



Report No.

50

April 2008

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR OF CUSTODIAL SERVICES

REPORT OF AN ANNOUNCED INSPECTION OF
RANGEVIEW JUVENILE REMAND CENTRE



Report of an Announced Inspection of
Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre

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

www.custodialinspector.wa.gov.au

April 2008

ISSN 1445-3134



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

Contents

THE INSPECTOR'S OVERVIEW

INCIPIENT CRISIS IN THE JUVENILE ESTATE	iii
---	-----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Methodology	3

CHAPTER 2

THE KEY STRATEGIC ISSUES AND PRESSURES	5
Building design and functionality.....	5
Housing a complex population of girls at Rangeview.....	8
Staffing issues.....	11
Custodial staff shortages.....	11
Custodial staff training and development.....	11
Dysfunctional departmental human resources administration	13
Staff relations and communication.....	14
Non-custodial staff.....	15
Chapter summary	16

CHAPTER 3

CASE MANAGEMENT AND THROUGH-CARE	17
Supervised Bail Program	17
Case management.....	19
Programs.....	20
State wards.....	21
Structured day – education and other learning activities	24
Education programs	25
Learning and reparative activities run by custodial staff	26
Recreation	27
Chapter summary	28

CHAPTER 4

MEETING THE DUTY OF CARE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE IN RANGEVIEW	29
Aboriginal detainees as the predominant group.....	29
Aboriginal Welfare Officers.....	29
Aboriginal Visitors Scheme.....	31
Regional Detainees.....	31
Community in-reach.....	32
Access to Legal Representation.....	33
Social Contact.....	34

Visits (including use of video link).....	34
Detainee telephone system and email	34
Admission and orientation	35
Health and mental health.....	37
Food, nutrition and the canteen.....	40
Basic amenities.....	41
Accommodation and cells.....	41
Clothing and laundry arrangements	42
Chapter summary	43
CHAPTER 5	
SAFE ENVIRONMENTS	44
Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and emergency management.....	44
Behaviour management, de-escalation and use of force.....	46
Confidentiality and Complaints.....	48
Transports and Escorts	49
Security	50
Chapter summary	52
CHAPTER 6	
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	53
Recommendations.....	53
APPENDIX 1	
THE DEPARTMENT’S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS	56
APPENDIX 2	
THE DEPARTMENT’S RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF REPORT 41, PART 1 (RELEVANT TO THE JUVENILE CUSTODIAL ESTATE)	64
APPENDIX 3	
SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2004 RECOMMENDATIONS	66
APPENDIX 4	
THE INSPECTION TEAM.....	76
APPENDIX 5	
KEY DATES	77

The Inspector's Overview

INCIPIENT CRISIS IN THE JUVENILE ESTATE

THE BACKGROUND

The numbers of juvenile detainees have increased dramatically over the last five years. Until 2003, a high combined figure for Rangeview Remand Centre and Banksia Hill Detention Centre was about 120; in 2008, we are regularly nudging 200. To compound matters, whereas five years ago about one-third of the detainees (40) were being held on remand, in 2008 about 60 per cent (120) are held on remand. The system is thus quite distorted, for the capacity of Rangeview (60 comfortably, 80 at the extreme) is smaller than that of Banksia Hill (90 comfortably, 120 at the extreme). At any given time, about 75 per cent of the total population are Aboriginal.

Worse than that, all girls – remand or convicted – are housed at Rangeview, pushing even more male remand juveniles into Banksia Hill, where their needs which are quite different from those of convicted boys are not necessarily well met.

ORGANISATIONAL AND STAFFING STRESSES

In these circumstances, the stress upon staff is almost unsustainable. In January 2007 an incident occurred at Rangeview whereby a boy was forcibly restrained in a manner that caused him injury. This Office conducted a review of the circumstances (see Report 41). We made a series of recommendations that the Department accepted and has implemented to the best of its ability. Without in any way watering down or resiling from the thrust of that Report, it is well understood that extreme workplace stress engenders the kind of cultural slippage that enables the occurrence of such events. One of the most reassuring findings of this inspection was that the culture of Rangeview seemed to have returned to its 'default setting' – namely, support and concern for the young people. It is as if the January 2007 incident had stopped everyone in their tracks and had caused a reassessment of where they had been heading.

It would be foolish to assume that this resumed cultural setting will necessarily endure. The rate of population increase has worsened even in the six months since the on-site phase of this inspection, and the loss of staff has continued. A very experienced Superintendent has left the Service, his job well done. There has also been a depletion of senior management at Head Office.

STRATEGIES FOR TRYING TO REDUCE THE POPULATION

In this context, we must either reduce the population ('front end intervention') or put in the infrastructure and the human resources for the increased population ('back end intervention'). At a broad criminal justice administration level, all the pressures seem to be pointing towards further increases: for example, targeted policing of certain matters such as sex offences, and greater police presences in Indigenous areas. That being so, both the Inspector and the President of the Children's Court have initiated moves to try to persuade agencies to work together more effectively either to keep the remand population down or to develop diversionary schemes.

The Inspector's role was to convene a series of Roundtable discussions during 2007 of those agencies whose remits brought them into contact with children entering or on the verge of the criminal justice system. These agencies included: Police; Corrective Services; Attorney-General's; the Children's Court; the Department for Child Protection; and the Aboriginal Legal Service. Each of these could fairly claim to be carrying out their assigned role; yet each was doing so without adequate grasp of the downstream impact that they may be having on the system as a whole.

The Roundtable process was carried out in a cooperative spirit, and during its continuation the remand population was pulled back reasonably satisfactorily. Perhaps this was causative, perhaps coincidental. However, the pattern of increasing population rapidly re-established itself after the Roundtable sequence ended in October 2007.

Meanwhile, the President of the Children's Court had been preparing a Diversion Workshop, held in March 2008, at which there was a wider representation of agencies. The purpose was slightly different: to establish a process for identifying convicted offenders whose circumstances merited intensive case-management by all the relevant agencies working together in an effort to reduce the likelihood of re-offending. The intention is, through piloting such a scheme, to develop better markers for identifying positive cases and models for inter-agency coordination.

The Auditor General has also joined in, initiating a Performance Review of the Juvenile Justice system from the time of first contact with the Police through to the time that the child is admitted to a detention centre. So it can be seen that there is widespread concern in governmental, judicial and bureaucratic circles, about a problem that is starting to seem intractable.

NEW INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES

As for the back end intervention (infrastructure and human resources), this involves a long lag between commitment and implementation. Three years earlier, the Inspector had recommended the construction of a self-contained girls' unit at Banksia Hill; the available space and the contours of the land lent themselves to an appropriate solution, achieving separation with full and equivalent services. Capital funding was granted but recurrent funding refused. This meant that the proposed new area would have to be constructed in a location where it could be operated with existing staff. So a decision was forced upon the Department to shoe-horn a new building into the claustrophobic space of Rangeview. To do so would involve knocking over as much old accommodation as would be made available with the new accommodation. In other words, not a single extra bed would be added to the system.

In the course of this inspection, the folly of this proposal became starkly evident. We have accordingly recommended that the Rangeview construction proposal be abandoned, and the Department and the Minister have accepted this: see Recommendation 4 and the formal response. That is at least a start.

But the real challenge is now to obtain capital and recurrent funding to do what should have been done in the first place – to build appropriate accommodation for girls on the Banksia Hill site. The Department must now put together a properly argued business case for the Minister to take to the Expenditure Review Committee and Cabinet. In recent years Western Australia has lagged behind all other jurisdictions in its commitment to new corrective services facilities, partly because of the business cases being poorly-presented but partly also because of a misguided notion that to replace degraded infrastructure or to expand overall capacity is somehow to encourage the courts to impose detention or prison sentences. That particular horse has already bolted, however. The time for shilly-shallying has gone. The expansion of juvenile accommodation, not only for girls but generally, must be fast-tracked. This is not just a matter of good governance but also one of the State's duty of care and responsibility for the welfare of juveniles who come within the criminal justice system.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT ISSUES

In 2007, the Inspector's office took on responsibility for the environmental health assessments of prisons, juvenile detention centres and other custodial places. This function specifically resided with the Public Health Division of the Department of Health under section 40 of the *Prisons Act*. However, the terms of the *Inspector of Custodial Services Act 2003* clearly authorised the Inspector also to inspect such matters. It was agreed that, to avoid duplication and to strengthen the Inspector's functions, environmental health matters would be handled by the Inspector's office by a health inspector duly authorised by the *Health Act* provisions.

Correspondence between the Inspector and the Department referred to the protocols to be followed. In essence, care had to be taken in melding a jurisdictional area that was supported by mandatory powers (environmental health assessment under the *Health Act* authorisation) with an overall inspection system dependent for its efficacy on the quality of its work, its persuasive thrust, its ability to bypass the Department and deal with the Minister, and its transparency by way of reporting to Parliament and dealing in the media.

The Inspector emphasised to the Department that the use of the mandatory powers would be regulated in-house in such a way as to take account of legitimate correctional priorities as to the allocation of funds and resources. On the other hand, identified environmental health issues could not be ignored but must be the subject of an Action Plan to take effect over a reasonable time-frame. There was also the question of how to handle a very detailed and evidence-based environmental health assessment report within the general format of an inspection report under the *Inspector of Custodial Services Act 2003*.

The Rangeview inspection was the first occasion on which this model could be road-tested. A separate detailed environmental health assessment report was sent to the Department for attention in January 2008. The report and covering letter from the Inspector identified five categories of concern, with 13 specific recommendations for action. Urgent matters were identified that required attention within 28 working days. Longer-term or more complex

issues were also identified, and an action plan was requested to be submitted to the Inspector within 42 working days.

The five main categories of concern identified were:

- Food and goods deliveries and storage;
- Occupational health and safety issues relevant to both staff and detainees;
- General storage issues and the usage of space including hairdressing arrangements;
- Many examples of very poor maintenance and unacceptable levels of cleanliness and hygiene; and
- Inadequate recognition of the need for programs and training for staff in relation to health and occupational health and safety issues.

These categories are reiterated in this Inspection Report (see paragraph 2.3).

At the time of writing this Overview, progress has been made towards addressing most of the environmental health recommendations. This was determined during a follow up visit to the centre on 25 February 2008, subsequent to receiving the Department's formal response and action plan. The main outstanding issue not satisfactorily addressed was the poor conditions in the external store room. However, the Office has since been notified that works on the store room have now commenced. Most other outstanding issues require approvals for funding or inclusion into the Department's overall works program, and as such cannot be actioned locally by Rangeview's management.

Overall, the Department's response to the first environmental health assessment report has been positive, with local management particularly cooperative and committed to improving conditions in a timely manner. However, it was obvious that previous environmental health assessments (conducted by Department of Health) had not been satisfactorily acknowledged or understood at a Head Office level, so that issues had rarely been rectified.

This new model of environmental health assessment thus, at this early stage, would seem to have brought some extra accountability into the general inspection system. The Inspector's office will continue to refine and enhance this approach in future inspections.

Richard Harding
Inspector of Custodial Services

31st March 2008.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

- 1.1 All children remanded into custody in Western Australia are initially brought to Rangeview Remand Centre ('Rangeview'), regardless of gender or where the young person lives. There are no juvenile detention facilities outside the metropolitan area, so aside from short stays in police lock-ups following arrest (and prior to attending court), young people from regional Western Australia are transported to custodial facilities in Perth. While most remain at Rangeview for the duration of their remand period, population pressures require some boys to be transferred to Banksia Hill Detention Centre ('Banksia Hill'), which usually accommodates sentenced juveniles.
- 1.2 In recent times Rangeview has had a very high throughput of admissions, or 'churn' in the population. In the first six months of 2007 there were 893 admissions of 587 individuals (187 young people were admitted multiple times during that period).¹ In the 2006–2007 financial year there were 1688 admissions, and a daily average population of 47.² Most of the detainees did not subsequently receive a custodial sentence from the courts.³
- 1.3 The average length of remand detention has increased significantly since the centre opened in 1994 from three days to 17 days at the time of this inspection in October 2007.⁴ The rate of remand has increased noticeably since 2004, particularly for Aboriginal juveniles.⁵ The overall juvenile custodial population now typically comprises about 60 per cent on remand and 40 per cent sentenced, the reverse of the situation at the time of the first inspection in 2004. With a design capacity of 56 and double-bunked operational capacity of 64, Rangeview cannot accommodate all remandees.⁶ In consequence, there has been a shift in population to Banksia Hill, which was previously reserved for sentenced juveniles. The daily average remand population in juvenile detention for the 2006–2007 year was about 77 (47 at Rangeview and 30 at Banksia Hill), in addition to the sentenced population.⁷
- 1.4 Another factor adding to the complexity of the population at Rangeview is that the centre now holds all female juvenile detainees, including sentenced girls previously held at Banksia Hill. In October 2005, following a sexual encounter between a male and female detainee at Banksia Hill, a decision was made to accommodate both sentenced and unsentenced girls at Rangeview. Following an inspection of Banksia Hill in March 2005, this Office supported

1 Figures taken from Rangeview's local database statistics, provided by the centre for the inspection.

2 Department of Corrective Services, *Annual Report 2006–2007* (September 2007).

3 Research by the Department of Corrective Services ('the Department') conducted throughout 2005 and 2006 revealed that 87% to 95% of young people remanded in custody did not subsequently receive a custodial sentence to detention. See Department of Corrective Services, *Review of Remand Admissions to Rangeview Remand Centre* (November 2006).

