from Karnet in 2005.² While the fence will most likely reduce impulsive escapes, this benefit must be weighed against the reduction to the real level of freedom and trust afforded to prisoners at Karnet.

INSPECTION PLANNING

- 1.4 Regular liaison visits to Karnet have been conducted since the previous inspection to monitor progress in implementation of past inspection recommendations and maintain awareness of the prison's performance. In addition, a pre-inspection 'scoping visit' was undertaken on 9 November 2006 to assess selected key areas of the prison and determine the scope of the inspection.
- 1.5 The reports of these visits confirmed that substantial progress had been made on recommendations from the previous inspection, and that Karnet was generally performing consistently well. Karnet's capacity for self-evaluation was strong enough to warrant a 'light touch' methodology for this inspection.³ Consequently, a small inspection team was selected to be led by the Deputy Inspector.
- 1.6 Themes and areas of particular interest for the inspection were proposed as follows:
 - the impact of the fence on prison and farm operations;
 - the management of drugs;
 - the changing prisoner mix and the management of bullying;
 - infrastructure maintenance;
 - the structured prison day; and
 - the role of Karnet in prison food production.

1 It should also be noted that there was a small increase in capacity from 160 to 174, as a result of the installation of a transportable wing in Unit 2 in 2005.

2 Further discussion of this decision can be found in Mahoney D, *Inquiry into the Management of Offenders in Custody and in the Community* (November 2005) ch 3 ('the Mahoney Inquiry') and Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services (OICS), *Directed Review of the Management of Offenders in Custody*, Report No. 30 (November 2005) 19.

3 For further details on 'light touch inspections' see OICS, *2005–2006 Annual Report* (2006) 6.

- 1.7 The inspection was formally announced on 23 November 2006. The Department of Corrective Services ('the Department') was invited to make a written submission on all aspects of the operation of Karnet, including its place within the strategic objectives of the Department and its strengths and weaknesses. Comments were also invited on the proposed inspection themes. A wide range of related documents and items of information were also requested and provided for desk top analysis prior to the inspection.
- 1.8 An inspection plan was developed which set out the inspection methodology and day-to-day practical arrangements, including responsibilities of each member of the inspection team and a timetable for the many diverse and simultaneous inspection activities. Each inspections officer was responsible for analysing information provided by the Department for their allotted inspection tasks.

SURVEYS

- 1.9 Prisoner surveys were undertaken on 21 November 2006, with staff surveys distributed on the same day. The Inspectorate's usual surveys were upgraded and enhanced by incorporating significant aspects of the University of Cambridge's *Measuring Quality of Prison Life Survey* (MQPL), which has proved an accurate tool for measuring the climate of different prisons in the United Kingdom and identifying subtle differences in the quality of life for prisoners.⁴
- 1.10 Seventy-four prisoners took part in the survey, which was administered in groups. The survey elicited a high rate of responses in all but a few of the questions. The overall quality of life score by prisoners was measured at 8.03 out of a possible 10 – clearly a very positive assessment. Prisoners generally indicated that they were treated with dignity and humanity. However, some problems were identified, such as lack of staff support during a prisoner's first days at the prison; failure to prevent drug-use or to help prisoners with drug problems; insufficient reasons for decisions affecting prisoners; and a sense of not being valued, trusted or cared about by staff.
- 1.11 Staff were given a week to complete their survey, but because only 22 staff chose to participate (including just six custodial staff), the results of this survey were less probative. Those that did respond rated the quality of their working life at Karnet quite highly (7.18 out of 10). Staff were proud of their good relationships with prisoners and what they had achieved in terms of helping prisoners. However, they also drew attention to a lack of training and career development opportunities, a lack of recognition and appreciation given for their work on a day-to-day basis and a fairly high level of accumulated stress.

CONSULTATION WITH COMMUNITY AGENCIES

- 1.12 The Office invited all external agencies known to have contact with the prison to provide submissions or attend a consultation about the prison. Seven agencies were represented at the consultation meeting on 24 January 2007 and two other agencies provided submissions.

4 The Department of Corrective Services has subsequently incorporated the MQPL survey into its annual review of the privately managed Acacia Prison.

- 1.13 The support and re-entry services represented at the meeting reported that they were properly accommodated and supported by prison management. However, the group expressed unanimous disappointment about the installation of the fence, anticipating that the prison's minimum-security status would be lost and that it would negatively affect the public's perception of Karnet prisoners. They considered that the trust and self-discipline fostered in the previously open prison would also be threatened, thereby jeopardising the rehabilitation of prisoners.
- 1.14 The group also contended that the fence affected the friendly atmosphere of visits. The lack of shade for waiting visitors and for children using play equipment were noted and suggestions were made about establishing a visits centre outside the perimeter fence.

STRATEGIC BRIEFINGS BY THE DEPARTMENT

- 1.15 Another important event in the pre-inspection phase was a strategic briefing by senior head office staff of the Department. The performance of any prison is affected by the strategic direction, policies and resources provided by the Department, but in the case of Karnet areas such as offender services, health services and education services were under the direct management of head office, with only limited control by prison management.
- 1.16 The Director, Women's and Rural Prisons led the briefing, which was held on 30 January 2007. The briefing included presentations from the managers responsible for offender services, health services, education services and asset maintenance. Much of the information provided at this briefing has informed the discussion throughout this report of many of the operational aspects of Karnet. Importantly, the briefing made the crucial point that while the Karnet Prison Farm operational budget for 2005–2006 was fully funded in line with its budgetary submission, none of the service areas controlled by head office were fully funded, and each faced significant cutbacks and reductions in services.
- 1.17 A supplementary briefing was provided by the Department on 8 February 2007 concerning the future of Karnet in the Western Australian prison system. The Inspectorate was informed at that meeting that Karnet's current site had been identified as having significant mining potential by Alcoa and the Department of Industry and Resources.⁵
- 1.18 The Inspectorate was further informed that a recent report concerning the adequacy of utilities for Karnet had found that the prison was environmentally and socially unsustainable and that there was no capacity to increase prisoner numbers.⁶ In addition, the suitability of the work available to prisoners, given the current labour market, was doubted. Consequently, the Department was actively shortlisting potential sites for a new metropolitan prison precinct, with the aim of initially building a new metropolitan minimum-security prison 'to replace Karnet'.⁷

5 Department of Corrective Services (DCS), *Strategic Asset Plan 2007–2027* (January 2007).

6 Department of Housing and Works, *Karnet Prison Farm – Condition and Compliance Audit of Site Services* (February 2007).

7 DCS, *Capital Investment Plan 2007/08 to 2016/17* (25 October 2006).

RETHINKING THE INSPECTION

- 1.19 The news that the future of Karnet was by no means assured forced a reconsideration of the inspection focus. In particular, the Inspector undertook an analysis of the strategic future of the prison.
- 1.20 In addition, the Inspectorate was close to completing its Code of Inspection Standards. It was therefore decided that two further Inspectorate staff would join the inspection team, not as extra inspectors, but to consider how best to incorporate these standards into inspection practice. Nevertheless, it was decided to proceed with the inspection using a light touch methodology.

A FINAL PRELUDE: THE BIKIE DRUG RING REPORT

- 1.21 In the week prior to the inspection, a network of people bringing drugs into Karnet was uncovered. A mobile phone had been found in the possession of a prisoner and raids on homes of associates had yielded a sum of cash and led to 12 arrests. The prisoner who was alleged to be the ring-leader was immediately transferred to a higher-security prison.⁸
- 1.22 The arrests were the culmination of a long-running investigation involving both the prison and the police. However, the manner of its conclusion and the implied criticism of the prison in the way the incident was publicised was a cause of great concern for the prison's administration in the week prior to the inspection.
- 1.23 As noted in the list of inspection themes above, the management of drugs in the prison had already been identified as a key focus for the inspection of Karnet, and the arrests confirmed this. For this reason the Inspectorate had engaged expert advisors from the Drug and Alcohol Office and the Forensic Mental Health Service to accompany the inspection team.

THE INSPECTION

- 1.24 It was therefore a somewhat larger than usual inspection team that commenced the light touch inspection of Karnet Prison Farm on 12 February 2007. In common with most inspections, presentations by the superintendent and other members of the management team occupied the first morning. In line with the light touch methodology, these were reflective, and covered both strengths and weaknesses.
- 1.25 Another feature of the light touch methodology was the use of panel discussions featuring various prison managers and other key people involved in aspects of prison's operations. There were panels relating to resources and systems; security and safety; and rehabilitation. In addition, meetings were organised to consult groups of custodial staff, administrative staff and vocational support staff, and groups of peer support prisoners, Aboriginal prisoners and prisoners due to be released.
- 1.26 Inspection team-members visited each accommodation unit, service facility and workshop in the prison and spoke to large numbers of staff and prisoners *in situ*. Observations were

8 Riley S, 'Bikie was brains behind prison drug ring', *The West Australian Online* (6 February 2007).

made of personal interaction among and between staff and prisoners, and inspections were made of the condition of buildings, fittings, equipment and machinery. Records were examined and other information was obtained and analysed.

CONSULTATION WITH COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

- 1.27 The Inspector met with the local member of Parliament and the shire president to discuss Karnet. Five councillors, the chief executive officer and three other staff from the shire also toured the prison with the Inspector on 6 March 2007, some three weeks after the inspection.
- 1.28 It was clear that despite a degree of anxiety about escapes from the prison, there was strong support in the community for the prison. Karnet was viewed as making a valuable contribution to the community through the Section 94 outside work program and as a key local employer. There was also considerable concern expressed regarding the possible encroachment of bauxite mining in the area and the presence of the prison was seen as an important buffer against this happening.

INSPECTION DEBRIEF

- 1.29 Immediately following the inspection, a verbal debrief of the inspection findings was given to management, staff and head office representatives. This gave the prison an early indication of the tenor of the inspection report and provided an opportunity to address urgent or simple issues before the publication of this report.
- 1.30 The exit debrief on the morning of 16 February 2006 was marked by presentations from both the Deputy Inspector and the Inspector of Custodial Services. The Deputy Inspector commenced the debrief by highlighting the finding that Karnet is a ‘good and functioning prison farm’.⁹ His presentation focussed on operational aspects of the prison. In this respect he said:

As this is the third cycle of inspection at Karnet the focus is not so much about discovering what is already known, but rather on more strategic considerations of success-enabling factors that may be relevant at the prison itself, or at other prisons, and also of impediments to growth and development.¹⁰

- 1.31 The Inspector’s presentation on the other hand, focussed on the Department’s doubtful assessment of Karnet’s future, saying ‘[t]his threat is in a sense more sinister in that it is seldom articulated openly but mostly just hinted at’.¹¹ He noted that Karnet is:

[A]n immensely valuable State asset – not only a prison that is doing good correctional, rehabilitative, reparation and re-entry work but also one that is contributing a great deal to keep food costs down across the whole prison system.¹²

9 OICS, *Karnet Prison Farm Inspection – 12th February – 16th February 2007: Exit Debrief* (February 2007) 2.

10 Ibid.

11 Ibid, 12.

12 Ibid, 13.

- 1.32 The Inspector addressed the question of the prison’s sustainability (see final chapter of this report) and articulated his position as follows:

That brings us back to the key question – is there any sensible basis for planning the closure of Karnet? Could a business case be made for doing so? Clearly the answer is that there is no sensible basis for closure and a business case would fall over at the first proper scrutiny. On the contrary, Karnet should be enhanced and expanded, with prisoner services extended to match. That is where the business case lies.¹³

- 1.33 The discussion that follows provides information and analysis to support the two key points in the inspection debrief: that operationally Karnet is a well-functioning prison and that it is worthy of an unambiguous commitment to its future by government.

13 Ibid, 15–16.

Chapter 2

OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE: A PRISON THAT WORKS

RESOURCES AND SYSTEMS

Business Management

- 2.1 In his briefing to the inspection team, the superintendent of Karnet drew attention to a number of changes and improvements since the last inspection. He also highlighted a range of developments and issues that needed to be addressed and some ideas for the immediate future.¹⁴ These were further elaborated in subsequent briefings by other managers and featured in the annual business plan and other material made available by the prison and head office.¹⁵
- 2.2 This was as it should be. The Inspectorate's previous recommendations asked nothing more of management than good business practice: to report on outcomes for the previous cycle, appraise the current situation, identify issues for attention and plan for the next cycle and beyond. It was clear that local management at Karnet was reflective and forward looking, at least in the short to medium term.¹⁶
- 2.3 It was also clear from the staff survey and from our meetings with various groups of staff that staff at Karnet had confidence in line managers and senior management at the prison. Senior managers rated especially highly for their approachability by other staff.¹⁷ At the conclusion of the inspection, the Inspector was able to say that the:

The Inspectorate regards the local management team as highly experienced, committed to the prison and to improving performance; they are a stabilising influence on the prison at a time of rapid change.¹⁸

- 2.4 This view is somewhat different to that implied in the Inspector's following comment about the performance of the prison following its last inspection in 2004:

Three years later, the prison seemed to have lost momentum. Some things had got better, some worse. Overall it was performing at the same level.¹⁹

Financial Management

- 2.5 The inspection team found that financial management at Karnet was complex and included budget allocations for some statewide services such as livestock and milk production. Conversely, the head office costs attributable to Karnet for offender services such as education, programs and corporate user charges were not controlled or managed by the prison.
- 2.6 The report of the 2004 inspection noted that inadequate funding had been provided for Karnet, but this situation had improved with the operational budget for 2006–2007 fully

14 DCS, *Karnet Prison Farm OICS Briefing*, Karnet (February 2007). Again the detail from this material is covered in the relevant areas of this report.