4 Information from the Superintendent's verbal briefing to the inspection team, 7 October 2007.

5 Department of Corrective Services, *Review of Remand Admissions to Rangeview Remand Centre* (November 2006) 5.

6 The Department has since identified the maximum capacity of Rangeview (that is, the actual number of beds in cells) as 80. However, when the operational capacity of 64 is exceeded, there are not sufficient staff to maintain supervision levels (requiring additional staff working on overtime or contingency measures involving additional detainee lockdown periods) and infrastructure at the centre becomes further stressed. These capacity figures are also affected by the number of girls held in the centre, as detainee living quarters must be segregated by gender.

7 Figures from Department of Corrective Services, *Annual Report 2006–2007* (September 2007) 39.

INTRODUCTION

the notion that all girls should be accommodated together to improve access to services and reduce disadvantage to the very small populations of remanded and sentenced girls. The Office preferred Banksia Hill for this purpose, given the larger size of the site available to build a dedicated precinct for the girls, and access to a wider range of services (such as Case Planning and Education) compared to Rangeview.⁸ However, the Department has since approved funding for the building of a dedicated girls unit at Rangeview, citing the smaller size of the centre and possibility of closer supervision of girls as a reason for this choice.⁹ Chapter 2 identifies a number of concerns regarding the proposed new girls unit, and highlights that Rangeview may not be the best option for the ongoing placement of the girls.

- 1.5 At the time of transfer of the girls, the then Minister for Justice also decided that male and female detainees were to be separated in all but a few highly supervised, structured activities until further notice.¹⁰ This directive was still in place at Rangeview at the time of the inspection, and consequently the girls were managed under an extremely restrictive regime.
- 1.6 The detention of sentenced juveniles at Rangeview is at odds with the underlying philosophy of the centre, which is geared towards moving young people out of custody and back into the community as soon as possible, seeing custody as the last resort. This attitude is appropriately taken in line with governing legislation and international standards for juvenile justice promoting that young people should always only ever be kept in custody for the minimum time and only where it is absolutely necessary.¹¹
- 1.7 There can at times be a tension between this intent and that of other agencies involved in the juvenile justice process. For example, police, courts and the Department for Child Protection may have different priorities for managing young people on remand. Bail options may not be easily facilitated at time of arrest, or custody may be seen as respite for family and community members. Additionally, the lack of available services in the community, or the unlikelihood of many detainees accessing services in the community has led to some agencies seeing detention as a ‘window of opportunity’ to deliver services (such as health care, education, treatment programs, harm minimisation and preventative information) which may otherwise not be accessed. For some young people in detention, Rangeview offers a safe, stable and healthy alternative to their lives in the community. A shortage of community placements and services has made Rangeview the default position for placement of difficult young people, blurring the lines between custodial services and welfare services. There needs to be an increase in the provision of community services to address such issues as the lack of accommodation and support services, to prevent some young people being detained unnecessarily.
- 1.8 Another development in the detainee population since the last inspection is that many detainees have become more volatile, unpredictable and unsettled, with a shift in drug-use

8 Harding R, *Exit Debrief: Banksia Hill Juvenile Detention Centre Inspection, 21 – 24 March 2005* (30 March 2005).

9 Department of Justice, *Briefing for the Minister of Justice – Review of Female Detainees in Rangeview Remand Centre* (3 November 2005) 1.

10 Prior to this incident, boys and girls engaged in some mixed-gender activities (such as education and recreation) under supervision of staff, when it was assessed as suitable.

11 *Young Offenders Act 1994* (WA) s 7(h); and United Nations *Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty*, adopted by General Assembly resolution 45/113 of 14 December 1990, Rule 17.

INTRODUCTION

patterns and mental health issues in the community. In addition, there are a lot of newer and less-experienced officers in the centres who have not yet built up the confidence and experience to deal with such volatility on a routine basis.

- 1.9 However, it was clear to the inspection team that the dedication of staff (including custodial, non-custodial, management, visiting service providers and support staff) to improving the circumstances of each detainee remained. This was despite increasing pressures from staff shortages, the increasing detainee population and the reduced infrastructure capacity. It was observed that relationships between detainees and staff were focused on establishing rapport and mutual respect, with a rejection of the use of (adult) prison-style management, language and attitude. Daily life in the centre provided a well-ordered and caring environment in which boundaries and behavioural expectations were made clear and were reinforced through respectful but firm discipline.

METHODOLOGY

- 1.10 The report of this Office's first inspection of Rangeview, undertaken in June 2004, gives a detailed description and analysis of the activities and services provided at the centre.¹² The present report details findings of the Inspectorate's second announced inspection of the facility undertaken in October 2007. While it does provide an outline of the centre's operation, this report concentrates on those areas that have changed since the first inspection or that are seen to require particular attention following the second inspection.
- 1.11 The assessment of progress against the recommendations made in the first report was a focus of this inspection. Generally, progress in all areas highlighted for attention in previous recommendations has been satisfactory.¹³ This report highlights areas that persist as strategic pressures and identifies areas for improvement including any new issues arising during the inspection. Any previous recommendations not satisfactorily addressed (and still relevant to the operations of the centre) are restated in the body of this report.
- 1.12 The inspection consisted of two phases over a period of months – the pre-inspection phase and the on-site phase. The pre-inspection phase involved conducting surveys of staff and detainees; requesting and analysing documents provided by the Department of Corrective Services ('the Department'); reviewing records of all liaison visits to the centre since the previous inspection; and consulting with community-based service providers and agencies having regular contact with the centre. The pre-inspection phase concluded with a series of panel discussions on key service areas with the relevant managers and a briefing from the executive of the juvenile justice division of the Department.
- 1.13 The on-site phase occurred over a week, from 7–12 October 2007. On-site inspection activities included direct observation of activities and resources; interviews, meetings and focus groups with detainees, staff and management; and further analysis of relevant

12 See Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services (OICS), *Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre*, Report No. 29 (August 2005) for more information on the functions and services at Rangeview and the findings of the first inspection.

13 In some cases the recommendations of the first inspection were no longer relevant in respect to the current operations of the centre.

INTRODUCTION

documentation and other evidence.

- 1.14 The inspection team was comprised of inspection staff from the Office and several expert advisers: representatives from the Department of Education and Training; Department of Health; Drug and Alcohol Office; and the State Ombudsman's Office. Additionally, an environmental health inspector participated in the inspection. This represented a new function for the Office with environmental health inspections previously performed separately by the Department of Health.
- 1.15 As with the first inspection, the nationally endorsed Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators (AJJA) standards¹⁴ were used as a reference point for inspection activities, in addition to relevant international standards and current policy and legislation governing juvenile justice in Western Australia. This is in line with the Office's move towards a standards-driven model of inspection. The Office has already established a *Code of Inspection Standards* for adult prisons¹⁵ and a research officer attended this inspection to inform the development of inspection standards to be used in the Office's future inspections of juvenile detention facilities.
- 1.16 Key themes of the inspection identified in the planning process were:
- the increase and 'churn' in the juvenile remand population;
 - the management of Aboriginal detainees, recognising the differences between those from regional/remote areas and those from urban areas; and
 - the management of female detainees.

The subsequent chapters of this report draw out these key issues and other strategic findings of the inspection.

14 Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators, *Standards for Juvenile Custodial Facilities* (revised 1999).

15 OICS, *Code of Inspection Standards for Adult Custodial Services*, Version 1 (April 2007).

Chapter 2

THE KEY STRATEGIC ISSUES AND PRESSURES

- 2.1 Rangeview was experiencing a number of pressures at the time of the inspection. The centre was struggling to house a burgeoning population, which was becoming more complex and volatile, and was also coping with a new population of sentenced girls with case management needs not previously encountered or met at Rangeview. This was occurring in the context of limited staff resources, limited space and ageing infrastructure which made the management of the population more challenging.

BUILDING DESIGN AND FUNCTIONALITY

- 2.2 The physical infrastructure at Rangeview is struggling to cope with the demands of the current detainee population. Originally built for a population of 36 and expanded to 56 with the addition of an extra accommodation unit in 2000, the administrative and office space, storage space, kitchen, medical centre, staff lunchroom and other amenities were catering for almost double the original design capacity on a regular basis. Detainee accommodation capacity had been stretched to the limit during the early months of 2007, with all available cells being occupied.¹⁶ This included using bunks in Unit 1 which, as transit accommodation, should be used for single-cell occupancy only until sufficient at-risk assessment and cell-sharing suitability has been established.
- 2.3 The environmental health assessment of the centre undertaken during the inspection found that the centre was generally well maintained, although there were a number of areas needing attention. These were grouped into five categories of concern:
- food deliveries and storage;
 - occupational safety and health (OSH) issues;
 - general storage issues and the use of space in the centre;
 - maintenance and hygiene; and
 - programs and training in relation to health and OSH issues, for staff and detainees.

A detailed report outlining the specific areas for attention identified during the environmental health assessment was provided to the centre and the Department for action,¹⁷ and will be followed up at subsequent reviews.

- 2.4 An obvious deficiency in the centre was the lack of a suitable covered recreation area for detainees.¹⁸ This considerably limits the range of activities available during inclement or hot weather. In particular, sporting activities, detainee interaction during morning tea and lunch breaks, family days and other special events are inhibited by the lack of a covered recreational facility. Several days of the on-site inspection week were wet and cold, forcing detainees to remain indoors when they would otherwise have participated in outside

16 And again shortly after the inspection, when the population rose to 73 (including 28 girls) on the weekend of 17 November 2007, necessitating the use of all available cells in Unit 1 to house the overflow.

17 The environmental health assessment report was lodged with the Department on 14 January 2008.

18 The centre's original gym was converted into additional classrooms and vocational workshop with the addition of Unit 4 in 2000, to cater for an increased standard capacity up from 36 originally to 56 (and up to 64 with 'safe' double-bunking). Several local budget submissions for a replacement recreation area have been unsuccessful.

activities. A covered recreation area would also allow for flexibility in terms of education activities, giving teachers the opportunity for program delivery outside the classroom or to offer incentives to have lessons outside, as well as providing an additional space for visiting ‘road-shows’ and service provider presentations.

- 2.5 The need for an undercover area was the subject of a recommendation in the first inspection report that:

An adequate undercover recreation area is provided to rectify the loss of the gymnasium during the redevelopment of the Centre in 2001. If there are considerable delays, a short-term stop-gap measure is considered.¹⁹

While a fully enclosed gymnasium with additional program and activities rooms attached would be the ideal option, the likelihood of such a structure being funded is not strong. A simple structure consisting of posts and roof with the ability to close off some or all sides would be a vast improvement on the current situation and relatively inexpensive. A functional undercover area is essential for the good management of a centre full of active young people who need daily opportunities to expend their energies in a positive way. As such the previous recommendation is re-stated.

Recommendation 1:

That the Department commit to the construction of a suitable outdoor covered area at Rangeview Remand Centre as an urgent priority.

- 2.6 Another aspect of outdoor recreation is the centre’s swimming pool. This was potentially a great asset in managing the population, particularly during summer, but had some issues in relation to maintenance and management that were identified in the environmental health review. These will be monitored at future contacts with the centre.
- 2.7 Detainees requiring constant observation (whether at risk of self-harm or suicide, physically ill, or exhibiting bizarre behaviour) were placed in the observation cells in the Special Purpose Unit (SPU). These detainees were monitored by the control room operator and visited by a nurse if required.²⁰ While the SPU allowed constant monitoring, the cells were found to be indistinguishable from punishment cells: cold, inhospitable, devoid of furniture and comforts, with window frames and glass badly marked by graffiti and scuffing – hardly a therapeutic environment for one assessed as being at risk or suicidal.
- 2.8 A related issue was the lack of a suitable space to house detainees returning from court following an unfavourable decision or following some other upsetting event. These detainees could benefit from some quiet time alone to process what has happened before being placed back into a class or activity group. The lack of staff availability usually made it impossible to return detainees to their cells for time out, as this required an officer to be present in the unit. The observation cells are unsuitable for this purpose and there is no other suitable supervised space available.