15 DCS, *Karnet Prison 2006–2007 Annual Business Plan* (11 October, 2006).

16 Unfortunately, the fact that the superintendent could note in his overview: 'commence negotiations regarding the long term viability of Karnet', suggests that local management has not hitherto had any involvement in discussions or planning for the long-term future of the facility. See final chapter below.

17 OICS, *Karnet Prison Staff Survey*, (November 2006).

18 OICS, *Karnet Prison Farm Inspection – 12th February – 16th February 2007: Exit Debrief* (February 2007) 6.

19 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 26 (March 2005) iii.

funded in accord with the prison's submission. The budget allocation for the current year was \$9.633 million, some \$1.223 million above that for the previous year.

- 2.7 The budget assumed a reduced daily average population of 158, despite the prison having capacity for 174 and census data for January to October 2006 showing an actual average population of 167.6.²⁰ And while the budget anticipated an expansion of staff numbers to 78 by the end of the financial year (up from 72), in reality a further 11 positions would have to be funded to staff the new gatehouse operations. Thus, even this expanded budget was likely to be overrun.
- 2.8 Costs appeared to be escalating dramatically at the prison. The budgeted expenditure for 2006–2007 represented a 52 per cent increase on the actual operational costs for Karnet in 2002–2003. In 2005–2006 the headline cost per prisoner per day for Karnet was \$265.43 or \$96,881.95 per annum. However, this cost comprised not only prison operations at \$9.254 million and services to the prison controlled directly through head office (such as health, education, other offender services, and maintenance) at \$1.738 million, but also administrative costs from head office apportioned against Karnet at \$4.791 million, for a total of \$15.783 million.²¹
- 2.9 It was recommended in the previous inspection report, that the Department should devolve responsibility to the local administration via a service level agreement.²² This recommendation was reinforced in respect to the whole prison system in the Directed Review of Offenders in Custody and was also reflected in the recommendations of the Mahoney Inquiry.²³ Consequently, in early 2007 the Department commenced a project to develop the first service level agreement for a public prison.²⁴

Human Resources

- 2.10 The prison system has had a number of staffing reviews, respectively known as the Johnson, Mahoney and Mitchell reviews. As a result of these reviews 13 extra staff positions have been approved for Karnet.²⁵ A further 11 staff positions have been approved in consequence of installation of the security fence and gatehouse. While there have been comprehensive reviews across the prison system of operational and administrative staff, there have been no equivalent reviews of staffing levels in other key areas such as health, education and offender services. In fact, offender services management has had to rationalise staff in 2006–2007.

20 End of month census data from January to October 2006, as obtained from the Total Offender Management Solutions (TOMS) database.

21 If the head office costs were excluded, then the cost per prisoner per day would be \$162.91 or \$59,462.15 per annum. It should be noted that industrial expenses are particularly high at Karnet because of farm operations and accounted for about \$36 per prisoner per day, or \$13,160.56 per annum.

22 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 26 (March 2005) recommendations 3 & 8. See also Appendix 1 of that report.

23 Mahoney D, *Inquiry into the Management of Offenders in Custody and in the Community* (November 2005) recommendations 71 & 72; OICS, *Directed Review of the Management of Offenders in Custody*, Report No. 30 (November 2005) recommendation 96.

24 At the time of writing a service level agreement had been implemented at Casuarina Prison.

25 The outcome of the Mitchell review, which focussed on administrative staff, was unknown for Karnet at the time of writing. In public sector parlance, the term FTE meaning 'full-time equivalent' is used instead of 'position' as positions may be shared by two or more workers.

Recommendation 1

That the Department of Corrective Services undertake a system-wide review of staffing levels for health, education and other offender services, especially in light of the escalating prisoner population.

- 2.11 The approved new staffing will open up a range of new opportunities at Karnet. A second unit manager for the prison should normalise unit operations; case management, assessments and re-entry planning will be boosted by appointment of a case management coordinator; a staff training officer is required (discussed further below); and three new vocational support officers will increase employment and training opportunities for prisoners.
- 2.12 The most urgent requirement for extra staff at the time of the inspection was for the soon-to-be-implemented gatehouse roster. Karnet had traditionally been unable to accept probationary officers because of insufficient staff to support and train them, so it was dependent on transfers of experienced officers. While 58 officers on the transfer list had expressed interest in Karnet, few had accepted a position there. No doubt Karnet's location was a factor in such decisions, but staff also suggested that a crucial disincentive was the peculiar roster system at Karnet.²⁶
- 2.13 The process of the Department working through the transfer list was very slow. It was clear that some of the gatehouse roster would initially have to be covered by existing staff, resulting in high levels of overtime. An examination of staff leave and overtime records showed that overtime levels had already been high for many months and sick leave also appeared elevated. In some cases individual officers had high levels both of overtime and of sick leave. It would appear that the transfer list process has been an inadequate strategy to significantly increase staff levels at the prison.

Staff Training

- 2.14 Both staff and management confirmed that staff training – delivered on a weekly basis in most other prisons – had been virtually non-existent at Karnet. No one had been designated as a trainer for the prison, no training needs analysis had been conducted, no training strategy was in place and there was no ongoing delivery of training. Essential first aid training in areas such as cardio-pulmonary resuscitation had not been provided in over six years (although oxy-viva training had been provided within the past two years). Use of force training had also not been available for some years. The recent implementation of case management had not been supported by staff training, but merely by instructions circulated by email.
- 2.15 Only a minority of vocational support officers (VSOs) at Karnet had undertaken the three-week core training package in essential skills and knowledge in security and safety, first made available to VSOs in 2006. However, a number of these officers had gained training as Certificate IV Workplace Trainers and Assessors which qualified them to deliver technical training and certify the achievement of competencies by trainees.

26 The roster included split weekends (one day worked) and consecutive afternoon shifts, finishing late evening. A new and more favourable roster was due to be implemented.

- 2.16 A few staff at Karnet had been trained to facilitate the Cognitive Skills Program for prisoners and a clerical officer had undertaken training related to her clerical work. Staff joining the new gate roster received a three-week training program to operate the gatehouse and perimeter systems. In the Inspectorate's opinion this is not sufficient: all staff should be given training in prisoner management and security in the context of the new perimeter fence and gate.
- 2.17 The recent creation of a second unit manager position had made unit management processes more manageable; nonetheless, unit management was another area in which adequate training had not been provided. Staff also highlighted the need for training in areas such as use of breathing apparatus, bushfire fighting, conducting funeral escorts, working with vulnerable and suicidal prisoners, and sentence planning (including for Section 94 assessments and release planning).
- 2.18 During the inspection we were told that a training officer position had been funded and would be filled in the near future, although this had not been accomplished at the time of writing. VSOs are essential to the operation of the prison and a way should be found to ensure they all complete core training.

Recommendation 2

That the position of Training Officer be filled as soon as practicable and that a comprehensive training-needs analysis be conducted in consultation with staff, management, the Corrective Services Academy and other stakeholders, and a staff training strategy be developed and implemented as a high priority.

Farm Management and Industries

- 2.19 The business manager had responsibility for industries and the farm. He had traditionally been assisted by a farm manager, but this position had recently been recast as Manager, Primary Production. This was a sensible reform which made a single position responsible for the supply and management of all livestock in the Department's farm operations, at Wooroloo, Pardelup and Karnet.²⁷
- 2.20 An inspection of livestock operations was not undertaken; however, local management appeared to have systems in place for financial planning and measuring production performance. There was also evidence of considerable improvements, such as:
- an increased milking facility to 12 a side swing-over;
 - a consolidated cool-room in dairy to allow pallet loading;
 - a newly commissioned separator to supply fat-reduced milk to prisons;
 - redeveloped poultry sheds from cages to barn-style in compliance with new legislation;
 - 100 hectares reseeded with new pasture varieties to increase livestock fodder;
 - re-fenced main laneways to back of farm;
 - the first crop of plums generated and plans for an expanded orchard;

²⁷ At the time of the inspection, only cattle came under the purview of this position, but it was hoped that sheep would also be taken on. Control over feed production at other centres is a related area that should be centralised.

- a new cool room for storage of market garden/orchard produce;
- the introduction of a cryvac packaging system for meat in the abattoir; and
- a newly installed dicing machine in the abattoir.

2.21 It was also encouraging to see that in accordance with a recommendation from the previous inspection, the *Primary Industries Farms Coordination Plan 2005–2006* and *Karnet Prison Farm Plan 2006* had been developed.²⁸ Unfortunately, neither plan included financial information or information about farm assets and maintenance and neither had been updated. Nevertheless, the state-level primary industries plan did project ahead some seven years on production against expected prisoner population and both represented an important step forward.

Recommendation 3

That Karnet Prison Farm be responsible for coordinating the prison system's food production. In addition, a consolidated and comprehensive farm plan including detail for each prison farm should be updated annually.

Asset Management

- 2.22 A number of the prison's assets had been developed or upgraded since the previous inspection including a small increase in prisoner accommodation; the establishment of a gym hall; and the installation of the security fence. The latter forced the funding of a number of remedial works, including a replacement tennis court and relocated children's play ground, to be deferred. The largest single item in the Infrastructure and Upgrade Program for 2006–2007 was for a personal duress alarm system (part of a system-wide roll out of duress alarms following a hostage incident at Bunbury Prison in 2005).
- 2.23 The superintendent outlined a number of asset-related projects that local management wished to implement in 2007 including:
- conversion of Unit 2 bottom landing to semi-self-care status;
 - development of a toilet area for visitors;
 - completion of the recreation precinct plan, including rectangular sports field, tennis courts, basketball court, cricket nets and bowling green;
 - relocation of industrial staff as a result of the security fence;
 - redevelopment of the abattoir facility and implementation of waste-water treatment; and
 - prisoner accommodation upgrades and maintenance.
- 2.24 Most of these projects were evident in the *Karnet Prison Farm Business Plan 2006–2007*, which also identified a need for additional classroom facilities. Some of these projects were necessary to address problems in notifications from past environmental health inspections, particularly those concerning the discharge of abattoir waste-water into the water table and unhygienic flooring in part of the abattoir and in the kitchen. The following table summarises the progress of projects at the time of the inspection.

28 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 26 (March 2005) 10.

OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE: A PRISON THAT WORKS

Karnet Prison Farm Infrastructure and Upgrade Projects (Completed and Planned)

Project	Status	Comments
<i>Extra 12 Beds</i>	<i>Completed 05/06</i>	<i>Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Dairy Separator/Homogeniser</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Abattoir Partitions</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Gym Hall</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Infrastructure Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Children's Playground</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Fence Remediation/Centre Funds</i>
<i>Running Track</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Fence Remediation/Centre Funds</i>
<i>Security Fence/Gatehouse</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Fence Remediation/Centre Funds</i>
<i>Tennis Courts</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Infrastructure Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Cricket Nets</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Fence Remediation/Centre Funds</i>
<i>Basketball Court</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Fence Remediation/Centre Funds</i>
<i>Bowling Green</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Fence Remediation/Centre Funds</i>
<i>Rectangular Sports Ground</i>	<i>Completed 06/07</i>	<i>Fence Remediation/Centre Funds</i>
<i>Abattoir Waste Water Diversion</i>	<i>Tendered in 06/07</i>	<i>Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Waste Water Treatment</i>	<i>Tendered in 06/07</i>	<i>Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Abattoir Floor Remediation</i>	<i>Proposed 07/08</i>	<i>Bid for Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Kitchen Floor Remediation</i>	<i>Proposed 07/08</i>	<i>Bid for Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Convert part Unit 2 to Self-Care</i>	<i>Proposed 07/08</i>	<i>Bid for Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Visitor Toilets</i>	<i>Proposed 07/08</i>	<i>Bid for Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Relocate Gardens Base</i>	<i>Proposed 07/08</i>	<i>Bid for Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Unit 1 Ablutions Renovation</i>	<i>Proposed 07/08</i>	<i>Bid for Infrastructure & Upgrade Funding</i>
<i>Education Extension</i>	<i>Nil proposal</i>	<i>Planning proposed for 06/07 did not proceed</i>
<i>Accommodation Asbestos Removal</i>	<i>Planned 10/11</i>	<i>Forward estimate only</i>

2.25 Many of the current year projects had been completed by using funding allocated to fence remediation. This had only been possible because of the generous operational funding provided in the current year, as compared to previous years. This meant that the recreation precinct had been able to be completed in one year, rather than three years as originally planned. The prison was also managing to undertake some limited refurbishment of prisoner accommodation, including the installation of ceiling fans, heaters, basic furniture and painting.

2.26 However, a number of other projects were dependent on further funding from the Department's Infrastructure and Upgrade Funding Program, for which funding bids were made by many prisons. While some of these projects were so essential they were likely to receive funding, many depended on competing priorities from across the prison system. Prisoner facilities such as the Unit 1 ablutions block and the conversion of the lower landing in Unit 2 to semi-self-care were projects most likely not to be funded through this program. However, if the prison's operational budget remains well-funded in future years there should be capacity to complete many projects using the prison's own resources.

2.27 Especially noticeable to the Office was the lack of immediate refurbishment of prisoner accommodation and the removal of asbestos, as well as the urgent need to extend the education and training facilities. Some \$10,000 was included in the Infrastructure and

Upgrade Program in 2006–2007 to develop a proposal for an extension to the education and training facilities; however, this did not proceed.

- 2.28 It should also be noted that a Department of Housing and Works report (received by the Department of Corrective Services in February 2007) indicated that some \$1.64 million would be required to remediate and ensure compliance of water supply, waste-water management and electrical infrastructure, including certain emergency systems. Some of these works had not been anticipated by Karnet and would require further funding to sustain the prison into the medium or longer term.²⁹
- 2.29 The Department's own Bromilow Life Cycle Costing Model has indicated that funding required to hold custodial facilities at an acceptable state of repair varies from one per cent of replacement value for a new building rising to 2.2 per cent of replacement value at age 30 years and thereafter.³⁰ Just under \$500,000 in recurrent funding was allocated in 2006–2007 to Karnet for breakdown repairs and faults, routine maintenance restoration and minor improvements. The prison's operational budget included additional small provisions for repairs and maintenance for each aspect of farm and industry operations. However, if it is assumed that replacement cost for the total prison infrastructure is in the vicinity of \$60 million, then under the Bromilow model \$1.32 million each year would be required to maintain the infrastructure.

CUSTODY

Perimeter Security

- 2.30 During the inspection the prison was in transition from an unfenced environment to one where the accommodation units and support infrastructure (such as health, education, recreation and visits) are contained within a security fence. Other areas of the prison, notably the farm, the workshops and programs rooms are situated outside the fence.
- 2.31 The security fence provides a significant barrier that requires considerable physical effort to defeat. There were also early detection electronic systems, including CCTV cameras with night lighting for the entire perimeter system. In addition, an on-the-person duress alarm system was being established. These security assets represented the most significant changes to the prison since it was last inspected.
- 2.32 The new security fence required many of the standing and local orders and most of the emergency management plans to be rewritten, and for staff to be trained in new procedures. Yet, it will be important for the prison to maintain its low-security operational culture. As emphasised by re-entry service providers in our consultations, the sense of responsibility engendered in prisoners by a low-security environment is an important element in preparing them for the responsibilities they will face on release.

29 Department of Housing and Works, *Karnet Prison Farm, Condition and Compliance Audit of Site Services* (February 2007).

30 DCS, *Capital Investment Plan 2007/08 to 2016/17* (25 October 2006).

- 2.33 Low-security prisons rely upon upstream high-quality risk assessments to ensure that the prisoners sent to them are suitable. They must also rely heavily on procedural security such as regular prisoner counts and dynamic security – achieved through high-quality relationships between staff and prisoners – to deal with problems and security issues as soon as they emerge. The prison should not allow the security barrier provided by the fence to erode or replace its previous reliance on good dynamic and procedural security. To do so would threaten not only security, but also the gains made to date in rehabilitation and resettlement at the prison.
- 2.34 The security fence surrounds the prisoner accommodation units, but not the workshops or farm assets that are attended daily by the majority of prisoners. It would be counter-productive and destructive to the minimum-security culture of the prison if a practice of selectivity emerged in relation to which prisoners were permitted to work in unfenced areas.
- 2.35 We were told by prison management that the gate would remain open during the day and only be closed at night: a policy we strongly endorse. Of course, appropriate prisoner movement systems and contraband management arrangements will have to be put into place. Some staff and prisoners suggested that a prisoner determined to escape might be able to win a position of trust outside the fence and thereby enable an escape. But, the fence clearly protects against an impulsive escape. It should also minimise the opportunity for third parties to drop contraband and for prisoners to retrieve it. Thus the fence provides an important boost to security.

Recommendation 4

That, once the capital works associated with the fence project and the duress alarm system have been completed, the prison (in conjunction with the Director State Security and the Special Services Branch) conduct a full site security review to test and adjust the emergency plans and routine orders.

Recommendation 5

That support be given to ensure that the low-security operational culture of the prison is not adversely affected by the new fence. The front gate should remain open during the normal working day, unless exceptional circumstances arise.

Dynamic Security and Unit Management

- 2.36 Unit management was first introduced to the Western Australian prison system in 1988. It has been repackaged and relaunched more than once, but its implementation has been quite patchy. Insofar as it implies management of a prisoner accommodation unit by a particular team of officers, then its implementation has certainly been less than complete at Karnet, which only had one unit manager to cover three accommodation units. This should improve to some degree with the establishment of a second unit manager position.
- 2.37 Unit management is relevant to security because better knowledge of a smaller group of prisoners and good relations between officers and prisoners facilitates the early

identification of problems, which if acted upon appropriately usually prevents trouble.³¹

In this respect, the relationship between staff and prisoners at Karnet was quite sound with staff rating the relationship at 4.03 (out of 5) and prisoners at 3.42. Staff rated safety, security and order very highly (at 3.88), and prisoners also rated their physical safety, an important aspect of security and order, quite highly (at 3.60).

- 2.38 The gathering and use of intelligence in a prison is dependent to a significant degree on the quality of the relationship between staff and prisoners. Karnet was able to show a number of quality intelligence reports touching on serious matters to demonstrate effective functioning in this regard.

Procedural Security, Substance Control and Prisoner Discipline

- 2.39 The report of the 2004 inspection expressed considerable concern at the failure of practices at Karnet to reflect the Department's commitment to minimise illicit drug use.³² Returning prisoners to a higher-security prison for marijuana use was rare, and yet there was concern that prisoners were affected by this drug whilst at work.
- 2.40 Efforts had been made to answer the concerns raised at the conclusion of the previous inspection, which culminated in the *Karnet Prison Farm Local Drug Action Plan, December 2005*. The plan included use of drug detection dogs, increased urinalysis (including random, targeted and point-of-entry testing), random breathalyser tests, random cell searches conducted on a daily basis, increased visitor searches, better use of intelligence and various other measures. Point-of-entry testing meant that all prisoners were tested on entry to the prison. Information provided by the prison indicated a 7.4 per cent positive result for the 256 prisoners tested on entry in the 12 months to November 2006.
- 2.41 A careful examination was made of the records relating to each of these areas for a 12-month period. While it was clear that a major commitment to urinalysis and breathalyser testing had been made, it was less clear that other measures had been effectively implemented. Records indicated that drug detection dogs had been used infrequently. Further, there was no evidence that the required searches were being carried out, whether of cells, common areas, workshop areas or visitors. Pursuant to Local Order 1.4, there should have been 180 cell searches completed each month; however, the number of cells searched each month at Karnet ranged from 27 to 144.
- 2.42 In addition, there appeared to be a significant discrepancy between the results of urinalysis that had been recorded locally and those reported on the Performance Management System at head office.³³ Drug prevalence data sighted at Karnet showed that 11 per cent of tests indicated positive for drugs for July to October 2006: a 3.6 per cent increase on the level established by point-of-entry testing. Prisoners themselves indicated that drug control

31 This is described at length in Mahoney D, *Inquiry into the Management of Offenders in Custody and in the Community* (November 2005) 69–72. As highlighted in this reference, case management is integral to unit management. This is discussed further below.

32 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 26 (March 2005) iv–v.

33 DCS, *Monthly Prisons Performance Management Measurement System Report*, October 2006 reported 13 positive results for July–October 2006, compared with 45 on paperwork for the period held at Karnet.

in the prison was only marginally successful and that drug use was higher than it should be.³⁴ Respondents to the staff survey also expressed a low level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of drug policies and practices at Karnet.³⁵

- 2.43 Where testing had indicated drugs had been used by prisoners, local management maintained a degree of tolerance to cannabis use, in contrast to use of alcohol or other substances. Cannabis users were permitted up to three prison-based convictions for use of cannabis at Karnet before their security rating was upgraded and they were removed to another prison.³⁶ The use of alcohol or substances other than cannabis resulted in immediate transfer.
- 2.44 In general terms, it was clear that Karnet's security portfolio was under-resourced. There was no Senior Officer Security and the only dedicated security position was the assistant superintendent who had to rely on routine operational staff for assistance when their routine duties allowed. As previously indicated, these staff had not been adequately trained to conduct security and safety activities, which are becoming more complex, not least in the area of substance control. The installation of the security fence had added further to the demands on security related functions, knowledge and training.

Recommendation 6

That Karnet Prison review current arrangements and establish better systems to ensure compliance with procedural security standards, including searching and drug testing. These methods should be compatible with adult custodial record-keeping and reporting to enable prison system comparison.

Recommendation 7

That the Department audit the application of the Justice Drug Plan across all prisons to identify operational risk and service improvements. The plan was first issued in 2003 and the inspection at Karnet shows that several aspects have either not been implemented or should be strengthened.

Prisoner Classification

- 2.45 Prisoner classification is seemingly unproblematic at Karnet. All prisoners entering Karnet have been rated minimum-security by another prison. Karnet need only review a prisoner's security rating or placement if that prisoner misbehaves or if new information comes to light. However, the inspection found that two groups of prisoners were summarily returned to higher-security prisons over the last two years. A number of prisoners serving life or indeterminate sentences, but approved for a pre-release program, had been returned to high-security after one of their number escaped from Karnet on 18 March 2005.³⁷

34 OICS, *Karnet Prison Farm Prisoner Survey* (November 2007). The dimensional score for Drug Control was 3.20 (out of 5). The question on the level of drug use scored 2.89 (meaning the level of drug use was considered high). Some 41.9 per cent said they had a problem with drugs and/or alcohol before coming into prison.

35 OICS, *Karnet Prison Farm Staff Survey* (November 2007). Practices and policies on drugs rated at 60 per cent, the second lowest of 15 items.

36 There were a small number of incidents and charges at Karnet not relating to substance misuse. These were considered by this Office to have been managed appropriately.

37 Mahoney D, *Inquiry into the Management of Offenders in Custody and in the Community* (November 2005) 23ff. Edwards' escape had been preceded by another high profile escape on 11 March 2005.

A further group of foreign nationals had also been returned to medium- or maximum-security prisons in late 2005 after the escape from Karnet of two foreign drug dealers.

- 2.46 The Mahoney Inquiry recommended that the Department review its assessment and classification processes to ensure each prisoner's suitability to be placed at a minimum-security prison and that no public affront be caused by such placement.³⁸ Such a review had not been initiated by the Department at the time of the Karnet inspection, and indeed the Inspectorate was subsequently tasked by the Minister to undertake a review of prisoner assessment and classification, in consultation with the Department.
- 2.47 Prisoners could only participate in off-site activities if they had been specifically assessed as suitable. However, the criteria had been made much more onerous in the previous 12 months, to the point that just 34 of 174 prisoners at the time of the inspection had been assessed as eligible to participate in activities under section 94 of the *Prisons Act 1981*.³⁹
- 2.48 This has meant that a much smaller pool of prisoners have been available to undertake work that benefits the local community or to participate in off-site sporting or recreation activities. It has also had an adverse impact on the efficiency of medical and funeral escorts and on the success of applications for home leave, re-entry release and parole. Perversely, the failure to provide prisoners with access to programs has prevented many from obtaining the necessary suitability assessment. Such assessments have been included as part of the aforementioned review of assessments and classification systems being undertaken by the Inspectorate.

Complaints and Grievances

- 2.49 In 2006 seven grievances were lodged and all were resolved with a satisfactory outcome. These grievances were resolved at different stages of the process, which indicated that the procedure was both understood and used correctly. Thus, in its handling of complaints and grievances Karnet performed well. However, the low number of grievances lodged, and the fact that a number of prisoners during the inspection had made complaints that were unresolved, suggested that even at Karnet the system was still not as effective as it could be.

Emergency Management

- 2.50 Emergency response systems were affected by the installation of the perimeter fence, so new orders had to be drafted and manuals updated. Elevated risks, such as bushfire, and chlorine gas (used in waste-water treatment) were included in the emergency manuals. However, the inspection team recommended that certain of the manuals be better ordered.

Occupational Safety and Health

- 2.51 The Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) Committee at Karnet was revived only a few months before the inspection. Members had received an induction and regular meetings had commenced. A five-day training course for members had also been arranged in March. Safety data sheets were kept in each work area, and the prison had a site hazards action plan, which was reviewed at each meeting.

38 Ibid, recommendation 19.

39 The Act has since been amended. The relevant section in the amended Act is now section 83.

- 2.52 Prisoners were given both generic OSH training (if not already received at another prison) and specific training for the type of equipment used in particular work areas. A Form 002 recording each prisoner's OSH training was maintained in each work area and protective clothing and footwear were made available as required.
- 2.53 As previously mentioned, up to 11 per cent of prisoners had tested positive for drugs and prisoners under the influence of substances in workplaces constituted a real safety risk. The occasional application of breath-analysis and urinalysis in work areas was welcome, but there should have also been active consultations with Worksafe about best practice in managing this issue.