19 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre*, Report No. 29 (August 2005) 48, recommendation 27.

20 Rangeview Remand Centre, *Standing Order 10 – At-risk detainees, suicide attempts and special purpose cells*, (September 2001).

- 2.9 Observation or ‘safe’ cells for placement of at-risk detainees should be specifically designed so that minimising risk does not equate to maximising deprivation. Ideally such cells would be attached to the medical centre to allow observation by health staff (as opposed to custodial officers). Alternatively, such cells could be contained in a specialised unit to cater for the needs of all detainees assessed at the highest end of risk, whether from Rangeview or Banksia Hill.

Recommendation 2:

That Rangeview’s observation cells be refurbished, or that ‘safe cells’ be built within the medical centre, to create an appropriate therapeutic environment for the management and monitoring of at-risk detainees.

- 2.10 Various examples of poor work environments for staff were viewed during the inspection. We observed cramped and overcrowded offices, poor layout of work spaces, storage spaces filled beyond capacity, and a staff amenities room too small to cater for the needs of staff. One particular example was the inadequacy of the Family Liaison Unit offices. The functions of this unit have grown substantially since the centre was built, particularly in respect of the Supervised Bail Program (see Chapter 3). Consequently there were more staff engaged in the unit and a higher workload involving more administrative work, telephone and electronic contact, and detainee interviews. Family Liaison Unit staff worked in cramped office space that was not designed for the purpose. At the time of the inspection, a bid had been lodged for expansion of office accommodation for the unit. The desperate need for further office space is supported by the findings of this inspection.²¹
- 2.11 The inspection team also found a lack of appropriate space for lawyers and service providers to interview detainees privately. Groups that attended the pre-inspection community consultation meeting cited this as one of the biggest obstacles to providing effective services in the centre. The space most often used was the social visits room, with the level of privacy dependent on whether the room was concurrently being used for visits or other interviews. The visits room itself was cramped and frequently overcrowded, with minimal facilities and no access to any secure outdoor areas. At times, providers were required to use the search rooms for interviews. While these do provide sufficient privacy, they are not a suitable environment for therapeutic and assessment interviews by counsellors and other service providers. The centre needs appropriate official visits rooms, suitable for a variety of interviews and official visits including therapeutic service visits. There is also the need for a dedicated room at Rangeview for the delivery of therapeutic programs.
- 2.12 The education and vocational training building (‘EdVoc’) was found to be poorly designed and inadequate for the needs of the current population. Originally the centre’s gym, the building was remodelled to include additional classrooms and a vocational skills workshop when Unit 4 (Jeealia) was built in 2000. Various design and infrastructure issues were noted in the building, such as insufficient office and meeting space for education staff; lack

21 At the time of writing, the Office was advised that funding had been approved for the additional office accommodation for the Family Liaison Unit, with transportable buildings to be purchased and installed in 2008. Consequently, there is no recommendation addressing this matter. See, however, Recommendation 3 below regarding the need for further remediation of existing infrastructure.

of storage; poor design of some classrooms; and lack of easy access for staff between the two sides of the building. There are six teaching rooms in the building – four classrooms (including the centre’s original library converted to a classroom to cope with increased demand), the vocational workshop (primarily used for woodwork) and an activity room for arts and craft activities. As with all activities, classes were segregated by gender. This, coupled with the maximum supervision of eight detainees per class, meant that some detainees could not access the classrooms, and that the choice of activities and placement options for girls were limited.

Recommendation 3:

That the Department and Rangeview develop a master plan to address the immediate and future infrastructure needs of the centre. This should include, but not be limited to, staff work space (offices, storerooms, amenities), interview rooms, detainee accommodation and facilities, and improvements to the education and programs spaces.

HOUSING A COMPLEX POPULATION OF GIRLS AT RANGEVIEW

- 2.13 Fourteen girls were housed at Rangeview on the first weekday of the inspection, four sentenced and 10 held on remand. Managing the girls has become more difficult with increases in population and length of stay – the number of girls often exceeded the capacity of the girls accommodation unit (16 beds) in the months leading up to the inspection. The number of girls held at Rangeview peaked at 28 in November 2006 (and again just after the inspection in November 2007) and some cells were double-bunked on a constant basis. When the population of girls exceeds 16, the extra girls are generally housed in Unit 1 – the most run-down accommodation area generally only used for very short stays as transit accommodation.
- 2.14 While staff and management at Rangeview are acutely aware of the disadvantage experienced by the girls, the emphasis remains on the necessity to keep male and female detainees separated at all times. This policy dominates the management of the girls and erodes equitable access to services. The only times that male and female detainees mix is during special events (such as Christmas) and occasionally during the morning tea breaks in the area outside EdVoc.²² Consequently, female detainees spend most of their waking hours together (albeit divided into two classes during school hours if there are more than eight girls) and are under constant supervision and scrutiny. There are often relationship conflicts between different girls, causing a great deal of stress for some girls and the staff who supervise them. The proximity of the boys also often causes tension between female detainees, and the strict separation seems to amplify the attention of the boys.
- 2.15 Practically all activities for the girls are operated on an ‘all in or all out basis’. That is, if an activity is arranged for the girls they must all participate (there being no other supervision options). Girls therefore have less opportunity than the boys to learn to exercise personal choice, or engage with other detainees (and staff). These restrictions can also disadvantage

22 Note however this is not guaranteed – in reality the girls are often returned to their unit for meals, to avoid any behavioural issues by having the groups mixing.

boys, since only one gender group can participate in outdoor recreation at a time.

- 2.16 Interviews and meetings with staff during the inspection indicated that many found working with girls difficult, stressful and much more demanding than working with boys. Staff responses to the pre-inspection survey showed that almost 30 per cent of staff did not feel competent in managing female detainees.²³ Staff reported having little in the way of specific training relating to the management of girls. Only 44 per cent of survey respondents thought the policies and procedures for the management of the girls at Rangeview were effective.
- 2.17 Sentenced girls are disadvantaged substantially in comparison to their male counterparts at Banksia Hill. Rangeview is a remand centre and as such does not have the breadth of programs, educational, personal development and recreational activities available at Banksia Hill (which was specifically designed to house sentenced detainees). The sentenced girls require access to case management to work towards supervised release, a function managed from Banksia Hill. Sentenced girls are housed in the same unit and managed in virtually the same way as remand girls, with no access to the hierarchical accommodation or incentives available at Banksia Hill. Sentenced girls at Rangeview spoken to during the inspection were very aware of their disadvantage.
- 2.18 Prior to the decision to move the sentenced girls to Rangeview in October 2005, there was a project underway within the Department's juvenile custodial services branch to develop a business case for a dedicated facility for girls at Banksia Hill, fenced off from the rest of the centre. This project ceased when the girls were moved to Rangeview. Instead, around \$6.5 million was approved for construction of a new girls unit at Rangeview, without any recurrent funding for additional staff or services.²⁴
- 2.19 The proposal for the new girls unit was examined during the inspection. While it was seen as positive in the sense that it would provide improved accommodation for the girls, there is not sufficient space within the secure perimeter at Rangeview to build a precinct to provide for all of their needs. Such a precinct should allow for some freedom of movement, access to outdoor recreation and activity spaces separated from the boys, sufficient accommodation options to allow for hierarchical progression to encourage personal responsibility and to allow separation of feuding girls, and access to a broader range of services for longer-term and sentenced girls. From the outset, the Department's focus seemed to be on the provision of accommodation that was separated from the boys. It was an infrastructure emphasis and not one likely to solve the disadvantage and inequity experienced by girls in the centre.
- 2.20 The failure of the Department to allocate extra resources to Rangeview to provide enhanced services for female detainees demonstrates a lack of insight into the different needs of girls. As identified in the adult prison estate, women in custody generally have higher demands for health services, counselling and general welfare services compared to their

23 Note that a much lower 14.7% rated themselves as not sufficiently competent in managing detainees in general on the same survey. Similar results were found in the 2004 pre-inspection staff survey, with self-ratings of competence in general detainee management at 87% (13% not competent) and female detainee management at 73% (27% not competent).

24 The original proposal for Banksia Hill also failed to include recurrent funding.

male counterparts.²⁵ Despite this, the girls at Rangeview have not received any dedicated specialised staffing allocations. At the time of the inspection, there was no dedicated unit manager for the girls at Rangeview despite this being recommended at the time of the initial review of the placement of all the girls.²⁶ Instead, the Transit Unit manager had responsibility for the girls as well as the SPU, covering new admissions and any detainees housed in observation or separation.²⁷ It did not appear that the situation for the girls will change much in this respect in the proposed new unit. A girls unit must have its own manager, additional unit and support staff and resources.

- 2.21 It must be questioned how seriously the Department is taking the needs of girls in detention, and how contradictory it is to their ‘women-centred approach to custodial management’ (active in the adult system)²⁸ if they cannot even provide girls with a dedicated unit manager. At the time of the inspection, no one had the role of championing the needs of the girls, either within the facility or within head office. Without this, many of their needs will likely continue to be unmet.
- 2.22 A factor that must be also considered is that the female detainee population has already peaked beyond the design capacity of the proposed new unit (27 beds). The facility at Rangeview, in its very limited space, will have no ability to expand further, and is likely to become over-crowded very quickly. The plans for the proposed new unit also require the demolition of the existing Unit 1 (Eyre), removing the centre’s current overflow option. While positive in that the oldest and poorest accommodation in the centre will be replaced by a new and contemporary unit, it will nonetheless remove much-needed beds from the juvenile estate in a context of an overall population already approaching capacity. In addition, it will leave Rangeview without a transition option for new arrivals.

Recommendation 4:

The current proposal to construct a new girls unit at Rangeview should be halted and alternative options for the accommodation of girls considered. Any new girls unit must be resourced for appropriate staffing and services to meet the needs of the girls.²⁹

25 See for example Salomone J, *Towards best practice in women’s corrections: the Western Australian low security prison for women* (2004) available on the Department’s website www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au

26 Department of Justice, *Briefing for the Minister of Justice – Review of Female Detainees in Rangeview Remand Centre* (3 November 2005) 3, recommendation 3.

27 This unit manager juggled the demands of various high-needs detainees and often could not devote the attention needed to the girls.

28 For more information regarding the women-centred approach, see the Inspector’s overview in OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Boronia Pre-release Centre for Women*, Report No. 42 (April 2007) v–viii.

29 Note that at the time of writing in December 2007, the girls accommodation project at Rangeview had been put on hold indefinitely to allow other options to be explored, driven largely by a sharp increase in population and the need to retain Unit 1 for bed capacity to manage the overall population.

STAFFING ISSUES

Custodial staff shortages

- 2.23 Rangeview was suffering from acute staff shortages at the time of the inspection. This was particularly evident in respect of custodial officers, but staff pressures were also present in non-custodial positions. In the months leading up to the inspection, it was not unusual to have several officers on unplanned leave each day requiring the positions to be filled with overtime, or for the roster to run without a full complement of staff. Officers were generally prepared to undertake a considerable amount of overtime and take on extra duties during shifts to ensure the smooth running of the centre when other staff were on leave. Even so, the situation was not sustainable – staff were becoming overworked, despite their positivity. The increased number of girls in the centre meant female staff were particularly in demand and in danger of burnout.
- 2.24 Retention of staff was an issue, with an increasing number of officers (including senior officers) leaving Rangeview in the three years between inspections. As a result the custodial officer group had an increasing proportion of relatively new and inexperienced officers, and there reportedly had been many instances where new recruits shadowed inexperienced staff during and immediately after their initial training.
- 2.25 The lack of Aboriginal staff at Rangeview was marked across all work areas, but particularly in the custodial contingent. With a very high proportion of detainees being Aboriginal it is essential that better recruitment and retention plans for Aboriginal staff be put in place at Rangeview.
- 2.26 Custodial staff shortages were found to affect all areas of the centre’s functioning. Examples included:
- the cancellation of some programs and activities because of a lack of supervisory staff;
 - delays in the movement of detainees in to and out of education and other activities;
 - rolling lockdowns when detainee numbers were high and when the ratio of staff to detainees would otherwise be unsafe;
 - administrative staff required to escort tradesmen through the centre;
 - management supervising detainees to allow officers time for breaks; and
 - liaison officers being coopted to assist with daily detainee management, particularly during admissions and visits.