Recommendation 8

That the occupational safety and health system at Karnet be maintained as a high priority. There should also be further consideration on the question of the impact of substance misuse by prisoners on workplace safety.

Prisoner Escorts

- 2.54 When dependent on prisoner transport contractors (AIMS Corporation), Karnet had particular difficulty getting its prisoners to medical appointments in Perth.⁴⁰ Prisoners in transit from Karnet had also been subject to being placed in restraints as if they had a maximum-security rating. The journey in the back of the secure van can be quite gruelling for prisoners, especially on the winding approach between the highway and the prison.
- 2.55 In June 2005, Karnet was allocated two extra staff positions and a Tarago van, and became responsible for its own medical escorts and for other discretionary escorts such as funerals. This has enabled health services staff to make appointments with good assurance that the prisoner would attend. Prisoners have been able to be informed of their appointments two or three days in advance, which has made it possible to resolve many issues that otherwise would have proved problematic, such as rescheduling prison work commitments or visits arrangements. Cancellations, either by prisoners or the transport service, were thus relatively rare. However, a change of rules in 2006 meant that the majority of prisoners not yet approved for Section 94 work release, each had to be accompanied by an officer. This limited the number able to participate in group runs, for example to a dental clinic.

CARE AND WELLBEING

Reception, Induction and Orientation

- 2.56 The 2004 inspection found that the induction and orientation process at Karnet lacked continuity, thoroughness, peer support involvement and adequate documentation. It was recommended that it be reassessed.⁴¹ This had been done and changes were implemented in stages. At the time of the present inspection reception processes generally worked well.

40 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 26 (March 2005) 28.

41 Ibid, 21–22.

-
- 2.57 Induction commenced for each new prisoner at the point of reception and included an excellent orientation booklet; a list of peer support prisoners; and information about orientation processes, work options, and behavioural (conduct) rules including the policies on bullying, drugs and equity. Depending on the time of arrival, induction would usually begin with a health assessment, followed by unit placement and orientation. If health staff were not available at the time of arrival, the health assessment would generally be undertaken on the next day.
- 2.58 The health assessment included physical and mental health screening, including the at-risk (of self harm) check-list, point-of-entry urinalysis testing for drugs, and arrangements to enable continuation treatment for known medical conditions. The initial unit orientation comprised the TOMS orientation checklist, and a tour of the unit. There was also an introduction to a peer support prisoner who provided a tour of the prison.
- 2.59 On a new prisoner's first full day in Karnet, they would usually attend a slideshow presentation and discussion with an assessments officer. When possible, the senior community corrections officer (CCO) would also meet with the prisoner. The slideshow covered key areas well and included written information displayed on screen in conjunction with a narration (recorded by one of the peer support prisoners).
- 2.60 The orientation booklet included the 'Pathway to Release' checklist (also used at Wooroloo Prison Farm) whereby prisoners indicated whether they required information about or appointments with staff from services such as education, the prison-based CCO or re-entry services. These checklists were collected at the orientation session and appointments were arranged by assessment staff, usually within the first week of arrival at Karnet.
- 2.61 The inspection team found that the induction and orientation processes were of a high standard and much improved from the last inspection. However, when prisoners were surveyed in November 2006, they gave a low score to entry support (which rated 2.98 out of 5) and the second lowest dimensional score to distress on entering custody (3.11).⁴² This suggests either that these reforms had been insufficiently implemented when many of these prisoners were received at Karnet or that more support is needed after the initial orientation.

Prisoner Safety

- 2.62 One of the drivers of distress for new prisoners is the change from a closed to an open prison regime, and the reduced sense of safety this engenders. Sex offenders and others coming from protection units feel this acutely. The 2004 inspection found 'evidence of significant disharmony between some sex offenders and others in the Karnet population'⁴³ and the custodial experience of many vulnerable prisoners was less than positive. The report recommended that antagonism toward this population be addressed.
- 2.63 By late 2006 the proportion of sex offenders had reduced from 42 per cent in 2004 to 37 per cent.⁴⁴ There was some evidence that more young and short-term prisoners were being sent to Karnet, but the numbers of prisoners over 40-years-old had also increased.

42 OICS, *Karnet Prison Farm Prisoner Survey* (November 2007).

43 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 26 (March 2005) 24.

44 Analysis of monthly census data provided by the DCS, January–October 2006.

Such changes in the composition of the prison population can have subtle effects on ensuring prisoner safety in such an open environment.

- 2.64 It was clear that efforts to contain bullying in general, and against sex offenders in particular, had been significantly enhanced. Prisoners said that a previous element of tolerance to such behaviours by some staff had been replaced by a hard-line against people engaging in bullying behaviour. Such prisoners were simply returned to a higher-security prison. While some questioned whether this was always just, there was no doubt that vulnerable prisoners felt more free to move around the prison or engage in recreation and other pursuits without fear. This was reflected in the prisoner survey in which the dimensional score for physical safety was a very high 3.6 (out of 5).
- 2.65 However, good performance in this regard needs to be maintained with commitment and vigilance. It continued to be the case that many prisoners resented the presence of sex offenders at the prison, especially in visits, and that while a high level of safety was evident, an underlying level of fear was understandably still present for some.

Aboriginal Prisoners

- 2.66 There were just 15 Aboriginal prisoners at Karnet during the inspection week, under 9 per cent of the population, at a time when Aboriginal comprised some 42 per cent of the population in the prison system as a whole. Perhaps there was some relationship between the factors that accounted for over-representation of Aboriginal people in the system as a whole that militated against their attaining a lower security rating. Nevertheless, this figure appears unacceptably low and deserves further consideration.
- 2.67 Some Aboriginal prisoners indicated they felt vulnerable at Karnet in comparison with other prisons and that they had experienced discrimination in their treatment. They reported an undertone of disdain which they felt went unchallenged. They felt that the anti-bullying policy protected sex offenders, but not indigenous prisoners, and that there had been instances of indigenous prisoners being unfairly accused of bullying and removed.
- 2.68 The prisoners also felt they were given less opportunities for meaningful work and awarded lower gratuity levels. They said that when they gathered together socially, for example in self-care, or even at the Aboriginal Meeting Place, they were asked to move on by certain staff who appeared afraid they were becoming a gang. They also claimed that they were not consulted about the content of the NAIDOC day celebrations last year.
- 2.69 These perceptions should not be dismissed, but there was no substantial evidence to indicate systemic discrimination at Karnet.⁴⁵ For example, an examination of employment records did show some clustering of indigenous prisoners in gardens, but others held positions in education, the farm, recreation, the library, skills development, unit cleaners and the kitchen. There was also a favourable distribution in gratuity levels. Aboriginal prisoners also benefited from two front-end loader short-courses in early 2007, due to the availability of special funding obtained through education services.

45 Prisoners generally rated the Race Relations dimension quite highly (at 3.42 out of 5) in the Prisoner Survey.

- 2.70 The perceptions of Aboriginal prisoners seemed based on a combination of their relatively small numbers at Karnet, and a lack of confidence that their concerns were being heard and understood by staff and the administration. This was despite the presence of an Aboriginal prisoner support officer and evident respect for certain senior staff in the prison. While not a problem of active discrimination, the experiences and perceptions of Aboriginal prisoners at Karnet require examination and remedy by the prison.
- 2.71 Aboriginal prisoners said they would like to be able to sleep outside, either at the Aboriginal meeting place, or on verandas, as they might have done at home.⁴⁶ They also said they would like more skills courses, more incentives of direct relevance to them, and (what we interpreted as) more opportunities to develop self-esteem and moral sensibility based on their own culture. Aboriginal prisoners expressed an interest in receiving visits from community elders, sportsmen, musicians and others who could act as role models, as well as from Aboriginal community support agencies. They would also have appreciated more ‘bush tucker’ and damper.
- 2.72 With attention to such issues and ideas, there is every reason to believe that more indigenous prisoners will better use the opportunities that Karnet offers.

Recommendation 9

That the Karnet Prison Farm Business Plan include a strategy aimed at increasing the proportion of indigenous prisoners. This should include a review of any issues operating against their selection for transfer to Karnet, steps aimed at strengthening the communication and understanding between indigenous prisoners and staff, and enhancing welfare support and cultural opportunities for indigenous prisoners.

Prisoner Contacts with Friends and Family

- 2.73 As a working prison farm, regular visits with family and friends at Karnet were only made available for a single two-hour session on weekend days and public holidays. Despite this, the number of visits per month per prisoner was the fourth highest in the state, behind only Broome, Eastern Goldfields and Boronia.⁴⁷ This was probably because the majority of prisoners came from the metropolitan area or the south-west region of Western Australia. Only nine per cent of prisoners at Karnet at the time of the inspection had come from other regions, interstate or overseas.⁴⁸
- 2.74 The visits facility at Karnet is impressive in size and is decorated with very fine murals. The outdoor area includes two large areas under shade, an excellent aviary, a lawn and a large modern children’s play area. This created a number of pleasant spaces which allowed easy interaction between prisoners and their visitors.

46 The Inspectorate considers that this may be a reasonable proposition now the site has a perimeter fence that is secured at night.

47 DCS, *Monthly Prisons Performance Management Measurement System Report*, October 2006, 54.

48 From census data obtained from the Department, January–October 2006.

- 2.75 However, staff and visitors highlighted some issues. One area that deserved attention was the lack of shade over the children’s playground, sometimes causing children’s hands to be burnt by hot metal when using the playground. It also appears that the experience of visiting had been affected by the new fence such that visitors had to wait sometimes for lengthy periods for admission outside the gate with no available shade or shelter.
- 2.76 At the door of the visits facility, visitors were first attended by Outcare staff who checked their bookings and identifications, and otherwise assisted visitors. Identification forms were issued to new visitors. That this was done in the open air was less than satisfactory. It is time that Outcare had their own facility, preferably outside the gate where visitors can be welcomed, processed and allowed to wait in comfort. Prison management said they intended moving a demountable close to the gate for this purpose, but there was no identified funding to facilitate this.

Recommendation 10

That a visitor services facility be established at Karnet. In the interim, a shaded waiting area with seats should be provided.

- 2.77 Supervision of visits is an important issue at Karnet given its prisoner population mix. As a prison in which sex offenders are integrated with other prisoners,⁴⁹ supervision, particularly of children, is an important issue for the administration, visitors and prisoners. Upon admission prisoners convicted of sex offences against children are required to sign a contract preventing unauthorised contact with children in visits. This includes a commitment to ensure ‘that all visits are taken in a conspicuous position in the general visits area’.⁵⁰ There were complaints from both prisoners and staff that this provision was increasingly being ignored.
- 2.78 Staff expressed concern that effective supervision of visits was impossible, with often only three staff on duty. This was especially difficult during the first half-hour when they were fully occupied processing visitors at the visits desk, or inside processing deposits by visitors into prisoners’ spending accounts.
- 2.79 Line of sight supervision was not feasible for many areas from the visits desk, including a section of the indoor area and large parts of the outdoor area. The toilets were outside the facility leading towards the main part of the prison in a position where access could not be effectively supervised. Visitors and prisoners crossed paths constantly as they went to and from the coffee/tea making area to the toilet, cashier, BBQ and children’s play area.
- 2.80 Outcare provided some childcare for visits, but parents remained responsible for their own children at all times. The carer’s role was to provide toys for children and keep an eye on their care and interactions. There was no defined play area other than the children’s play ground. Because the carer was based within the main visits room, she could not possibly watch the many children spread out throughout the visits area.

49 With over a third of the population listed as having committed offences against children less than 16 years of age (list provided by Karnet management).

50 Karnet Prison Farm, *Local Order 1.16 Restricted Category, Prisoners – Visits (7 December 2006)*.

- 2.81 However, it must be said that notwithstanding the aforementioned complaints, visitors were most appreciative of the accepting and helpful attitude from staff and the quality of interaction afforded in the visits facility.

Recommendation 11

That the Department review visits arrangements at Karnet Prison Farm to ensure that children are fully protected.

Recommendation 12

That shade be installed over the children's play area as a matter of urgency.

Recommendation 13

That toilets for visitors be provided in a location where the entrance may be supervised by staff.

- 2.82 Visits were only one aspect of communication between prisoners and their friends and families. The telephone system was the most important other means for prisoners to keep in contact with family. This worked well, but some prisoners complained that there were insufficient phones given there was less time after work (as compared with other prisons) to make contact with people. Inquiries indicated that officer-assisted calls were rare, as were inter-prison visits and video visits.

- 2.83 The Prisons Division of the Department needs to consider whether there is a way of providing internet connections with voice and webcam for those from other regions, states and countries, given the increasing popularity and effectiveness of this technology around the world. With appropriate supervision, security and recording, this would provide a particularly cheap and accessible way of helping this group of prisoners. The Department has taken such a cautious approach to prisoners' use of computers and the internet that later in this report concern is expressed that prisoners had been without the use of computers for many months which had resulted in them falling behind in their studies. Elsewhere in the prison system, the Department also must provide legal resources to prisoners to enable them to defend their case and this would be best achieved through the use of computerised up to date information. At many prisons, prisoners complain that any minor change to their computers must be achieved via sending their computers to head office and this inevitably incurs delays of up to many months before they get their computers back. Thus, there are many issues around prisoners using computers that need to be addressed.

Recommendation 14

a) That the Department consider provision of secure supervised and recorded video conference connections over the internet to prisoners with family in other regions, states and countries, given the increasing popularity and effectiveness of this technology around the world.

b) That the Department broadly review its management of prisoner computers and prisoners' access to computers.

Recreation

- 2.84 Recent changes in the staffing of recreation at Karnet have breathed new life into this area of the prison's operations. Recreation staff were present seven days a week, with a 10.00 pm finish on Thursdays to facilitate a weekly film night. Recreation had also benefited from the construction of a recreation hall, tennis courts and other new works associated with the fence installation. An internal walking/running track, cricket nets and a new rectangular soccer ground were under construction.
- 2.85 A positive effort at Karnet had been made to engage older prisoners in active recreation, such as darts, bowls (bocce) and use of the pool and gym. However, many in the over-40 age group preferred to watch television and play cards. Many prisoners were tired at the end of the day because of the manual nature of their work; nevertheless, the gym was well patronised. Soccer had also become the most popular form of ball sport. Movies on DVD were broadcast on a daily basis. The library was well attended and a range of other activities such as tai chi, meditation and religious activities were also available.
- 2.86 The gym was largely supervised by an older prisoner who was a former boxing instructor. This prisoner did an excellent job in helping design an exercise routine and uses for the equipment; however, there were no formal appraisals, written instructions, or routines recorded. While we acknowledge this prisoner's experience and enthusiasm, he lacks relevant qualifications and may not be aware of modern safe approaches to operating gym equipment. There were also significant periods in which prisoners could access the gym when it was unsupervised.
- 2.87 The inspection revealed that Karnet's gym equipment was old, has had to be repaired many times and may be unsafe. Karnet is the only prison where free weights and complex isometric equipment are used. Both recreation and medical staff had reported injuries to prisoners caused by use of gym equipment. Given the popularity of the gymnasium, it would be unfortunate if it were simply shut down or access significantly reduced, but it is essential that the operation of the gymnasium, the quality of the equipment available and arrangements for supervision and training be reviewed.
- 2.88 Most recreation activities were self-organised by prisoners including, for example, games of soccer. There would seem to be an opportunity to create prisoner employment and training opportunities in the management of recreation for prisoners at Karnet. There had been outside recreation opportunities in previous months, with occasional visits to Jarrahdale oval over the summer for cricket, including on the Australia Day weekend.⁵¹ Regular visits to a suburban recreation centre for indoor cricket and soccer were stopped in November when two brothers arranged to be visited there. Ironically, the brothers were subsequently transferred to Wooroloo and allowed to resume outside recreation, while those left at Karnet have continued to be denied this opportunity. A strong sense of unfairness was evident in comments by prisoners about this. The Inspectorate was also concerned that this constituted a form of collective punishment, which should be rectified as soon as possible.

51 Only prisoners approved for section 94 (now section 83) work release are allowed to participate in external recreation activities.

Recommendation 15

- a) That the operation of the gymnasium, the quality of the equipment available and arrangements for supervision and training be reviewed.*
- b) That the cancellation of external sporting activities be reviewed as soon as possible.*

Chaplaincy

- 2.89 The prison has an active Anglican chaplain who provides both pastoral support and regular services to the prison. However, services were less popular than when a Pentecostal service was being provided. A prison fellowship group had recently started on Monday nights, which was well attended. Buddhist meditation sessions were offered each weekend by monks from the nearby Buddhist monastery, and efforts were being made to assist prisoners of other faiths, including facilitating visits from their pastors.
- 2.90 While the worship centre takes the form of a Christian chapel, there were plans to acknowledge other faiths, such as by installing a statue of Buddha in the garden. There was some concern expressed by prisoners that the chapel was not wheelchair friendly.

Canteen

- 2.91 The canteen appeared to function well and it received an 81.1 per cent approval from prisoners surveyed. It had a reasonable range of goods and allowed special orders from an approved list if needed. Prisoners complained about the lack of 'healthy' food options and there were plans to review the range of products with this in mind. Prisoners also complained that canteen prices had risen (including a delivery component) over the last 12 months but had not been matched by a commensurate rise in gratuities.

Food

- 2.92 The kitchen ran a four-week revolving standard menu. Various special diets were also catered; these included vegetarian and halal diets, as well as diets provided on advice from the medical centre for certain prisoners. Since mid-January 2007, all milk supplied was low in fat and a number of prisoners were also able to access skim (or no fat) milk.
- 2.93 Some 79.7 per cent of prisoners surveyed were satisfied with the quality and quantity of food at Karnet, and this was supported in individual and focus group discussions during the inspection. However, some prisoners complained that not enough meat or fruit was provided. About 100 prisoners took their meals on a self-service basis in the main dining room, while the remaining prisoners self-catered. The self-care prisoners said they sometimes had difficulty obtaining supplies from the kitchen.

Health Services

- 2.94 The Inspectorate's expert advisor found health services at Karnet to be well managed and generally of good quality. Access had recently been improved by a system of self-referral by prisoners through the recently established medical receptionist position. The nurse manager had been active in brokering access for Karnet prisoners to health services at Hakea and Casuarina Prisons, as well as public hospitals and clinics. For example, dental care was reserved for Karnet prisoners at Casuarina Prison one day per week. Close cooperation with

transport officers meant a much better success rate for medical escorts than was possible through the contractor (as discussed above).

- 2.95 This is not to say that the service was without problems. While the rate of complaints was not high, there were still concerns that dental and other specialist services were difficult to access.⁵² As with other non-operational prisoner services, prison health services were under-funded in 2006–2007 and this had forced Karnet to curtail access to key ancillary services such as physiotherapy, optical and podiatry.
- 2.96 The prison had been given Worksafe improvement notices in early 2006 in relation to the risk of Q fever from aspects of its farm operations. Health Services have had to work closely with prison management on strategies to address this risk including extending the awareness of medical staff and considering the possibility of vaccinating farm-workers.⁵³ The Worksafe notices were lifted upon implementation of various procedures to prevent contamination; however, the issue will require continuing attention to minimise risks.⁵⁴
- 2.97 There were only five pharmacotherapy patients at the time of inspection. Following a recommendation from the previous inspection patients are now dosed at 8.00 am (instead of 12.30 pm), which allows them to engage in work on the farm or in the broader community. These patients were well-managed, despite the nurse not having been given the opportunity for Prisoner Addiction Services Team (PAST) training.
- 2.98 The significant attention given to health promotion makes health services at Karnet exemplary. Along with Wooroloo and Albany, Karnet committed to the Pit-Stop Program in 2006, which provided individual health assessments for most of the prison population, together with lifestyle advice to promote health and fitness. Prison management and health services also undertook the commendable initiative to create 48 smoke-free cells. There was also a healthy-choices review of canteen items and of food provision more generally. A particular achievement was the joint health services and recreation initiative to develop a fitness program targeted at prisoners over 40 years of age.

Support Services

- 2.99 The pre-inspection prisoner survey gave an overall quality of life score by Karnet prisoners of 8.03 (out of 10). It is clear from the generally positive responses throughout the survey that prisoners were generally appreciative of their environs and the degree of freedom enjoyed at Karnet. However, a minority of prisoners returned surveys indicating that they had experienced suffering in the prison (15); were unable to relieve stress (15); have had thoughts about suicide (4); often felt depressed (20); have had major feelings of distress (19); had general fears for psychological safety (24); or had problems sleeping (35).
- 2.100 It was therefore concerning that there were negative responses to questions related to the perceived priority given to suicide prevention in the prison; only peer support was viewed

52 Five prisoners in the pre-inspection prisoner survey indicated that problems with health services or treatment were a negative aspect of life at Karnet.

53 The inspection team was advised that supplies of the vaccine for Q fever were in fact unavailable.

54 Nina Lynhe, Worksafe WA Commissioner, letter to Lindsay Mercer, Business Manager, Karnet Prison Farm (10 April 2006) sighted by the inspection team.

positively by prisoners. At the time of the inspection, 11 per cent of the prison's population had been diagnosed with a psychiatric or mental health issue and 23 prisoners (out of 174) were taking antidepressant medication.

- 2.101 A Prison Counselling Service (PCS) officer attended Karnet three days a week (Tuesday to Thursday). He worked closely both with centre staff and medical staff, especially the part-time mental health nurse. Notwithstanding the above survey results, there had been limited demand for crisis intervention so the PCS officer had the opportunity to offer some longer-term counselling. Nonetheless, the part-time nature of the service did impact upon the prison, as highlighted by three transfers in a three-month period to Casuarina Prison's Crisis Care Unit when the PCS officer was not on-site.
- 2.102 Questions were raised by various sources about the capacity of custodial staff to manage at-risk prisoners. Fifty-five per cent of staff indicated in the pre-inspection survey that more staff training and support was needed to help them manage the risk of suicide or self-harm.⁵⁵ The mechanisms for dealing with at-risk issues, self-harm and suicidal behaviour at Karnet seemed overly reliant on PCS and the mental health nurse (both part-time positions), and on peer support prisoners.
- 2.103 Operation of the prisoner support program was one of the main roles of the prison support officer. He reported that there had been several occasions since the last inspection where intervention by peer support prisoners had prevented suicide. Most peer support prisoners said they had received 'Gatekeeper' training in listening skills and suicide prevention, but there had been some turnover in membership and a number were now in need of this training.

Recommendation 16

That prisoner support systems at Karnet be reviewed with consideration given to extending the Prisoner Counselling Service and to ensuring all custodial staff and peer supporters have relevant training in suicide prevention.

REPARATION, REHABILITATION AND RE-ENTRY

Assessments and Case Management

- 2.104 Assessments and case management at Karnet had recently come under control and supervision of the newly created position of Case Management Coordinator. Assessments staff reviewed each prisoner's Individual Management Plan (IMP) on arrival to check their program status, note any unaddressed program needs and consider existing opportunities to meet these needs. They also met with prisoners to discuss their case and resources available to assist them to prepare for release. These staff also had to produce key documents such as parole reports and re-entry release reports, IMP reviews and make referrals to various parties in preparation for their release.
- 2.105 The importance of case management in prison functioning was strongly underlined in the

⁵⁵ Seventy-seven per cent of staff surveyed agreed that dealing with prisoner suicide/self-harm was extremely stressful.

Mahoney Inquiry.⁵⁶ The Department had committed to establishing case management coordinator positions in all prisons as part of its initial response to the Mahoney Inquiry. However, an early project to review case management at head office level had stalled, so prisons were operating without direction (beyond the limitations of Director General's Rule 18).

- 2.106 In the lead-up to the inspection, Karnet administration had appointed an acting case management coordinator and had mobilised staff to undertake contact reports on all eligible prisoners. Short-term prisoners and those due to leave within six weeks were excluded. Each officer was required to complete four contact reports to cover the remaining eligible prisoner population. This was an exemplary effort, especially since officers received no in-person training, but only emailed instructions. An examination of some randomly selected reports showed that staff did an effective job. Further contact reports are required every six months under the Rule, but the Office was informed that the prison intends to do this every three months. While there was much that could be improved in the way case management was being performed, this was a good start for Karnet and will enhance dynamic security, staff-prisoner relations and the welfare of prisoners.

Employment and Gratuity Levels

- 2.107 The inspection team found that Karnet offered the most extensive range of meaningful work opportunities to prisoners of any prison in Western Australia. The range included various aspects of farm operations, the abattoir, dairy, mechanical workshops, the gardens, construction, recreation, the kitchen and off-site work in the community. Only a handful of prisoners were employed in cleaning or menial tasks. The figures shown in Karnet's monthly performance statistics indicated that prisoners were engaged in an average of 27 hours of productive activity per week.
- 2.108 A massive 88.9 per cent of prisoners expressed satisfaction with their access to work in the prison in the pre-inspection survey. This was largely due to the dedication of Karnet's team of VSOs. The challenge will be to maintain this level of productive activity within the new security fence, particularly if prisoner numbers increase.
- 2.109 An analysis of the profile of work at the time of the inspection suggested an equitable distribution of work opportunities and gratuities across most prisoner groups. In response to a recommendation that had been made at the previous inspection, the gratuity profile had been adjusted to attract prisoners to work in industries requiring non-standard hours, such as the dairy. This strategy appeared to be highly successful.

Work in the Community

- 2.110 Karnet has long had a vigorous program involving prisoners in work of general benefit to the community. Some excellent work had been done in recent years on developing and creating facilities on nature trails, as well as and maintenance for a local school and other community facilities. This work has helped to maintain a positive profile for the prison among its local community.

56 See recommendations 20, 21, 22 and 23.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Visitors queue at the perimeter fence waiting to enter the prison.



Students studying in the crowded conditions of the education centre.



Inside a prisoner's cell.



Prisoner's spiritual and cultural needs are met through the worship centre (right of picture) and the Aboriginal meeting place (left of picture).



PHOTOGRAPHS



Prisoner's are able to access the indoors gymnasium as one means of recreation.



In addition to standard dorm-style accommodation units, Karnet also has a limited number of huts for prisoner accommodation.



Access to water is an ongoing issue for the prison, but at the time of the inspection the water level in the dam at Karnet was reasonable.



Prisoners in the section 94 work team participate in various community projects, such as this work on the Bibbulmun Track.