Recommendation 5:

Staffing shortages at Rangeview should be addressed by the Department as a matter of urgency. These shortages relate to custodial officers generally, and female and Aboriginal custodial officers particularly.

Custodial staff training and development

- 2.27 Custodial staff training has been severely hampered by the shortage of staff required to fill all rostered positions on a daily basis. Although some limited training occurs during the centre’s routine weekly lockdown period, this has been insufficient to maintain the currency of basic skills, let alone provide additional training.

- 2.28 The acute need for training for juvenile custodial staff was recognised by the Mahoney Inquiry,³⁰ with funding subsequently made available for this purpose. This funding was to be used to create a training unit to deliver across-the-board additional training with the capacity to backfill operational staff released for training. Comprehensive training packages have been written and are ready to be delivered, as well as a plan to meet recurrent training for custodial staff (with some places for non-custodial staff also). However, due to the persistent staff shortages this has not been implemented. Further, there are insufficient officers in the system (across Rangeview and Banksia Hill) to staff the proposed training unit, so these plans have been delayed until additional staff become available through future recruitment.

Recommendation 6:

That the Mahoney funds allocated for training in the juvenile custodial centres be quarantined and preserved until such time as the proposed training unit can be staffed. In the meantime, alternative methods for addressing the deficits in recurrent training must be explored as a matter of urgency.

- 2.29 In an effort to address these issues, Rangeview's training officer had developed a series of online staff training modules on a variety of procedural areas. Staff were given opportunities to complete these modules when on night shift or when relieved for half-hour periods during regular shifts. The training officer had also developed a system to monitor module completions, and test staff competence in the workplace. While not sufficient to address all staff training needs, this initiative has proven to be a good method for delivery of regular refreshers on procedural matters in the current circumstances.
- 2.30 The training officer position is clearly vital, yet it is not a discretely funded position. A similar situation has been found in many adult prisons and exists also at Banksia Hill. Previously in the juvenile centres, there was a 'security and training officer' position allocated on the roster; however, it was identified that one position was insufficient to manage these two areas. The position was therefore split into two at Rangeview: a security officer and a training officer, but the training position was not separately resourced. Indeed, neither position is suitably resourced or supported; each should be allocated its own appropriately remunerated, substantive position and provision of appropriate training, resources and support.

Recommendation 7:

The positions of Security Officer and Training Officer at Rangeview should each become discrete, full-time and appropriately classified positions.

- 2.31 The need for succession planning and capacity building within Rangeview's operational staff was becoming apparent, with a relatively small pool of experienced people able to act in senior management roles, and a shortage of substantive middle managers in the custodial pool (shift and unit managers). These vacant positions are filled by custodial officers, often for short periods of time before returning to the roster. There has also been little formal training available for middle managers (whether acting or substantive), which may account

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

for the apparent variation in management styles and what is permitted during a particular manager's shift. This becomes a significant issue where no clear operational procedures are available. The juvenile custodial branch of the Department has recognised the need to establish support structures, development and training specifically for middle management; but again, the lack of staff to release officers for training has delayed any action in this area.

- 2.32 Related to training and development is the area of performance management. Staff appraisals should be scheduled annually for all staff in the centre (custodial and non-custodial), and while this had not always occurred in the past, attempts had been made to complete these reviews in a timely manner in the years between inspections. However, some custodial staff felt that the appraisals were meaningless because they were often completed by managers who had not recently worked with the officer (and so were not able to comment on current work performance), or alternatively by their peers acting in a management position (and who may be hesitant to be critical). Further, any goals identified during the appraisals were unlikely to be supported by access to training or external activities due to the lack of staff to backfill shifts to release officers to developmental activities.
- 2.33 A positive development was the expansion of the Department's leadership program in 2006 to include applicants from juvenile custodial services. Four staff attended from the juvenile system that year, all of whom remained in the juvenile system and had acted in senior management positions on a regular basis. Several more juvenile custodial staff had gained positions in subsequent programs.

Dysfunctional departmental human resources administration

- 2.34 The stress of staff shortages at Rangeview appeared to be exacerbated by poor human resources management at head office. Multiple examples of this were reported by staff from all areas of the centre during the inspection; these included delays and errors in pay and difficulties in accessing correct information about leave and accrued entitlements. Complicating these problems was the requirement for all human resources enquiries to be made through Rangeview's resources officer to a generic call-centre which serviced the whole department. Most call-centre staff had little understanding of the juvenile custodial system and resolution of issues was often unacceptably delayed. The Office is concerned that difficulties arising from centralised human resources administration within the Department may be made worse by the further removal of these services from the operational areas, in line with state government plans to incorporate departmentally managed human resources administration into the centralised Office of Shared Services.
- 2.35 Of particular concern at Rangeview were the numerous examples of slow processing of contracts, which caused pay delays for teaching staff, psychologists and administrative support workers. Some staff had experienced weeks (or months in some extreme cases) without pay – putting enormous strain on individuals and their families. This is not acceptable. Non-custodial staff commented that most people 'do the work in spite of the system' because they are committed to their work.

- 2.36 Similarly, extended delays in the custodial officer recruitment process were reportedly causing some applicants to withdraw during the process or find other work. In addition to this, inaccurate job descriptions and non-competitive wages in the current job climate may also be contributing to the difficulties experienced in recruiting and retaining suitable new staff.

Recommendation 8:

The deficiencies of the Department's human resources administration system should be identified and rectified. These include delays in recruitment processes; delays in processing of employment contracts; delays in payment of salaries; and inaccuracies in job description forms.

Staff relations and communication

- 2.37 The inspection revealed a generally positive and supportive work culture at Rangeview. Staff in all areas expressed confidence that issues raised with local management would be addressed appropriately. There was a good staff grievance process in place and grievance resolution officers were available and visible in the centre.³¹ Additionally, there was an active staff support team, with two on-site psychologists available to assist if needed. There were processes in place for critical incident debriefs and an external staff counselling service available. This function of staff support is important within the custodial environment and especially important at Rangeview while under stress from staff shortages and other pressures.
- 2.38 Relations between staff (both within and between staff groups) were generally found to be positive and congenial. Staff across all services in the centre were observed to interact well with each other and with detainees during the inspection, and detainee attitudes to staff were also generally quite positive. There did, however, appear to be a divide between custodial and non-custodial staff, and between some groups of non-custodial staff, regarding communication of relevant information about detainees. For example, education staff reported that they were not always informed by custodial officers about behavioural problems or incidents that may be affecting detainees in their care, while custodial officers reported that at times there was medical or psychological information that (notwithstanding privacy considerations) they should have been made aware of to assist with managing detainees in the units.
- 2.39 Custodial staff shortages and the nature of the shift roster meant that officers and middle management moved through a variety of roles in the centre, often at short notice. This made it difficult to achieve continuity within the centre. Clear and timely communication and interaction between services is vital to ensure detainees are managed appropriately. To support this, procedures must also be in place to ensure that roles and responsibilities are clear. Prior to the inspection, the centre did not have a central set of operational procedures – these were in development at the time of the inspection with a senior officer taken offline to finalise them.

31 No formal staff grievances had been lodged at Rangeview since the current team of grievance officers commenced in 2005.

- 2.40 There seemed to be a focus in the centre on operational and custodial needs, with non-custodial services such as programs being given lower priority (with the exception of health or psychological intervention for detainees identified as immediately at risk). This culture could be stemming from the original role of Rangeview as a short-stay remand centre, with high turnover of volatile young people where operational needs necessarily dictate much of what occurs in the centre. While this may be unavoidable, a better sense of integration of the non-custodial services doing valuable work in the centre may be assisted by more regular communication about the roles of each service and the information needed by all staff to best manage the young people in their care.

Recommendation 9:

That processes are put in place for more systematic, structured and timely communication between custodial staff and non-custodial staff at Rangeview in relation to any security issues, special orders or issues relevant to the management of individual detainees.

Non-custodial staff

- 2.41 The inspection found that non-custodial services (education, recreation, health, psychological services and programs) were managed jointly across juvenile custodial services, with the managers of these areas generally based at Banksia Hill. While joint management of the services was warranted considering the 'one centre' approach to juvenile custodial management, having a manager off-site made it more difficult for staff to access professional support. In response to this issue, identified during the 2004 inspection, the principal of the school set one day a week to spend on site at Rangeview as well as being available daily via telephone contact. The teachers reported feeling much more supported since this arrangement has been in place, with the principal able to better appreciate their needs and resolve local issues. The managers of other services attend as required, and there is some crossover of staff with nurses and the programs officer attending both sites.
- 2.42 Health staff were positive about the support they received at the local level, but felt disconnected from the broader health services directorate within the Department. Staffing levels for nurses in the health centre were stable and generally sufficient to meet demand. However, staffing levels in psychological services and program delivery were pressured with the increase in detainee population and complexity. A lack of regular in-service training for health staff and a number of other issues were identified during the inspection – these reflect systemic issues within prisoner health and the health services directorate as discussed in this Office's *Thematic Review of Offender Health Services*.³²
- 2.43 Education staffing was relatively stable, with a motivated and positive core group of teachers and a vocational tutor. Since the education centre operates with no breaks for school holiday periods, relief teachers are brought in to cover periods when teachers take leave or attend professional development. There were two Aboriginal education workers (AEWs), one male and one female, who attend the centre one day a week each. Given that the majority of detainees are Aboriginal, an increase in availability of AEWs would be beneficial to support the teaching staff,

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

particularly with regional and remote Aboriginal detainees. The principal of the school was seeking extra funds for additional AEW time and also for a part-time welding instructor to run courses in the workshop.

- 2.44 The inspection in 2004 flagged a number of administrative concerns about education staff conditions and these have all since been resolved. However, one administrative anomaly was noted during the 2007 inspection regarding teachers' registration with the Western Australian College of Teaching (WACOT). Because the educational facilities in detention centres and prisons are not considered 'schools', work in these facilities does not count as years of service in the state education system. This does not affect teachers' employment contracts with the Department, but was raised as a concern by younger teachers who may return to the school system later in their careers. It may also act as a deterrent to teachers entering the Department's educational system. The Department should clarify this point with WACOT with a view to gaining recognition for service for its teachers. However, there should be no move to make custodial education facilities 'schools' or for them to come under the Department of Education and Training centralised system, as this would reduce the ability of the Department's education management to select the most appropriate teachers. Given the unique nature of the custodial educational setting, the capacity to select appropriate teaching staff is paramount, particularly within the juvenile setting where education is a strong focus.

Recommendation 10:

That the Department advocates for its contracted teachers' period of service to be recognised by the Western Australian College of Teaching (WACOT).

CHAPTER SUMMARY

- 2.45 The centre continued to manage within existing resources in a facility already at bursting point, brought on by an increase in overall population and in the average length of stay and by the complexity of the population over the past three years.
- 2.46 Infrastructure generally at Rangeview is geared towards relatively short stays with fairly basic amenities. It is not suited to the placement of long-term or sentenced detainees. Yet, as of October 2005, all sentenced girls have been held at Rangeview. The inspection found that this is the most disadvantaged group of detainees in the centre.
- 2.47 Staffing shortages in custodial and operational roles were found to be impacting on the smooth running of all aspects of the centre's operations. One area particularly affected was access to training and developmental support for staff, which in turn may increase staff attrition and exacerbate already stressed staffing levels.