- 2.111 However, notwithstanding previous inspection recommendations, the number of prisoners in the community work program has remained restricted, with typically only six to seven prisoners in a single work party leaving the prison on any one day.⁵⁷ There were no new initiatives being considered to establish a work camp associated with Karnet, nor for a mobile work camp to extend the reach and scope of community work. As discussed above, changes in procedures had significantly reduced the numbers of Karnet prisoners assessed as suitable for Section 94 work release.
- 2.112 The only positive note in this regard was the approval in a recent staffing review, for Karnet to be allocated a second Section 94 officer. However, this had not been funded or filled at the time of the inspection. In any case, it would seem that this program is in need of a new impetus and direction. This might best be found through a closer partnership between the prison and other stakeholders, such as interested community members, local shires and the Department of the Environment and Conservation. Some kind of consultative body may help renew the sense of purpose and identify priorities to better direct the prison's efforts in this regard. For example, in addition to providing a springboard for community work in a new locality, a new work camp would help to accommodate extra prisoners at a time when prisoner numbers in the system are critically high.

Recommendation 17

That the Department, in conjunction with Karnet Prison administration, review the operation of the community work program in consultation with stakeholders, develop an ongoing consultative mechanism, identify opportunities to extend the program (including creation of a work camp or mobile work camp) and commit to the necessary resources to extend the program.

Education and Training

- 2.113 The inspection team observed that a wide range of education services was being offered at Karnet's education centre despite very limited space. The demand from prisoners was high and it appeared that education participation rates were robust. While only 12 per cent of prisoners were engaged in education on a full-time basis, some 58 per cent engaged in some education activity in any one week, many of these in vocational training. Completion rates were reasonably strong at 61 per cent. By excluding exiting prisoners, the rate rose to 76 per cent, which was comparable to the rate for TAFE module completion of 75 per cent.
- 2.114 There were some gaps in service delivery. While there were some part-time classes for students with low literacy levels, generally there were insufficient opportunities for those needing adult basic education. This was due mainly to manifestly inadequate classroom space, although staff resources was also a limiting factor. There was also an unmet demand for art programs because of insufficient staffing.

⁵⁷ See OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 26 (March 2005) recommendation 18; and OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Karnet Prison Farm*, Report No. 5, (May 2001) recommendation 5.

- 2.115 Prisoners were able to access an excellent range of courses through distance delivery, including tertiary studies. However, work space was so limited in the education centre that many prisoners were required to pursue their studies alone in their units. This meant that some prisoners who required support were removed from the very staff that could supply it. Access to computer facilities is also denied this group.
- 2.116 At the time of the inspection private computers had been denied to prisoners for over three months as a result of a security breach. The education centre had also been without its computers for five weeks (as a result of the breach) with no prospect of their return for several more weeks. Some students reported having forfeited substantial fees because they were unable to comply with external course requirements. It is hard to understand why an adequate number of 'clean' computers could not have been provided for use under strict supervision, while the security breach was managed.⁵⁸ The handling of this matter, while by no means unique to Karnet, again resulted in all prisoners being disadvantaged for the transgressions of a few.
- 2.117 An excellent range of vocational courses was made available to prisoners at Karnet, especially those related to construction, such as bricklaying or use of machinery and transport. The courses were popular and many had a waitlist. Some were fully subscribed within hours of the notice being posted. There was availability, however, of courses in business and office administration which suffered in particular from the lack of classroom space and limited (and at the time of the inspection entirely absent) computing facilities.
- 2.118 There was also an impressive range of traineeships offered at Karnet, which had some 26 trainees (about 15 per cent of the population) at the time of the inspection. Processes put in place by head office management helped with continuation of these traineeships after release, as did a close relationships with certain industry training and employment agencies, for example in the meat industry.
- 2.119 All education and training activity is coordinated by a single senior education officer assisted by a part-time education officer. Minimal extra tutoring (four days per week) was available to prisoners. The appointment of a peer tutor helped boost support in the classroom. The other major strength at Karnet is the team of VSOs who are committed and qualified to deliver training and assess competencies of participants.

Recommendation 18

That Education Branch purchase and store sufficient computers to respond to future security events in order to minimise inappropriate disruption to service delivery, until such time as a fully networked and secure system can facilitate timely administration, backups and auditing of educational computers.

58 Details of the security breach at Karnet were provided in the form of a briefing note to the Minister on educational computer audit and upgrade, by the Deputy Commissioner, Offender Management and Professional Development, dated January 2007. An attachment outlined remediation plans, ultimately based on the networking of educational computers so that administration, backups and auditing of such computers can be undertaken from head office.

Recommendation 19

That the Department develop a plan to establish a learning centre precinct in Karnet Prison Farm of sufficient scale to meet the existing and future needs of prisoners in education and vocational skills development. There should also be interim arrangements to improve service delivery through increased funds, increased staffing levels and the provision of temporary accommodation.

Programs

- 2.120 The Inspectorate was informed by the Corrective Services Programs Branch at the head office briefing for Karnet that resource limitations had forced a rationalisation of programs. The Managing Anger and Substance Abuse program (MASU), hitherto a mainstay in many prisons including Karnet, had been cancelled because of unproven efficacy and because it targeted prisoners rated only at medium-risk. In addition, the programs branch were having acute difficulties attracting and retaining qualified staff to deliver programs. The Prisoners Review Board had been informed of this situation, and there was assurance that it would take the unavailability of certain programs into account when making decisions about a prisoner's release on parole.
- 2.121 The inspection team observed a high level of anxiety among prisoners at Karnet about their inability to access programs in the wake of the cancellation of MASU. This was particularly the case for prisoners who had been assessed as needing therapy for anger management and substance misuse. These prisoners believed that their chances of attaining parole would be affected because they were unable to undertake programs relevant to their rehabilitation.
- 2.122 It was apparent that programs staff only attended Karnet on days when actually delivering or interviewing prisoners in relation to particular programs. Programs were coordinated from head office in Perth and the prison had no control over what programs were delivered or when they were delivered. Continuity in program delivery was also hindered by the fact that staff were not assigned to deliver programs at Karnet beyond completion of each program.
- 2.123 The fact that programs staff were not on-site between sessions when group members often needed support presented a problem for Karnet, especially in regard to the sex offender program.⁵⁹ It had fallen to the PCS officer – himself only on-site on a part-time basis – the prison-based CCO and others to fill the gap left by the lack of on-site programs staff.
- 2.124 One important therapeutic program, the Cognitive Skills Program is not managed by the programs branch and therefore is not subject to the same resource constraints. Karnet has two VSO positions dedicated to the Cognitive Skills Program and these staff recently completed training in the new version, known as *Think First*. However, just one *Think First* program ran in 2006 using a facilitator from Casuarina. The delivery of the first *Think First* course in 2007 was delayed and it is a concern that Karnet has not yet managed to establish this course on at least a quarterly basis.

⁵⁹ The Inspectorate has learned that the programs branch is restructuring and programs officers have each been asked to propose a prison as their base prison. At the time of writing it was not known if Karnet would have an officer based there.

Recommendation 20

That the range and frequency of delivery of offender programs, including Think First, be comprehensively reviewed to ensure that prisoners are appropriately prepared for release.

The lessons learnt from this Karnet audit should be applied to all prisons with a re-entry profile to gauge the service gap.

Prisoner Re-entry

- 2.125 As each Karnet prisoner approaches eligibility for release, he is tracked closely by assessments staff and the prison-based senior CCO. Regular information sessions are held for prisoners to help them understand requirements for re-entry release, home leave and parole. One of these was observed during the inspection and it was clearly very useful for those who attended.
- 2.126 High-risk offenders, including those with extensive criminal histories or recidivism, those with a high public profile and those with life or indefinite sentences (including Governor's pleasure) were case-managed throughout their stay by the senior CCO. There were five prisoners at Karnet on pre-release programs, but remarkably there had been little pre-release involvement by local CCOs who would have to manage these offenders on release. Home visits, which were part of assessing a prisoner's parole plans, had to be undertaken instead with an Outcare representative.
- 2.127 An impressive range of service providers assist prisoners in preparation for release at Karnet. Some provide services on application by prisoners or referral by staff. Others access lists of people due for release and offer services to those who meet their particular criteria. Most service providers reported that they were appropriately accommodated at Karnet, enjoyed good relations with management and were satisfied with their personal security in that environment.
- 2.128 Services to Karnet at the time of the inspection included drug and alcohol counselling provided by Cyrenian House and Holyoake and funded under the Prison to Parole program. These counsellors provided relapse prevention counselling and further support after a prisoner's release. However, it was concerning that these services were impacted by heavy demand from prisoners wanting to convince the Prisoners Release Board that they were dealing with their problems and deserved release, following cancellation of the MASU program.
- 2.129 Prisoners could access various services funded under the Department's re-entry program, including support and accommodation services from Outcare and placement and support services for certain hard-to-place prisoners from Outreach. Outcare also provided a living skills program, which was appreciated by those who attended, and an employment and training service. Centrelink also played an important role in ensuring that released prisoners were able to access funds on release.

SUMMARY

- 2.130 The Inspectorate found a well-functioning prison at Karnet, which by and large provided an excellent environment for the safe accommodation of minimum-security prisoners, including vulnerable prisoners. Karnet ensured prisoner participation in meaningful education, training and work and effectively prepared prisoners for release.
- 2.131 The administration of Karnet was effective at managing its business cycle and farm, with the added responsibility for livestock production for the state's three prison farms. A further extension of Karnet's role in coordinating the prison system's food production should be examined. The prison faces challenges in regard to increasing operational staff numbers to cover existing shortfalls and to staff the new gatehouse in response to recent staffing reviews. A further review is needed to assess levels of staffing in health, education and offender services. The failure to provide regular staff training is of significant concern to the Inspectorate and must be rectified as soon as practicable.
- 2.132 The Inspectorate found that significant site works were required as a consequence of the installation of the perimeter security fence. Some works had been completed at the time of writing; however, refurbishment and/or replacement of prisoner accommodation and increased accommodation for the education and training precinct remain unfunded.
- 2.133 The security portfolio was found to be under-resourced, and there were concerns about aspects of procedural security including an apparent underperformance in searches, and poor reporting of illicit substance testing. The new perimeter fence was seen as a major security asset, but there was a need to review and adjust the emergency plans and routine orders relating to its operation following the experience of the prison since it was commissioned. It is particularly important to ensure that the operational culture of the prison, which maximises prisoner self-responsibility, is not adversely impacted by the new fence.
- 2.134 The Inspectorate was concerned that such a small proportion of prisoners were able to be assessed as suitable for work or activities in the community, but Karnet undertook to review this. Occupational health and safety systems had only been revived a few months before then inspection and vigilance will be required to ensure that this continues. The reestablishment of a prisoner transport service to Karnet has been invaluable for ensuring an effective service for medical and funeral escorts for prisoners.
- 2.135 Orientation processes at Karnet had been significantly upgraded from what was observed at the previous inspection, although there needs to be more recognition of the potential for distress in a prisoner's first days at Karnet. It was notable that efforts to contain bullying in the prison had been significantly improved from the last inspection. Aboriginal prisoners felt somewhat marginalised; their low number was a matter of concern and they needed better channels of communication with staff.
- 2.136 Visit arrangements at Karnet were essentially good, but adequate shade and seating is lacking in the visits area and a visitor service centre is required outside the perimeter fence. The Inspectorate was concerned about aspects of child safety given the cross traffic and large areas in visits that could not effectively be supervised by staff. The need for

adequate shade is also an issue for the children's play area and works must be undertaken to address this. Toilets in the visits area need to be relocated for security reasons. More support is required for the few prisoners from remote regions, interstate or overseas to enable them to maintain contact with their families.

- 2.137 Recreation had been significantly enhanced since the last inspection due to the installation of a new gymnasium and a range of outdoor facilities. The program for prisoners in the over-40s age group was a commendable initiative and the weights gym remained popular. However, we were concerned about the poor state of repair of some of this equipment and injuries caused by incorrect use. Chaplaincy, canteen and catering services at the prison were all found to be satisfactory.
- 2.138 The inspection team found Karnet to have well-managed, quality health services, although access to ancillary and specialist services had been under-funded. Pharmacotherapy functioned well despite a lack of training provided to local staff. The risk of Q fever in the farm was a new challenge requiring ongoing attention. Health promotion efforts included the Pit-Stop program, the creation of 48 smoke-free cells, reviews of catering and canteen supplies and the over-40s recreation program.
- 2.139 Support services comprised a PCS counsellor, and a prison support officer who coordinated the peer support program. These services were effective, but only part-time.
- 2.140 The appointment of an acting case management coordinator was welcomed, as was the establishment of case management processes in Karnet, with contact reports completed for all eligible prisoners in the month before the inspection. This should enhance dynamic security, unit management and care of prisoners.
- 2.141 The prison was found to offer the most extensive range of meaningful work opportunities in the state, and the gratuity profile had been amended as previously recommended to better reflect efforts made by those working non-standard and long hours. However, while good efforts continued in the area of community work, much more could be done, especially if a work camp were to be created. There were also excellent results in education and training despite limitations in staffing and classroom space. The removal of all computers for security reasons was seen as punitive and should be addressed through provision of substitutes if similar circumstances arise in future.
- 2.142 Programs generally in the Western Australian prison system have suffered greatly from a lack of resources and difficulties attracting and retaining trained staff. The MASU program had been cancelled at all prisons and delays were threatening the medium-intensity sex offenders program due to staffing issues. *Think First*, the new cognitive skills program, was not operating consistently at Karnet at the time of the inspection. Prisoners had legitimate concerns that the new Prisoners Review Board would view failure to address offending behaviour negatively, despite non-availability of the program. However, re-entry services did appear to be operating effectively at Karnet.
- 2.143 Thus while Karnet was found in general to be functioning well (and in some areas significantly better than had been the case in the previous inspection) attention was still

needed to a number of areas. This included matters arising from the security fence and gatehouse, the failure to provide ongoing training to staff, the safety of children in visits, the need to upgrade prisoner accommodation, the need to extend prisoner support services, the opportunity to extend community work and the need to restore effective programs to support the rehabilitation of prisoners.