Chapter 3

CASE MANAGEMENT AND THROUGH-CARE

- 3.1 A key aspect of Rangeview’s philosophy is to return detainees back into the community as quickly as possible. However, there is also a strong commitment to assisting detainees to develop some life skills while they are in the centre, even though this may be for a very short time. A guiding principle within the juvenile custodial setting is through-care – whereby from the point of arrival in the system, the aim is to prepare the young person for release and equip them with what they need for successful placement back in the community. This is generally thought of in terms of sentenced juveniles, but is equally relevant (though poorly defined) for those on remand.
- 3.2 In a general sense, detainees live in unit style accommodation within which they are guided by unit staff and taught daily living skills, such as cleaning, cooking, manners and respect, management of property, self-management of behaviour, and inter-personal skills. The inspection team observed that the detainees were generally well mannered and behaved respectfully (and were treated respectfully) in their interactions with staff and each other.
- 3.3 A number of specific services and activities are also provided which assist in addressing these objectives. In terms of getting young people back into the community, the Supervised Bail Program is excellent. Therapeutic programs and education offer some chances to progress and the Family Liaison Unit do good work in terms of release planning (although this is often short-term assistance, such as organising transport home). However, the area of case management needs much more attention and development, particularly since the placement of sentenced girls at Rangeview since late 2005. The centre’s focus on management of a diverse population on an individual basis is done well intuitively and on day-to-day basis, but there is little formal case management and little long-term planning available for longer-term remands or sentenced detainees.
- 3.4 The churn of the population – with admissions and discharges occurring constantly and often at very short notice – has made the delivery of case management, educational and programmatic services more difficult at Rangeview. Activity groups change on a daily basis (and often partway through the day) depending on court appearances, official interviews and release on bail at short notice, which disrupts delivery of programs and education in particular – sometimes to the point of removing someone to be released on bail mid-way through a program or classroom session.
- 3.5 The high rate of churn, particularly of short-stay, repeat remand admissions creates a challenge to deliver any intervention that will reduce the likelihood of this particular group returning to custody. Consideration could be given to ways to ensure detainees complete any programs undertaken or gain recognition for activities completed during their time in custody, without delaying their release unnecessarily.

Supervised Bail Program

- 3.6 The Supervised Bail Program was established ‘to avoid the unnecessary detention of juveniles in circumstances where they have been deemed eligible for bail by the Court, but a responsible adult could not be found to sign the bail undertaking on their behalf’.³³ Effectively, the centre (through the Family Liaison Unit) takes on the role of the responsible

33 Department of Corrective Services, *Supervised Bail Program Procedures Manual* (updated July 2007) 2.

adult to ensure the young person presents at court on the required day, monitoring their placement and behaviour, requiring juveniles to regularly make contact by telephone, and providing support to the family or organisation where bail placement has been made. It provides an essential addition to the efforts of the Children's Court to ensure that juvenile remand detention remains a last resort for young people awaiting trial, particularly important considering that the great majority of detainees held on remand do not return to custody after sentencing.

- 3.7 Making an appropriate supervised bail placement requires extensive consultation with other agencies, family and significant others in each juvenile's life. There are potentially significant risks to the community and to the juvenile if an inappropriate placement is made. The absence of any serious incidents during a placement, and good court attendance rates by those on supervised bail are indications of the effectiveness of the program.³⁴
- 3.8 The numbers managed on supervised bail have increased significantly since the previous inspection. For the 2003–2004 financial year, there were 386 placements in the community on supervised bail (of which 40 were in regional areas), with an estimated saving of 7790 days in custody.³⁵ Three years later, for the 2006–2007 year, this had increased to 521 placements (including 116 regional) saving 16163 days in custody.³⁶ The resource implications of this are not just in reducing significantly the cost of managing these extra days in custody.³⁷ Without the program, the juvenile custodial estate would need to house an additional 40 to 50 remandees on average each day, requiring the construction of a new remand centre.³⁸ The increase in regional placements is particularly positive, enabling more young people to be managed in their home community rather than being held out-of-country in the metropolitan area. Supervised bail in the regions is likely to grow further with the support of the regional youth justice strategies commencing in the Gascoyne and Goldfields regions in 2007.³⁹
- 3.9 There were a few of points of concern regarding the program, despite its great success and positive outcomes. These included the lack of a clearly defined legislative basis for the program and the resulting potential liability taken on by individual liaison officers in taking on the role of responsible adult;⁴⁰ the lack of discrete funding for the program, which was

34 For the first six months of 2007, 108 of the 276 supervised bail releases successfully completed the court process without having bail withdrawn (which occurs if bail conditions are breached). A further 38 who had breached were subsequently allowed supervised bail, of which 28 were re-bailed to placements. These figures were taken from Rangeview's Supervised Bail Program database.

35 Department of Corrective Services, *Annual Report 2003–2004* (September 2004).

36 Department of Corrective Services, *Annual Report 2006–2007* (September 2007).

37 For the 2006–2007 year, the daily cost to manage a juvenile in custody per day was almost \$657, compared to just \$79 per day to manage a juvenile in the community. Department of Corrective Services, *Annual Report 2006–2007* (September 2007) 99.

38 Average daily figures were taken from Rangeview's Supervised Bail Program database for 2007 up until the time of the inspection.

39 Information on the regional youth justice strategies is available on the Department's website: www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au

40 While the program in no way contravened any relevant legislation (such as the *Bail Act 1982* and *Young Offenders Act 1994*), there was a lack of specific legislation and clarity regarding the program's boundaries and the status of individual officers signing the bail undertaking in terms of liability if issues arose during the young person's placement. The Supervised Bail Program is an administrative program with no specific statutory basis.

instead run from Rangeview's operational budget; and the potential net-widening over the last few years whereby it was suggested that the Children's Court may be tending to bypass the 'responsible adult' pathway to bail in favour of the supervised bail pathway, because of the success of the program in ensuring young people attend court. In this regard, supervised bail may be addressing welfare needs rather than just supervision; welfare needs should instead be addressed by a non-punitive agency or agencies in the community. There is a lack of sufficient community-based resources to address the various welfare needs of young people at risk.

- 3.10 In the majority of cases, juveniles are placed with family members, with a small number of placements made in emergency accommodation and Department for Child Protection (DCP) hostels. Frequently DCP placement options are unavailable; nonetheless, the Family Liaison Unit at Rangeview have been successful in finding placements, even for state wards that the DCP were unable to place. More could be done by DCP to find alternative placements and provide the necessary supports for juveniles to enable access to this program.

Recommendation 11:

That the Supervised Bail Program be reviewed with regard to the need for legislative provisions enabling and circumscribing the program, the responsibilities of other relevant agencies (especially the Department for Child Protection, Western Australia Police and the courts), and the need for discrete resources and funding to maintain the program.

Case management

- 3.11 The Case Planning Unit, based at Banksia Hill, is responsible for case management and release planning for sentenced detainees. With a case manager only visiting Rangeview once a week, the sentenced girls (and any sentenced boys unable to be placed at Banksia Hill) are disadvantaged. This case manager coordinates the case management of sentenced girls at Rangeview and also any longer-term remanded detainees. They also carry a significant caseload at Banksia Hill, and this restricts the ability to provide the necessary level of case management at Rangeview. Additionally, given the overall shortage of staff accommodation, the visiting case manager has no office to work from and limited access to appropriate interview facilities.
- 3.12 In terms of delivery of services relevant to sentenced detainees, the lack of program rooms, small number of female detainees, the need to keep the girls and boys segregated, and the lack of on-site case management meant that the case management of sentenced girls (at Rangeview) was not as effective as that of sentenced boys (at Banksia Hill). Banksia Hill was designed and resourced with the needs of sentenced detainees in mind, particularly in terms of education and program delivery, psychological services and case planning staff. This is not so at Rangeview, which was designed as a short-stay remand facility requiring only basic services and amenities. The proper case management of detainees is critical to minimising reoffending and there is a clear need for a case management coordinator to be based full-time at Rangeview, particularly while sentenced girls are being held there.

Recommendation 12:

That, while girls are being accommodated at Rangeview, a case manager position should be created, based at Rangeview, to address the case management needs of longer-term detainees and (particularly) the sentenced girls.

- 3.13 The notion of case management tends to be focused on sentenced detainees, with a set process in place upon sentencing for the development of a case plan to address offending ends and guide the young person towards release into activities in the community. However, there is also the need to consider ‘case management’ in the broader context for remandees. Many are held for a period of weeks or months, and are considered long-term remandees. Additionally many short-term remandees have ongoing contact with the justice system, yet are not able to access many meaningful services due to short periods in the centre. More must be done to address the needs of young people on remand who may never get a custodial sentence yet nonetheless spend significant time in custody.
- 3.14 The Family Liaison Unit takes up some case management tasks of remandees at Rangeview, particularly in terms of discharge planning such as organising transport home and arranging placements in the community for release (usually on bail). They may also link with community-based juvenile justice officers who may be responsible for managing the young person in the community. However, there was no formal process for case management of remand detainees in place at the time of the inspection.

Programs

- 3.15 Therapeutic programs are not a major focus of Rangeview. This is largely because of the priority to move detainees out of the system and on to bail. Program delivery in a remand context is generally focused on personal development and generic areas without identifying individual offending needs, as this could influence the court’s decision at sentencing should the program require admission of guilt.
- 3.16 Program delivery at Rangeview tends to be piecemeal and is made more difficult by the unpredictable nature of the population and the potential for detainees to be released at very short notice. The delivery of programs to individuals can be disrupted when detainees are taken out of the group for medical appointments, court appearances and visits. Programs can also be disrupted by institutional imperatives, particularly when there are custodial staff shortages.
- 3.17 Nonetheless, there was a good range of short-term programs appropriately targeted to the generally short-stay population. Appropriate and relevant material was presented, often using innovative presentation formats and activities. There was a determined effort made to assess each detainee’s needs and readiness for programmatic intervention within their first few days at the centre. However, the inspection team found that there was little available for longer-term and sentenced detainees beyond some individual counselling with the centre psychologists.
- 3.18 An improvement since the 2004 inspection was the creation of the Senior Programs Officer (SPO) position whose role is to develop, facilitate and maintain consistency of programs

delivered in the juvenile centres and community. The SPO spends two days a week each at Rangeview and Banksia Hill and one day in a metropolitan Community Justice Services office. The introduction of this position has been a great improvement, although the provision of just two days a week at each centre limits program delivery – more could be done in this area with additional resources.

- 3.19 One of the positive outcomes since the introduction of the SPO was the development and delivery of the Group Ready program. This is a one-off short session that uses a variety of developmentally appropriate activities and information to assess each detainee's readiness and capacity to work in groups, and provide information about the programs available in custody. Group Ready was scheduled twice weekly, with all new admissions scheduled to a session within a few days of arrival. The program was observed to effectively engage with detainees through the use of visual prompts, role-playing and activities that encouraged participation, while imparting concepts such as appropriate group behaviour and respecting confidentiality. At the end of the program detainees were observed to keenly nominate themselves for a selection of programs.
- 3.20 In addition to Group Ready, there were various short duration programs that were provided by the centre and external agencies. These included a weekly drug and alcohol information session provided by a contracted agency and less frequently delivered programs covering matters such as relationships, conflict resolution, protective behaviours, sex education, self-esteem and personal development.⁴¹ There was also a short re-entry program, a parenting skills program for boys, and information sessions regarding legal rights and responsibilities run on occasion.
- 3.21 If a detainee is assessed as unsuitable for group programs then individual counselling sessions may instead be scheduled with a psychologist. Rangeview's psychologists were doing an excellent job in terms of program delivery and individual counselling, but resources were stretched between providing this service as well as assessing and monitoring detainees with at-risk issues. The priority at Rangeview has been on the assessment and at-risk management role, but since the placement of the sentenced girls, the workload of the psychologists has increased. The Department has responded to these pressures by increasing psychologist staffing to two full-time positions. But resources are still insufficient to meet the needs of the increased population, especially in light of the increasing complexity of problems (including substance abuse and mental health issues) that beset young people entering the juvenile justice system.

State wards

- 3.22 Approximately 12.6 per cent of the detainees admitted to Rangeview in the first six months of 2007 were state wards, that is, under the care of the CEO of the Department for Child Protection (DCP).⁴² During the inspection, concerns were expressed about the lack of support that juveniles at the centre receive from DCP. In particular, the centre had

41 Additional personal development and support activities were provided by a range of visiting agencies, such as a department course for young women and chaplaincy services for all detainees.

42 From figures from the Rangeview admissions database, provided by the centre prior to the inspection.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Shade sails provided some degree of protection from the sun, but there was no undercover recreation area for activities during inclement weather.



Observation cells were stark, punitive areas devoid of comfort, yet were regularly used to house detainees at risk of self-harm.



Classrooms were positive environments designed to encourage learning for detainees across a wide range of abilities.



Detainees were engaged in art and craft projects in the activity room, which was not adequately resourced.

PHOTOGRAPHS



Although bright and clean, the accommodation for girls was too small and offered no option to separate girls.



Insufficient storage space for laundry was mirrored in a lack of storage space for food, general stores and administrative records across the centre.



Cramped education office space was indicative of the inadequacy of office space throughout the centre.



The visits room was small and often overcrowded during social visit sessions. The room was also used for official visits, due to a lack of official interview rooms.

experienced difficulties engaging DCP to secure appropriate accommodation for release of detainees or to assist detainees to address other practical issues in preparation for release.

- 3.23 Rangeview had worked closely with DCP during 2007 to better clarify roles and provide support for DCP workers when required, particularly in the context of supervised bail placements. A new position in DCP, the Advocate for Children in Care, had been used by the centre as a contact point to improve information flow and resolve any difficulties in obtaining the appropriate services from visiting DCP workers. These improvements in communication between the two agencies, coupled with a raised awareness of the issues through various consultation and stakeholder meetings throughout 2007, constituted positive outcomes. However, on a day-to-day basis, contact with DCP was still low and their involvement with their wards in detention remained on an as-needs and last-minute basis, likely due to persisting staff shortages within DCP and a lack of accommodation placements in the community. DCP should be acting in concert with the Family Liaison Unit regarding bail options and should also be making representations to the court upon application for bail, particularly considering the use of 'welfare detention' by the courts.

STRUCTURED DAY – EDUCATION AND OTHER LEARNING ACTIVITIES

- 3.24 The centre operates a structured day based largely around school hours. Weekdays follow a routine, starting in the morning with breakfast, ablutions and chores around the unit, followed by school or related activities (morning and afternoon sessions, with morning tea and lunch breaks), with structured after-school activities and less-structured evening recreation and relaxation time after the evening meal. Weekends operate on a relaxed routine but there are still structured unit activities, chores and recreation sessions. This fits with the practical approach of the centre with the intent to provide structure and routine to assist detainees to learn basic living skills.
- 3.25 All detainees at Rangeview are required to participate in an activity during school time once they have been oriented into the centre. Detainees earn gratuities for participation⁴³ and additional gratuities can be earned for additional chores or work done outside school hours. Gratuities can be spent at the canteen, with any balance paid out to the detainee upon release. The canteen is open daily (though with current staffing pressures, this may only be every second or third day) and stocks mostly snack food and drinks, plus a few personal items. Special purchases may be arranged on request by detainees for special occasions.
- 3.26 For the majority of detainees, structured activities will involve participation in education, with EdVoc able to cater for up to 48 detainees. All girls and the younger boys are placed in classrooms, while the older boys will generally be placed in the woodwork class, work parties or activity room. Longer-term boys who indicate an interest in continuing with their education may be transferred to Banksia Hill, which has a better range of educational resources and activities for longer-term studies.
- 3.27 As noted earlier, the daily turnover of the population creates challenges for staff in relation to maintaining order in the classes; delivering meaningful education and activity programs;

43 Up to two dollars per day.

and addressing the different needs of the small group of longer-term detainees (in particular the sentenced girls). The design limitations of EdVoc (outlined in Chapter 2) also impede possible expansion of service delivery in terms of learning and skilling activities, therapeutic programs and other group activities.

Education programs

- 3.28 The curriculum framework mandated for Western Australian schools is not followed at Rangeview as detainees are at varying and often very low educational levels.⁴⁴ The majority of detainees had intermittent school histories and often had little experience beyond primary school. Given that many detainees are only in Rangeview for a very short time, the emphasis is appropriately placed on addressing basic literacy, numeracy, social and life skills.
- 3.29 Some students were working towards improving their basic literacy and numeracy skills through undertaking the Certificate of General Education, delivered in partnership with Swan TAFE. A range of delivery methods, including computer activities and board and word games, have been developed which appear to engage the students at Rangeview better than conventional methods. The centre's teachers have developed a range of additional resource material targeted at different types of learning abilities. This was a positive local initiative that had attracted the attention of educational facilities in the community. Each teacher is allocated an amount of funds to spend on resources for their own classrooms and activities (in addition to funds for stationery and class sets of books), allowing autonomy to determine what activities will be run to suit their groups.
- 3.30 The girls had a limited range of activities available compared to the boys. With the strict segregation policy, the girls were generally restricted to two classrooms during the day and 'all-in or all-out' recreation and other activities. Sentenced and long-term remand girls who showed interest could undertake subjects through the School of Isolated and Distance Education (SIDE), with resources sent to the teachers at Rangeview and support available via telephone contact. However, in practical terms, there was little differentiation between the activities these girls could access and insufficient resources to provide them with quieter study space or long-term activities away from the generally less-settled remand girls.

Recommendation 13:

The Department, together with the teachers at Rangeview, should investigate options for a broader range of education programs and activity options for the girls, in particular sentenced and long-term girls.

- 3.31 Woodwork was available for boys during school time, usually for older boys who had indicated an interest. The range of projects students could undertake was fairly limited by space and equipment constraints and the short stays of most detainees. Following persistent lobbying by the longer-term girls and an acknowledgment that they required more

44 There have been changes to the compulsory school age in Western Australia in recent years. At the time of the inspection the compulsory school age was 16 (previously 15); in 2008 the compulsory school age is expected to rise again to 17 years. This is unlikely to have a significant impact upon the education program at Rangeview, given that the average period of time spent in custody for remandees is 17 days, and there are limited structured education programs that can be delivered in such a short space of time. However, care must be taken that longer-term detainees (in particular sentenced detainees) can access appropriate education during their time in detention.

activities, workshop sessions were implemented for the long-term girls during 2007. These were running two days a week, during the after-school structured recreation time. The centre was also trialling an additional woodwork session for the girls during Friday school time at the time of the inspection.

- 3.32 Teachers conducted testing to determine detainees' educational levels about a week after admission to allow time to settle in and prevent unnecessary testing of those released within a few days of arrival. Earlier in 2007 the teaching staff had developed a checklist based on the VONIY system,⁴⁵ identifying a number of the VONIY outcomes applicable in terms of developing life and social skills rather than focusing on academic achievement. The checklist allows recording of observations regarding the young person's protective behaviours (resilience, outlook and social competence), attitudes to education and training, aggressiveness and their developmental needs. The testing teacher also completed an individual assessment of learning needs and outlined a learning program for each individual.
- 3.33 Any detainee who had been in Rangeview for more than 15 consecutive days was case managed from an educational perspective, whereby the progress of the detainee was monitored and tracked according to the needs identified in the initial assessment. Student files were retained in the staff offices, holding testing results and sample copies of the student's work to enable some review and continuation of educational progress over time for those young people who return to custody on repeat occasions.
- 3.34 An improvement since the last inspection had been the development of better communication between juvenile custodial education services and the Department of Education and Training. Areas this impacted included improvements in identifying home schools in the community, identifying those detainees with no recorded home school or no regular attendance, and ensuring the school system was aware of released detainees who should be returning to schools in the community (whilst still maintaining appropriate confidentiality). However, there were limited resources to ensure effective through-care of released detainees in terms of education (and other services) beyond this.

Learning and reparative activities run by custodial staff

- 3.35 An art and craft program was conducted by custodial officers in the activity room in EdVoc during school hours, usually catering for older boys. The girls did not generally access this activity, though at times they participated in art and craft activities in their class groups. There had been some success in running small reparation projects in the activity room (and on occasions with the girls) such as making school bags to be sent to African children. There was some structure to the activities program, but resource limitations (such as lack of funds for materials and limited facilities in the room itself) reduced the options available. The activities undertaken in this room did not come under the jurisdiction of education services, with little interaction between the two areas.

45 VONIY: *Victorian Offending Needs Inventory for Youth*, which has been adopted and modified for the Western Australian context, primarily for use by Case Planning in case managing sentenced youth, to identify programmatic and other needs of young people sentenced (both in detention and on community-based orders).

- 3.36 There were minimal work-related activities available for detainees at the centre, with a focus instead on engagement with school or learning activities. There were several detainee work parties that occupied (typically older) boys not able or willing to be accommodated in classrooms, the workshop or the activity room during school hours. These work parties undertook cleaning, gardening and maintenance work and were supervised and directed by custodial officers. Work party activities were not linked with any accredited training – though limited on-the-job training and guidance was provided (depending on the officer, the detainees and the activities being undertaken), such as practical occupational safety and health, use of equipment and basic hand skills. The high turnover, population pressures and widely varying skill levels of detainees made undertaking meaningful work difficult. At times of high detainee numbers, the work parties served mainly as a supervisory mechanism whereby the officer in charge found simple tasks to occupy detainees rather than providing any skill development.
- 3.37 The opportunities for the delivery of accredited training or short courses would require additional resources in terms of staff to supervise and deliver the training, as well as the space and equipment to do so. However, if these resourcing issues could be overcome, this is an area which could offer meaningful activities to detainees to develop basic work skills and experience and provide a preview for boys transferring to Banksia Hill, which has a better range of training and work-related activities. The options for one-off accredited skills training (in particular short courses useful in the community, such as first aid or OSH) for sentenced girls and long-term remands could be offered if there were staff and physical resources to do so.

Recreation

- 3.38 A recreation officer position at Rangeview had been created since the last inspection, a positive initiative to ensure an appropriate focus on sport and recreation activities in the centre. However, the position was unfunded and part-time (three days a week), with no indication whether this would be made permanent or increased to full-time. There was also no budget specifically allocated to this officer; instead, the budget for recreation was shared with Banksia Hill and Banksia Hill tended to get priority.
- 3.39 While all staff and management were appreciative of the recreation officer, there could be more structured support for this position and more integration with education staff. Custodial staff also need to take responsibility to ensure recreational equipment is properly maintained and stored on the days the recreation officer is not present. Currently, custodial officers run the recreational activities in the centre during weekends and on the days the recreation officer is not present. Having a regular recreation or activity officer on duty at these other times would enable activities to be run regardless of custodial staff pressures.

Recommendation 14:

The position of Recreation Officer at Rangeview should be made full-time and appropriately classified, and be given some autonomy to manage a discrete budget to develop further recreational activities at Rangeview.

- 3.40 The centre had good outdoor recreational spaces comprising an oval, basketball and volleyball courts and a swimming pool. However, as mentioned previously, there is no undercover recreation area or gym. The recreation officer had developed a series of short fitness programs designed to be run in the units, including a series of individual activities for the girls to do in response to their limited access to the oval and organised sports. These activities provided structure for indoor physical activities compensating somewhat for the lack of a gymnasium. Indoor exercise equipment for the girls unit was being considered, funded by a small donation from a community sporting association made just prior to the inspection. A visiting yoga teacher ran occasional yoga classes for the girls, and had trialled a session with a group of boys shortly before the inspection, co-facilitated with the recreation officer.
- 3.41 Also available, and managed by unit staff, were a variety of in-unit passive recreation activities, including cards and board-games, books and magazines, radio and television in each cell, and videos broadcast to detainees in their own cells at set times. Units also had electronic game systems and a stock of PG-rated games, stored for use by long-term detainees as an incentive for good behaviour.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

- 3.42 There were some very good activities offered at Rangeview, especially in view of the infrastructure and resource pressures noted earlier in this report. However, there was a small group of long-term detainees (in particular the sentenced girls) whose recreational and educational needs were not adequately catered for. The intent and focus on the individual needs of the detainees provided a good basis for effective case management and through-care. However, the centre's good intentions are hampered by the high turnover of detainees and the nature of the population. With the majority of juveniles at Rangeview being short-stay detainees, the provision of meaningful service delivery, case management and through-care presents significant challenges for the centre.

Chapter 4

MEETING THE DUTY OF CARE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE IN RANGEVIEW

ABORIGINAL DETAINEES AS THE PREDOMINANT GROUP

- 4.1 As was found at the 2004 inspection, in 2007 there continued to be a disproportionate number of Aboriginal detainees – typically between 65 per cent and 85 per cent of the population. At the start of the on-site inspection period, around 68 per cent of Rangeview’s population and 72.8 per cent of the overall juvenile population in custody were Aboriginal.⁴⁶ Positively, there was no evidence of systemic racism identified within the centre and there also appeared to be little racist or disparaging behaviour within the detainee group. The treatment of Aboriginal visitors and Aboriginal staff within the centre was observed to be respectful, as was treatment of non-Aboriginal visitors and staff.
- 4.2 However, for a centre with predominantly Aboriginal detainees there was inadequate training for staff in cultural awareness (with training only provided at induction of new custodial officers). Only about 29 per cent of respondents to the staff pre-inspection survey were satisfied with the level of training provided. Despite this, the survey also revealed that the majority of staff (71%) felt competent in the area of cultural awareness.⁴⁷ Given the importance of Aboriginal issues in the centre, this area requires ongoing attention.
- 4.3 The over-arching philosophy of operations at Rangeview, expressed by management and staff, was to meet the needs of each detainee on an individual basis; therefore, any special needs of detainees who represent a minority were considered and catered for individually. Despite this individual-based approach, at times population pressures and security considerations (particularly regarding maintaining segregation of boys and girls) required staff to engage in more overt group management.
- 4.4 There were no obvious ethnic ‘gangs’ or significant groups of incompatible detainees in the population at the time of the inspection. There had at times been issues within the centre when detainees from feuding Aboriginal families had been held at the same time. This often resulted in fighting or assaults on detainees, though this was usually addressed quickly, sometimes by separation of feuding boys between Rangeview and Banksia Hill. Unfortunately, there was very limited scope to separate feuding girls, with all of the girls housed at Rangeview together in one accommodation unit.
- 4.5 Culturally and linguistically diverse detainees were not represented in large numbers in the centre, and were managed on an individual basis as with the rest of the population. Culturally appropriate food was available on request, with Halal food being one example that was being supplied at the time of the inspection. Similarly, interpreters were organised on an ad hoc basis as required, but were not identified as a major need. Non-Aboriginal detainees interviewed during the inspection did not like being singled out as different to their Aboriginal counterparts, a view mirrored by staff. There were no services or needs identified by non-Aboriginal detainees that were not being provided.