Chapter 3

STRATEGIC CONTEXT: SECURING THE FUTURE

A QUESTION OF SUSTAINABILITY

- 3.1 In February 2007 the Department received the final report of the condition and compliance audit of the Karnet site services commissioned by the Department of Housing and Works.⁶⁰ The audit assessed the status of and options for water supply, waste-water and electrical services.
- 3.2 The audit found that the existing potable water supply infrastructure is generally in satisfactory condition and that a significant reduction in potable water demand could be achieved by implementing an effective demand management strategy. Options to secure 100 per cent reliability for existing demand include harvesting additional water from the two existing soaks and increasing the storage capacity of the main dam. The audit also considered and costed the option of connecting to scheme water which would likely be needed if the population at Karnet exceeded 240. The audit found the waste-water infrastructure to be in relatively good condition and, with some modifications, capable of supporting a prisoner population of approximately 300.
- 3.3 The electrical infrastructure was found to be of variable quality. Some of the plant and equipment is old: the emergency power plant is 30 years old. The audit also noted that since the site inception in the early 1960s there has been significant growth in the administrative functions, accommodation and industry and farm workshops for the needs of the prisoners. There has been a continuous upgrade process and this method is recommended as appropriate for the prison. The dairy already has a separate power feed from Western Power; another feed for the abattoir was recommended by the audit report.
- 3.4 The most recent impost on the electrical system was the construction of the perimeter fence system which includes 39 CCTV cameras, electronic early detection and extensive night lighting systems. In addition, the Department is currently finalising the installation of a site-wide mobile duress system for staff and official visitors. The emergency power generator is 30 years old and requires replacement. There are some other compliance issues that require remediation, notably provision or upgrade of emergency and exit lighting and detection systems to comply with the Building Code of Australia 2005.
- 3.5 The audit report indicated that about \$1.64 million is required to address the issues it identified and to enable Karnet to continue to operate in the medium to long term. On this basis, a prisoner population of 240 would be sustainable, representing an increase of 66 over the current capacity. Potable water was the primary limiting factor to a larger capacity. The audit noted that if the prison was connected to the mains water supply, at an estimated additional cost of \$2 million, the site could accommodate up to 300 prisoners.
- 3.6 However, in his exit debrief, the Inspector made the point that the Department of Housing and Works audit report was compiled:

without consultation with those people on the ground who best understand the local conditions, problems and potential. After spending two hours going around the whole

60 Department of Housing and Works: *Karnet Prison Farm – Condition and Compliance Audit of Site Services* (February 2007).

water-related infrastructure with them, I believe that the official report actually under-estimates the viability of Karnet.⁶¹

It is the Inspectorate's view, that local management should always be integrally involved in long-term planning affecting the future of a prison.

LAND USE CONTESTABILITY

3.7 The Government's *State Infrastructure Strategy* (the Green Paper) notes that 'conflicting demands to use land for different purposes, which may be driven by environmental, social or economic considerations, can affect land allocation'.⁶² The Department's *Strategic Asset Plan* adopts this statement as a starting point. Despite Alcoa Australia's failure in its submission to mention an interest in the Karnet Prison site, it was claimed in discussions with them and with the Department of Industries and Resources that 'Alcoa would like to mine bauxite at the site commencing in approximately 2012'.⁶³

3.8 The *Strategic Asset Plan* notes that Alcoa's exports are worth some \$2.8 billion annually, and that this could be lifted significantly with the upgrade of its Pinjarra refinery and proposed expansion of its Wagerup refinery. It concludes:

Due to these factors and the economic advantages to the State for the Karnet site to be use for mining rather than custodial purposes, the Department has planned for the replacement of the Karnet facility by 2012.

3.9 This presents as a 'lay-down *miserere*', but it should not be regarded as such. While Alcoa may well have an interest in the site, this should be considered as something of an ambit claim over an area with considerable environmental and social values, not only as a site with immense value to the state as a major custodial asset. The plan lacks any detailed discussion on the cost to the state of the loss of these values and whether the state and others affected will be appropriately compensated. The full replacement cost to the community for a new prison on a green-fields site would be considerable, possibly over \$100 million. Further, there is no consideration about the possibilities, merits and opportunity costs of mining elsewhere.

It is the Inspectorate's firm view that continued use and development of Karnet as a custodial site fits neatly into the first aspect of the Green Paper's proposed land use planning framework, to deliver the state's development objectives and to 'provide essential facilities or expansions of essential facilities in a compatible manner and with a minimum of social and environmental impact'.⁶⁴ One of the most challenging issues for prisons is community acceptance; that is already established at Karnet and it is a social asset that should not be lightly discarded.

61 Stacey, RJ & Harding Prof R: *Karnet Prison Farm Inspection, 12th February – 16th February 2007, Exit Debrief*, Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services, (February 2007), 14.

62 Government of Western Australia: *Framework for the State Infrastructure Strategy – Green Paper*, (September 2006), 52.

63 Department of Corrective Services (DCS): *Strategic Asset Plan 2007-2027*, Corporate Support, (January 2007), 33.

64 Government of Western Australia: *Framework for the State Infrastructure Strategy – Green Paper*, (September 2006), 52.

CONCLUSION

- 3.10 The decision to fence prisoner accommodation and adjacent areas of Karnet was made in haste as a political response to public outcry following two high profile escapes in March 2005.⁶⁵ The cost was initially estimated at \$5.54 million, but it is believed to have cost over \$12 million, including remediation work and installation of a mobile duress alarm system. As we have seen, this investment enhances security insofar as it can be expected to prevent escapes or smuggling operations at night. However, the public may well be sceptical as to the value of such an investment if the prison is closed in the near future as envisaged in the Department's current Capital Investment Plan.⁶⁶
- 3.11 The Mahoney Inquiry noted that this state has more than 'twice as many minimum-security prisoners as it has places for them in minimum-security prisons'.⁶⁷ Since that inquiry the proportion, but not the numbers, of minimum-security prisoners has fallen, as increasing numbers of remandees have relentlessly increased the total custodial population. As maximum- and medium-security prisons plan to accommodate more prisoners through double-bunking, there is no doubt that minimum-security facilities like Karnet are a crucial component of the system. Indeed, if more minimum-security prisoners are able to be accommodated at minimum-security prisons and prison farms, then less pressure will be placed on higher-security facilities.
- 3.12 This report has noted that significant further investments will be needed in coming years to maintain, refurbish and remediate deficiencies at Karnet in various areas. It has suggested, for example, that prisoner accommodation in Unit 1 is past its 'use-by date' and should be replaced. Education and training must be better accommodated. Expenditures are required to guarantee utilities for the medium to long term.
- 3.13 It was also noted earlier that operational costs have escalated at Karnet. Although we acknowledge that a significant proportion of costs is related to the farm operations, the high operational costs have little to do with the inherent nature of the site. These costs appear to have more to do with system-wide changes in prisoner management and the installation of the security fence and gatehouse. Nevertheless, the way to gain maximum benefit from such operational expenses and capital investments is to spread the load across a larger number of prisoners, something that is achievable at Karnet with appropriate government commitment.
- 3.14 With a minimum-security population one can build to a domestic-plus level of robustness, so at once the per-bed construction costs become much more manageable than at a medium- or maximum-security prison. Not only should Karnet's Unit 1 be replaced by a new 64-bed unit, but a further 64-bed unit should be built, bringing the total capacity of Karnet to 242. Parts of Unit 1, if refurbished, may well prove suitable as a centre for education, training and programs and other activities.

65 Mahoney D, *Inquiry into the Management of Offenders in Custody and in the Community* (November 2005), chapter 3.

66 DCS, *Capital Investment Plan 2007–2008 to 2016–2017* (25 October 2006).

67 Mahoney D, *Inquiry into the Management of Offenders in Custody and in the Community* (November 2005) [5.67].

- 3.15 The Inspectorate suggests that by improving Karnet in this way, some 68 beds could be added to the prison estate quite quickly, given the will, funding and vision. This would contrast with the long lead times required for the construction of new or replacement prisons, or even for extra units within existing medium- or maximum-security prisons. Such a proposal is very much in line with recommendation 10 of the Mahoney Inquiry, which called for a strategy both to increase the capacity of existing minimum-security prisons, and to provide for future accommodation requirements of minimum-security prisoners.⁶⁸

Recommendation 21

That the Department's infrastructure and recurrent funding plans be revised to reflect a commitment to the continuation, improvement and expansion of Karnet Prison Farm, in the medium and longer terms. This should include construction of two 64-bed units (one to replace the existing Unit 1) and of other service delivery infrastructure (especially for education, training, employment and programs) for an effective prisoner population of approximately 240.