Aboriginal Welfare Officers

- 4.6 Aboriginal Welfare Officers (AWOs) at Rangeview play an integral role in meeting

46 Figures drawn from the Department’s Total Offender Management System (TOMS) database, 5 October 2007.

47 The self-rated competency in this area in 2004 was 73%.

the care and wellbeing needs of all detainees, not just Aboriginal youth. But as the vast majority of youth in detention are Aboriginal, having dedicated Aboriginal members of staff is important to meet their specific needs, and guarantees the presence of at least one Aboriginal staff member in the centre, during business hours at least. Perceptions of the AWO service in the centre were very positive, with 88 per cent of pre-inspection staff survey respondents stating that detainees had adequate access to the service, and various staff on-site expressing appreciation for the work undertaken by the two AWOs. Detainees were generally aware who the AWOs were when asked, and AWOs were observed to be actively engaging with detainees and regularly visible in the centre.

- 4.7 The AWOs were managed as part of the Family Liaison Unit, with two full-time AWOs in the centre at the time of the inspection (though the centre was only funded for 1.5 positions). The two AWOs were quite new to their positions – both enthusiastic and very positive in their outlook, but in many ways still exploring their roles. Consequently, there seemed to be an emphasis on the performance of necessary daily functions, such as providing practical support and counselling to detainees, ensuring family contacts were maintained and providing support to supervised bail staff in securing conditions necessary for young people for release.
- 4.8 There was less emphasis on encouraging and coordinating in-reach services from the community into the centre or on provision of cultural awareness training for staff. The AWOs could become more proactive in these areas with proper encouragement and mentoring from management. There are many basic programs that could be developed by leadership from the AWOs, such as a visiting Elders program or regular speaker program. A similar issue was raised at the 2004 inspection and does not seem to have significantly progressed,⁴⁸ though there have been a number of occasions where speakers and Elders have attended for special events or ad hoc sessions.
- 4.9 Comments during the community consultations prior to the inspection indicated a general under-utilisation of services by Aboriginal youth and their families. The AWOs could have a strong role in informing detainees and their families of services provided by government and non-government service providers in the community. Also, some external providers indicated a lack of knowledge about the AWO role and more broadly about other staff and functions. A better integration and awareness could enhance the services provided by visiting agencies by linking with services already available on site.
- 4.10 With regard to relevant recommendations made during the 2004 inspection,⁴⁹ adequate access to vehicles is now provided for AWOs, they are provided with a written information package and operations manual and are also given a standard new staff orientation.⁵⁰ However, the role of the AWOs is not explained to new detainees in any greater detail

48 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre*, Report No. 29 (August 2005) 55, recommendation 32.

49 Ibid., generally.

50 Addressing recommendation 11 and partially addressing recommendation 13. Provision of more regular and ongoing supervision and professional development opportunities would satisfy the remainder of recommendation 13.

than was the case in the last inspection.⁵¹ A more active involvement in orientation would improve detainees' knowledge and the AWOs profile.⁵²

Aboriginal Visitors Scheme

- 4.11 At the time of the inspection the regular Aboriginal Visitors Scheme (AVS) visitors for Rangeview had resigned due to a dispute with head office regarding pay, conditions and professional support. This was not unique to Rangeview, and had affected other custodial facilities around the state. While visits were continuing regularly (three or four visits each week), they were made by different visitors each time who also had commitments to visit adult prisons or the courts. The lack of continuity and familiarity made it difficult for visitors to build rapport with detainees and be fully effective in their role. AVS is an especially important service in Rangeview, both because of the high proportion of Aboriginal detainees and because many are from regional Western Australia and are unlikely to receive many social visits. The Department needs to resolve the conflict arising from recent working condition changes for AVS visitors.
- 4.12 AVS visitors interviewed during the inspection felt well respected at Rangeview. They reported always having the opportunity to debrief with senior management after each visit, and saw issues raised at these debriefs dealt with quickly and appropriately at the local level. The range of issues presented to AVS by detainees included lack of family contact, conflict between detainees, legal issues, family issues and offending behaviour issues.
- 4.13 Although some detainees interviewed during the inspection were not familiar with the name 'AVS', nearly all were familiar with the service they provided. Many detainees said that they did not speak to AVS, but might do if they felt they needed help with family matters outside the centre. There was concern expressed by some detainees that information they told to AVS may be relayed to their families. This prevented some detainees from speaking with AVS.

Regional Detainees

- 4.14 A population profile provided by Rangeview prior to the inspection indicated that approximately 40 per cent of its detainees were from regional areas.⁵³ This was a significant proportion of young people removed not just from their families, but far away from any form of support, familiar surroundings and the possibility of face-to-face social visits.
- 4.15 There was no system in place to provide support for family from regional and remote areas who may want to come to Perth to visit the detainees, but not be able to do so due to lack of transport or cost of travel, lack of accommodation or a lack of understanding of urban life. No obvious links were noted to any support agencies (or indeed perhaps there is a lack of such agencies) in the community to assist in this regard.

51 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre*, Report No. 29 (August 2005) recommendation 12.

52 However, most detainees knew who the AWOs were, if not their title – likely due to the positive presence of the AWOs out in the centre on a daily basis, and the level of contact the AWOs had with many of the detainees and their families in the course of their work.

53 Note that not all those from regional areas were Aboriginal.

-
- 4.16 AWOs were active in ensuring that regional detainees had adequate communication with their family, wherever possible – often through liaison with the local community justice services office or other community members to locate family and make arrangements for contact. Because many regional and remote detainees keep to themselves, there is a risk that their needs may be overlooked. AWOs and other staff were observed to be proactive in engaging this group of detainees – a positive approach that should be maintained.
- 4.17 A group of regional Aboriginal male detainees (from towns and communities in the Pilbara, Gascoyne and Goldfields regions) was interviewed during the inspection. None of the group had had face-to-face visits during their stay at Rangeview (except with legal advisers), although several had accessed video visits. Unlike their adult counterparts interviewed in the prison system,⁵⁴ these young detainees did not express as deep a level of distress at being so far from their country – but still expressed a preference to be nearer their homes and communities. The issue of biggest concern for these detainees was the transportation to Rangeview from their homes. All were transported in the back of police vans and found the experience very difficult. Some reported not being provided with food or water and not being able to stop to go to the toilet on the trip. Others complained of the rough driving conditions and the cold.

COMMUNITY IN-REACH

- 4.18 A number of community-based service providers attend the centre (some on a regular basis and others on an ad hoc or as-needs basis) either to deliver programs or information sessions or to see individual detainees. The pre-inspection community consultations revealed that services were generally coordinated through Banksia Hill⁵⁵ and that the lack of a clearly identified contact person at Rangeview was a concern for many community-based service providers.⁵⁶ There was a sense that while the staff at Rangeview were friendly and helpful when specifically asked, they did not really understand the functions or needs of some of the visiting agencies and as such agencies felt disconnected from the centre at the local level.
- 4.19 Identification of an on-site contact person and improved communication between Rangeview and community-based service providers would alleviate many of the issues raised in the pre-inspection consultations. As mentioned earlier, the Inspectorate believes that the AWOs would be an appropriate contact for community in-reach at Rangeview.
- 4.20 In the year prior to the inspection, an Elder Aboriginal lady was invited to run regular after-school sessions which were received positively, particularly by the girls. Sadly, the lady passed away and the centre was unable to replace her; however, a visiting (younger) Aboriginal woman recently ran a deportment workshop for girls at the centre. This was well received and there were plans to run a second workshop to be held shortly after the inspection.

54 Such as during the recent inspection of Casuarina Prison, OICS, *Draft Report of an Announced Inspection of Casuarina Prison* (as yet unpublished).

55 The Coordinator of Centre Activities and Re-entry Programs based at Banksia Hill organises and is the main contact for most community in-reach into Rangeview, usually in the form of service provision for programs.

56 Other issues raised at community consultations prior to the inspection included the lack of suitable interview or program space discussed above in Chapter 2.

-
- 4.21 A visiting chaplain, who has been attending both Rangeview and Banksia Hill for many years, provided general chaplaincy and also non-denominational services for Easter and Christmas. Learning for Life Ministries and Broken Chain also attended on a regular basis to run activities in evening recreation time and provide chaplaincy support to detainees. The centre runs several family days a year, for special events and cultural festivals such as Christmas and NAIDOC day. These are positive events and engage families with the centre in a relaxed atmosphere.
- 4.22 There were no services specifically targeted at regional and remote Aboriginal detainees that could help them connect back to country, aside from the aforementioned efforts to connect individuals with family members by telephone or video link. With the relatively high number of such detainees, obtaining of resources for such services could easily be justified and could be coordinated by the AWOs. Community service providers should be sought to provide visits or in-reach to remote and regional detainees both at Rangeview and at Banksia Hill. This would also serve to address outstanding recommendations from the previous inspection.⁵⁷

Access to Legal Representation

- 4.23 Most remand detainees relied on subsidised legal aid (Aboriginal Legal Service or Youth Legal Service) to provide legal representation and faced similar issues to adults in terms of accessing adequate time with their legal representatives.⁵⁸ Many detainees did not meet or speak with their representatives until immediately prior to appearing in court and this inevitably impacts on the quality of legal representation received. The lack of private interview space in the centre also affected the quality of any legal interviews conducted on site. Despite these shortcomings, most detainees spoken to during the inspection were aware of basic information about their charges and court dates. Liaison officers and AWOs play an important role in keeping detainees informed about such details, and have regular contact with family, community justice officers and legal advisers when needed.
- 4.24 During the community consultations prior to the inspection, several community service providers voiced concern about detainees' knowledge about their legal rights, and in particular about the process for police interviews of juveniles in detention. During the inspection week, an interview with a detainee was requested by police, with the process observed by inspection staff who also later interviewed the young person and the adult (family representative) who attended with him. The processes in place were all followed; however, no legal representation was requested. The detainee attended the interview to state a refusal to speak to police, who then left the centre. Both the detainee and the family member were satisfied with the process. Rangeview has a written procedure for dealing with police interviews, which also outlines the rights young people have in this situation.⁵⁹

57 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre*, Report No. 29 (August 2005) recommendations 32 and 36.

58 See, for example, OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Hakea Prison*, Report No. 45 (September 2007).

59 Department of Corrective Services, *Juvenile Custodial Rules*, Rule 501.5 and Rangeview's *Standing Order* 12.4. Procedures require that police make an appointment to see the detainee; that the detainee be given the opportunity to contact a lawyer before the interview; that the detainee's parent/guardian be interviewed, but must attend to advise the police of this formally; and that if no other person is available to attend the detainee may nominate a staff member to attend with them.

Staff and management at Rangeview were found to be particularly protective of the children's right not to be interviewed by police in the absence of a responsible adult.