68 Ibid, Recommendation 10.

Appendix 1

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>1. That the Department of Corrective Services undertake a system-wide review of staffing levels for health, education and other offender services, especially in light of escalating prisoner populations.</p>	<p>Supported in principle subject to funding / Moderate</p> <p>The Department acknowledges that levels of resourcing of health, education and other offender services have not increased commensurate with the increase in prisoner population. This situation is directly linked to the available funding for these services, which has not increased to allow services to grow to address increased demand. The Department supports a system-wide review of staffing levels, subject to funding.</p>
<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>2. That the position of Training Officer be filled as soon as practicable and that a comprehensive training-needs analysis be conducted in consultation with staff, management, the Corrective Services Academy and other stakeholders, and a staff training strategy be developed and implemented as a high priority.</p>	<p>Supported subject to funding / Acceptable</p> <p>The Satellite Training Project will result in the appointment of Staff Development Officers (SDO) in prisons across the state. Working in partnership with local management and the Academy, SDOs will implement a site-specific staff development strategy, which meets the needs of the Department, Division and prison. Training delivery shall be quality-assured, on-site, accessible and cost effective; while provided primarily for Adult Custodial staff, it will also be available for all other staff.</p> <p>SDOs will report through to the Manager Satellite Training (Corrective Services Academy), who will provide support and ensure a collaborative, coordinated approach to satellite training across the state.</p>
<p>Correctional value for money</p> <p>3. That Karnet Prison Farm be made the base for coordination of the prison system's food production system, to secure efficiencies and security of supply. A consolidated and comprehensive farm plan including detail for each prison farm, should be maintained annually.</p>	<p>Supported / Acceptable</p> <p>An Integrated Farm Management Plan has been developed for 2007/2008.</p> <p>Karnet Prison Farm will coordinate monthly Farm Management Meetings to ensure consistent primary industry practice during the production of meat, milk and fruit and notations recorded of actions identified throughout the meeting.</p> <p>Action complete.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Custody and security</p> <p>4. That, once the capital works associated with the fence project and the duress alarm system have been handed over by the contractors, the prison should (in conjunction with the Director State Security and the Special Services Branch) conduct a full site security review to test and adjust the emergency plans and routine orders that have been drafted.</p>	<p>Supported / Low</p> <p>The State Security Manager has been requested to review Karnet Prison Farm's security procedures including the mobile duress alarm system. The review will test and adjust emergency plans to ensure they operate as drafted. Currently Karnet Prison Farm has had practical completion on the gatehouse and is awaiting practical completion on the new fence security surveillance and mobile duress alarm systems. Upon practical completion and handover of these areas testing will be able to take place, which is tentatively scheduled for September 2007.</p>
<p>Custody and security</p> <p>5. That support be given to ensure that the low-security operational culture of the prison is not adversely affected by the new fence. The front gate should remain open during the normal working day, unless exceptional circumstances arise.</p>	<p>Supported / Acceptable</p> <p>Standard Operational Procedures are in place to ensure the gate is open during the day and the management team at Karnet Prison Farm will actively monitor the operational culture and take appropriate corrective actions as necessary.</p>
<p>Custody and security</p> <p>6. That Karnet Prison review current arrangements and establish better systems to ensure compliance with procedural security standards, including searching and drug testing. These methods should be compatible with Adult Custodial record-keeping and reporting to enable prison system comparison.</p>	<p>Supported / Low</p> <p>The Department has already established both an Operations Compliance Branch and a comprehensive testing framework that will enable both independent (centralised) audits and local testing practices to occur. Additionally, Karnet Prison Farm have conducted a review incorporating considerations for enhancing compliance with security standards and as a result have appointed two extra Unit Managers. This has resulted in improvements in reports being submitted to the Operations Manager on a daily basis and the results of cell searches and substance testing are entered onto TOMS in keeping with established record keeping frameworks to enable prison system comparisons.</p> <p>Action Complete.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Custody and security</p> <p>7. That the Department audit the application of the Justice Drug Plan across all prisons to identify operational risk and service improvements. The plan was first issued in 2003 and the inspection at Karnet shows that several aspects have either not been implemented or that the service delivery should be strengthened.</p>	<p>Supported in part / Acceptable</p> <p>The corporate application of the Justice Drug Plan will be factored into the Operational Compliance Framework across the State.</p>
<p>Custody and security</p> <p>8. That the occupational safety and health system at Karnet be maintained as a high priority. There should also be further consideration on the question of the impact of substance misuse by prisoners on workplace safety.</p>	<p>Supported / Low</p> <p>The responsibility of prisoner employment has now been delegated to the Unit One Manager enabling tighter controls. Also an industrial rover is now permanently located within the main industrial area controlling prisoner movement and providing additional supervision. Furthermore the dangers of drug use have now been incorporated into the prisoners Occupational Safety and Health induction. The Business Manager conducts Occupational Safety and Health meetings on a regular basis and identifies risks.</p> <p>Action Complete.</p>
<p>Racism, Aboriginality and equality</p> <p>9. That the Karnet Prison Farm Business Plan include a strategy aimed at increasing the proportion of indigenous prisoners. This should include a review of any issues militating against their selection for transfer to Karnet, steps aimed at strengthening the communication and understanding between indigenous prisoners and staff and of enhancing welfare support and cultural opportunities for indigenous prisoners.</p>	<p>Supported / Acceptable</p> <p>The Department is currently reviewing the Governance Frameworks that influence prisoner population levels in conjunction with the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services.</p> <p>An Indigenous Services Committee commenced on the 19th July 2007 to strengthen the communication between staff and prisoners at Karnet Prison Farm. Initial meetings are being held fortnightly with a view to going monthly with all meetings being minuted. Training Branch to be requested to provide cultural awareness training to commence in October 2007.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>10. That a visitor services facility be established at Karnet. In the interim, a shaded waiting area with seats should be provided.</p>	<p>Supported subject to funding / Acceptable</p> <p>A visitor services facility will be constructed throughout 2007/08 with an end date by February 2008.</p> <p>Under the existing arrangement there is adequate shade and shelter to enable the Department to place park benches under the trees near the current access point.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>11. That the Department review visits arrangements at Karnet Prison Farm to ensure that children are fully protected.</p>	<p>Supported / Low</p> <p>Visit arrangements have been reviewed and whilst no issues have been identified, additional staff will be placed in the visits area within nominated workstations located at critical points. This will ensure greater observation and protection for visitors and their children. Work on observation workstations to commence immediately with the appointment of additional staff to commence in September 2007 when new staff arrive. Local orders and procedures to be amended by the end of August 2007.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>12. That shade be installed over the children's play area as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>Supported subject to funding / Acceptable</p> <p>Funding has been established within Karnet Prison Farm's 2007/08 budget and the project is to go out to tender in August 2007 with completion of project expected by the end of 2007.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>13. That toilets for visitors be provided in a location where the entrance may be supervised by staff.</p>	<p>Supported subject to funding / Acceptable</p> <p>Provision of new toilets in the new entrance is subject to funding.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>14.(a) That the Department consider provision of secure supervised and recorded video conference connections over the internet to prisoners with family in other regions, states and countries, given</p>	<p>Supported in principle / Acceptable</p> <p>Karnet Prison Farm currently has this facility for prisoners. Action Complete.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>the increasing popularity and effectiveness of this technology around the world.</p> <p>(b) That the Department broadly review its management of prisoner computers and prisoners' access to computers.</p>	<p>Supported / High</p> <p>The Department is currently reviewing its management of prisoner computers and prisoner's access to computers. It is anticipated that this review will be completed by August 2007.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>15.(a) That the operation of the gymnasium, the quality of the equipment available and arrangements for supervision and training be reviewed.</p> <p>(b) That the cancellation of external sporting activities be reviewed as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Supported / Acceptable</p> <p>\$30,000 has been spent on the implementation of a new gymnasium area within the new recreation building. Health Services continue to provide education support in this area. The Jarrahdale oval is no longer required by the prison as Karnet Prison Farm has now established its own oval. Furthermore an additional playing field is currently being established which will be available in January 2008. Metropolitan indoor recreational activities have been re-established providing additional recreation activities to prisoners. Action Complete.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>16. That prisoner support systems at Karnet be reviewed with consideration given to extending the Prisoner Counselling Service and to ensuring all custodial staff and peer supporters have relevant training in suicide prevention.</p>	<p>Not supported / Acceptable</p> <p>The report indicates that Prisoner Counselling Service is available at Karnet Prison Farm for three days per week. Given that all referrals are being serviced in a timely fashion, it would appear that the current staffing of 0.6 FTE is adequate.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Reparation</p> <p>17. That the Department, in conjunction with Karnet Prison administration, review the operation of the community work program in consultation with stakeholders, develop an ongoing consultative mechanism, identify opportunities to extend the program (including creation of a work camp or mobile work camp) and commit to the necessary resources to extend the program.</p>	<p>Supported subject to funding / Acceptable</p> <p>Karnet Prison Farm has sought the assistance of Media and Public Affairs to establish the consultative committee with the first meeting to develop a framework, scheduled for September 2007. Preliminary contact has also been made with the local shire and relevant stakeholders who have indicated their support. Karnet Prison Farm plans to have the committee fully operational by December 2007.</p>
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>18. That Education Branch purchase and store sufficient computers to respond to future security events in order to minimise inappropriate disruption to service delivery, until such time as a fully networked and secure system can facilitate timely administration, backups and auditing of educational computers.</p>	<p>Not supported / Low</p> <p>The incident at Karnet Prison Farm, where the Education Centre computers were withdrawn for security checks, was a one off event. Education Centre computers, throughout the State, have now been configured so that CSC are the only people who can load anything onto the computers</p>
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>19. That the Department develop a plan to establish a learning centre precinct in Karnet Prison Farm of sufficient scale to meet the existing and future needs of prisoners in education and vocational skills development. There should also be interim arrangements to improve service delivery through increased funds, increased staffing levels and the provision of temporary accommodation.</p>	<p>Supported in principle, subject to funding / Low</p> <p>A review of education capital works and ongoing service requirements for a range of prison sites was undertaken in July 2006. This has been submitted for consideration on an ongoing basis as part of the Departments wider strategic capital works program.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Rehabilitation</p>	<p>Supported in principle / Acceptable</p>
<p>20. That the range and frequency of delivery of offender programs, including <i>Think First</i>, be comprehensively reviewed to ensure that prisoners are appropriately prepared for release. The lessons learnt from this Karnet audit should be applied to all prisons with a re-entry profile to gauge the service gap.</p>	<p>The Department acknowledges a review of Offender Programs is required and will schedule for completion in accordance with existing priorities and prerequisites.</p>
<p>Correctional value for money</p>	<p>Not supported / Acceptable</p>
<p>21. That the Department's infrastructure and recurrent funding plans be revised to reflect a commitment to the continuation, improvement and expansion of Karnet Prison Farm, in the medium and longer terms. This should include construction of two 64-bed units (one to replace the existing Unit 1) and of other service delivery infrastructure (especially for education, training, employment and programs) for an effective prisoner population of approximately 240.</p>	<p>The Department is currently supporting the existing infrastructure at Karnet Prison Farm, but further expansion is problematic due to environmental considerations and the need for significant infrastructure support facilities in the event of an expansion.</p> <p>All prison capacity expansion options are considered on a holistic basis and currently an expansion at Karnet Prison Farm is not part of the Department's capital investment plan.</p> <p>Another consideration is the current nature of the prison population – Karnet Prison Farm is a minimum security prison and the need for additional minimum security capacity is not paramount at this stage.</p>

Appendix 2

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2005 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
1	<p>Correctional value for money</p> <p>REPORT NO. 26, REPORT OF AN ANNOUNCED INSPECTION OF KARNET PRISON FARM.</p> <p>That the Department develop a master plan for the future role of Karnet Prison, taking into account changing prisoner profiles, its re-entry policy and the prison's infrastructure requirements (paragraph 2.36).</p>		•			
2	<p>Administration and accountability of DCS</p> <p>That the Department review the process by which it allocates budgets to individual prison facilities to ensure that each prison is sufficiently funded for the proper delivery of all prisoner services (paragraph 2.5).</p>			•		
3	<p>Administration and accountability of DCS</p> <p>As part of a state-wide policy of devolving responsibility for policy implementation at an operational level, Karnet should enter into a Service Level Agreement with the Department. A compliance and auditing function within the Department should be established to monitor the implementation of such agreements (paragraph 2.13).</p>		•			
4	<p>Correctional value for money</p> <p>The Karnet Farm Plan must be finalised in the context of a total Prison Farms Plan so as to maximise valuable State assets and food chain production and to appropriately risk manage the prison system food supply (paragraph 2.22).</p>			•		
5	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>That the Department reassess the method for appointing staff to enable a more appropriate blend and selection of uniformed, industrial and non-uniformed staff to better meet the functions and objectives of the prison. This should include a performance management system for all staff (paragraph 2.32).</p>			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2005 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
6	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>That the Department and local Karnet management provide an environment for better integration of staff across uniformed, industrial and non-industrial lines. Such integration should aim to promote better service delivery to prisoners and enhance the achievement of the prison's key strategies (paragraph 2.33).</p>			•		
7	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>That the Department ensure that professional development is relevant to the re-entry function of Karnet and takes into consideration the prisoner profile accommodated at the prison (paragraph 3.9).</p>			•		
8	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>That the Department implement better strategies to address staff diversity (paragraph 3.12).</p>		•			
9	<p>Custody and security</p> <p>That the Department and Karnet management must act jointly to develop an approach to the use of illicit drugs that is more consistent with the new drug management strategies meets the operational needs of the prison and is clear to both staff and prisoners (paragraph 3.22).</p>		•			
10	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>That the Department provide comprehensive training and ongoing support for staff for the implementation of the new drug management strategies at Karnet (paragraphs 3.23 and 4.46).</p>		•			
11	<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>That the prisoner induction and orientation process at Karnet should be reassessed to provide a system that is more comprehensive, involves the prisoner support group and is properly documented (paragraph 4.7).</p>				•	

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2005 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
12	<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>That Karnet management and staff recognise the positive benefits that can be provided through the peer support group and that the group's services be better utilised to improve the care and wellbeing of prisoners (paragraph 4.10).</p>			•		
13	<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>That the Department better recognise the positive benefits of access to the Prisoner Counselling Service and that its services be better utilised to improve care and wellbeing to prisoners (paragraph 4.13).</p>			•		
14	<p>Health</p> <p>That Karnet put systems in place for the provision of regular organised physical and passive recreational activities for prisoners (paragraph 4.24).</p>			•		
15	<p>Custody and security</p> <p>That Karnet act immediately to address the increasing antagonism displayed towards the sex offender prisoner population to ensure the continued successful mainstreaming of the vulnerable prisoner population (paragraph 4.30).</p>			•		
16	<p>Administration and accountability of DCS</p> <p>That the Department urgently address the unacceptable standard of prisoner accommodation provided in Units 1 and 2 at Karnet, and concurrently finalise an infrastructure plan to address the future needs of the prison (paragraph 4.35).</p>		•			

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2005 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
17	<p>Reparation</p> <p>That the Department commit to better organisation, support and resourcing of Section 94 activities at Karnet and across the State as a whole to embrace the activity as an important mechanism in the re-entry strategy for prisoners as well as reparation to the community (paragraph 5.10).</p>		•			
18	<p>Reparation</p> <p>The Department amend the current gratuity profile to take into consideration prisoners who undertake work requiring commitment outside the normal working hours and conditions for prisoners, as a means to encourage participation in employment and appropriately reward work outside the standard practices (paragraph 5.13).</p>			•		
19	<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>That case management practices must be improved at Karnet and should incorporate the Department funding a dedicated case management officer and also that it provide ongoing training and support to staff to ensure the successful implementation of the case management policy (paragraph 6.10).</p>			•		
20	<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>That the Department urgently address deficiencies in the scheduling and delivery of prisoner treatment programs to ensure prisoners have completed their Individual Management Plan requirements before their earliest release date (paragraph 6.20).</p>	•				

Appendix 3

THE INSPECTION TEAM

Professor Richard Harding	Inspector of Custodial Services
Mr Robert Stacey	Deputy Inspector of Custodial Services
Mr Bill Cullen	Director Operations
Mr Cliff Holdom	Inspections and Research Officer
Ms Kate Hitchins	Inspections and Research Officer
Ms Fiona Paskulich	Inspections and Research Officer
Ms Vivien Hubbard	Inspections and Research Officer (seconded from the Department of Corrective Services)
Ms Dace Tomsons	Expert Advisor, Drug and Alcohol Office
Dr Stephen Patchett	Expert Advisor, Forensic Mental Health Service
Ms Cheryl Wilkins	Expert Advisor, Department of Education and Training



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR
OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

www.custodialinspector.wa.gov.au

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