SOCIAL CONTACT

Visits (including use of video link)

- 4.25 Social visits are held at Rangeview every afternoon on every day of the year. Visitors must be approved by the detainee's parent or guardian and an adult must accompany visitors under the age of 18.⁶⁰ Parental approval also applies to contacts added to a detainee's approved telephone list. Visitors do not have to book social visits, except for special occasions such as Christmas or NAIDOC day when space is limited because of high demand. Having no requirement to pre-book visits is positive in enabling access for families whose children may have only just arrived or who attend the centre at short notice.
- 4.26 The way in which visits were run and how visitors were treated was found to be positive at the inspection. Visitors were treated with respect and there was appropriate flexibility with regard to visit times and processes, particularly with visitors new to the system or those who had travelled from country areas. However, the visits facilities were found to be inadequate. The visits room was small and quickly became crowded, so that on busy days the allocated visits time had to be split into two shorter sessions to allow access for everyone. There was no outdoor visits area and no area where visitors could access refreshments prior to or during the visit. Toilets and lockers in the foyer and a drink fountain in the visits room was the extent of the amenities. There were no cameras installed in the visits area and the centre generally relied on a single officer to monitor the entire area.⁶¹
- 4.27 A number of visitors rely on public transport to travel to the centre. While Rangeview is accessible from within the metropolitan area by public transport during the week, there are limited services on weekends. However, with the new southern railway now in operation, the viability of a shuttle bus between the Murdoch train station and the centre should be examined to assist visitors to access the centre.
- 4.28 The use of video link facilities for social visits had increased since the time of the previous inspection in recognition of the need to maintain detainee contact with family who are unable to visit. Where possible, the AWOs liaised with regional community justice services and other agencies to encourage families in regional areas to access facilities for video visits to the centre. In 2007 the Department of the Attorney General oversaw the installation of audio-visual equipment in a number of regional areas across the state, making this option more accessible for some communities. Video visits were also facilitated for detainees with close family in the prison system.

Detainee telephone system and mail

- 4.29 As during the previous inspection, detainees were allocated four free social calls per week, with the option to purchase extra calls. However, the location of the telephones at times

60 Unless prior approval is given by the Superintendent.

61 The visits facilities would be one infrastructure area to address within the master plan for works recommended in Chapter 2 of this report – see Recommendation 3 above.

limited access to other activities for detainees, given the existing staff pressures and direct supervision requirements. For example, when a detainee made a call inside the unit and there was only one officer in the unit, the remaining detainees had to remain in the unit as well, preventing access to outdoor recreation. Installation of a telephone in the vicinity of the oval would allow more flexibility for supervision particularly during evening recreation time when (generally male) detainees access the oval or basketball court.

- 4.30 While the number of social calls was found to be adequate, the phone system was old and prone to breakdown regularly. The system's computer required regular 'dumping' of stored information to avoid 'crashing' the system. Rebooting the system was time consuming and frustrating for detainees and staff. Indeed, the system crashed several times during the inspection. The centre had raised this issue with the Department and an interim fix that would increase the memory of the computer had been proposed (but had not been implemented at the time of the inspection). While this may alleviate the immediate issues, the telephone system was clearly ageing and should be considered for replacement.

Recommendation 15:

Rangeview's detainee telephone system should be replaced to ensure reliable access for detainees and the location for phones re-examined so as to facilitate convenient usage during recreation periods.

- 4.31 Incoming calls from family members were generally facilitated during the day, provided that the identity of the caller could reasonably be determined. This was especially so when the detainee was from a regional area or family were without a permanent telephone number. The flexibility in this regard was a positive response to the need to maintain family and community contact, especially for those unable to have visits due to pressures of distance.
- 4.32 Detainees can also correspond via written mail, either to family or friends in the community or within Banksia Hill and the adult prison system. There is also access to the confidential mail system similar to the adult prison system whereby detainees can write to a number of external agencies to raise issues or make complaints.

ADMISSION AND ORIENTATION

- 4.33 Admission, assessment and orientation processes were performed to an acceptable standard at Rangeview, providing for 'screening and assessment of young people [to] identify risk factors and individual needs that are relevant to the safe management of young people while in detention'.⁶² The process was found to be somewhat informal in manner, but this was suitable for young people and provided flexibility to meet the individual needs of each detainee. Detainees receive a significant amount of information about the centre and the expectations for their behaviour during the assessment and orientation process. Most of the information provided follows a standard form used during a verbal admissions interview, with an orientation video (being updated to DVD at the time of the inspection) played to all arrivals as part of the process regardless of whether they were new or repeat admissions.
- 4.34 Detainees interviewed during the inspection regarding admission and orientation were all

62 Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators, *Standards for Juvenile Custodial Facilities* (revised 1999) standard 3.1.

satisfied with the process and felt they had been treated well by staff. All felt they could ask an officer if they were unsure of what to do. The only issue raised was that some had not been able to access a telephone call immediately.

- 4.35 The practical and physical aspects of the admission process (strip-searching, showering, storing personal property)⁶³ were observed as being respectful and thorough, though somewhat chaotic at times of large intakes. Comprehensive admission interviews and assessments were conducted with all arrivals, with a genuine desire to ensure the detainees' wellbeing. Detainees were also asked whether their family knew they were in custody and if they needed to phone them.⁶⁴ Assessment for risk of self-harm was specifically addressed during the official admission assessment questions, but officers also looked for signs of distress and general demeanour throughout the searching and showering process. This was positive; however, there was little formal training for officers in risk assessment, so most of this was intuitive.
- 4.36 All arrivals saw a nurse within two hours to undergo a health assessment and further at-risk assessment. Because admissions can occur any time of the day or night, there was a nurse on duty 24-hours a day.⁶⁵ The admission health screening was found to be thorough and tailored to at-risk juveniles; it included an assessment of substance use, particularly any recent use before arriving in custody. Any detainee affected by substances (or withdrawal from substances) was placed in an observation cell under medical supervision.⁶⁶ If a detainee was assessed as requiring serious medical assistance they were transferred to hospital. Male detainees assessed as being at no risk following the health assessment were taken to the transit unit (Unit 1), while female detainees were taken directly to the girls unit (Unit 2). Any at-risk and first-time arrivals were housed in the observation cells.
- 4.37 All first-time arrivals and any arrivals identified as being at risk were seen by the centre psychologist as soon as possible after arrival as part of the admission assessment process. This generally occurred in a timely way for arrivals during normal business hours, but after hours and weekend arrivals could wait up to several days to be assessed. In urgent cases a psychologist was available on-call, but otherwise the young person remained in an observation cell until normal working hours resumed. As noted in Chapter 2, the observation cells were not at all therapeutic and there were concerns that extended placement in these cells may actually contribute to the negative state of mind of an unstable young person.
- 4.38 Once assessed by the psychologist, the detainee was either referred to a psychiatrist or placed

63 Strip-searches were always undertaken by an officer of the same gender as the detainee, observed by a second officer of either gender (observing the searching officer, not the detainee).

64 Note, however, that sometimes parents were not able to be contacted immediately, with officers or liaison unit staff making various efforts to locate family members to notify them of the young person's arrival in custody.

65 A substantial proportion of admissions arrive outside of regular business hours, generally from police arrest. Figures from Rangeview's admission database for the first half of 2007 show that 31.4% of admissions occurred between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday, 44.4% after hours on weekdays and 24.2% on weekends.

66 There are specific medication packs made up for drug withdrawal that nurses administer when required. Management of substance withdrawal has not been a major issue in the juvenile setting, as detainees with drug issues tend to be poly-drug and binge users, rather than be physically dependent on a single substance. Few young people arriving in custody have required medicated withdrawal management.

on a level of observation depending on assessed risk. They were then placed in the transit unit or standard accommodation. Orientation continued in the accommodation unit by the unit officer, following a standard checklist. The length of time detainees remain in the transit unit depended on individual circumstances and population pressures in the centre: generally, those new to the system spent one or two nights in the transit unit and were then placed in standard accommodation. Those admitted to the centre on multiple occasions were placed in standard accommodation almost immediately if not assessed as being at risk. This also occurred for newer detainees who had close family in the centre who they wished to be placed with.

- 4.39 The infrastructure for admissions remained substantially the same as at the time of the first inspection and therefore many of the issues that were highlighted in the 2005 report also remained. Although a new admissions area had been created just prior to the 2007 inspection – which offered a more logical flow of activity through the admission process and allowed greater privacy for detainees during assessment interviews – it was found to be substantially smaller than the wing of Unit 1 previously used for this purpose. The new area was only being used for the complete admission process when population pressures required detainees to be housed in the assessments wing of Unit 1, though the psychologists used the interview space for assessments on a regular basis.
- 4.40 While the inspection found that detainees were adequately orientated, some information that should be highlighted included the process for having phone numbers approved for detainees and the services provided by the AWOs. The AWOs do make a point of meeting all new arrivals within a day or two of their admission, but this is not a formal part of the orientation process. Since many newly arrived detainees are likely to be stressed, it may be beneficial for them to speak with the AWOs during the admission process – perhaps as they are waiting in the holding cells to be processed or immediately after processing. This may be particularly helpful for regional Aboriginal detainees who are far from home and may find some comfort in interaction with an Aboriginal staff member (even if not from their own country).

HEALTH AND MENTAL HEALTH

- 4.41 The quality of professional health services on site was of a high standard, with a nursing presence 24 hours a day and visiting doctors two days each week. Overall, detainees had a positive view of the health staff. This was clear from interviews undertaken during the inspection, as well as from responses to the pre-inspection survey where all respondents rated the nurses as ‘good’ (70%) or ‘okay’ (30%).⁶⁷ Access to the medical centre was not an issue, and custodial and other staff also spoke positively of the health staff. The service has adapted itself well to the reality of having more girls and long-stay detainees, though this seems to have been reactive rather than forward-planned for projected needs of the changing population.
- 4.42 Many detainees are marginalised individuals who may not access adequate health care in the community, and thus their time in custody provides an opportunity to address medical

⁶⁷ The rating scale options were ‘good’, ‘okay’ or ‘bad’.

needs and deliver health promotion and information. Detainees assessed as being at high risk of sexually transmitted infections or blood-borne viruses may have blood taken for testing if they consent to this.⁶⁸ Treatment can then commence in custody if required and referrals made for community health services for access after release. The health centre administers catch-up vaccinations usually delivered through the school system (such as rubella) as many detainees have intermittent school attendance histories. Detainees can access Hepatitis B vaccinations if they wish, and the girls can now also access the subsidised human papilloma virus vaccination. The health centre used to provide vitamins to all female detainees but this had apparently been stopped by head office. The Inspectorate considers this to be unfortunate in view of the poor nutritional habits of many detainees and the potential impact on women's health.

- 4.43 Health promotion and education of detainees regarding health issues was a central aim of the health staff. This tended to be done in an ad hoc and opportunistic way, but there was a commitment at the time of the inspection to undertake joint programs with other service areas and expand health promotion beyond one-to-one talks with detainees in the health centre. One of the nurses had been given responsibility to manage the health promotion portfolio, which would enhance the delivery of health promotion in the centre. This area needs support and encouragement to continue to evolve. At the time of the inspection discussions were underway regarding joint provision of safe-sex programs by one of the nurses and the senior programs officer. Alcohol and drug issues should also be part of the nurse portfolio to support safe substance-use programs as part of health promotion.
- 4.44 While generally the health centre was found to be running well and providing a very good service, there were a few gaps identified during the inspection that could improve the service further. For example, there was no Aboriginal health worker on site. Aboriginal health worker involvement would likely improve the initial health assessment of particularly regional and remote detainees, who may not disclose issues or may withhold consent to testing out of shame or misunderstanding. The centre had engaged in some discussions with the metropolitan-based Aboriginal health services, but at the time of the inspection no services were being provided in this regard.

Recommendation 16:

That the Department fund and implement an Aboriginal Health Worker position to enhance health services and health promotion within the juvenile custodial estate. In the interim, arrangements to access such services from appropriate community providers should be made.

- 4.45 Integration of health services into the rest of the operations of the centre was generally good, particularly in the context of detainee admissions. However, some areas could be improved. For example, a health statement of facts could be provided to inform long-term detainee case management (while still meeting appropriate patient confidentiality); health promotion could be integrated more into education, program and recreation areas with joint delivery; and psychological services and health services could be integrated better on

68 This is done a few days after admission, but only for those likely to be in custody for more than a few days to allow time for results to be returned.

a formal level to improve management of at-risk detainees or those with possible mental health issues. A minor point raised by our health adviser was that detainee psychology notes are kept separate to medical files – integrated notes may support better multi-disciplinary interventions for detainees with mental health needs.

- 4.46 There is no dedicated mental health nurse at Rangeview (or Banksia Hill). This is required in order to adequately meet the mental health needs of detainees. Psychiatry sessions are a private arrangement, with service generally only once per fortnight. Psychologists are available on site during working hours and were found to do a good job with limited resources, but the lack of a mental health nurse meant that general nursing staff were required to manage detainees with mental health issues at other times. Furthermore, there is no access to a forensic mental health unit specifically for juveniles, and transfer to the adult-focused Frankland Centre within Graylands Hospital is inappropriate. This is not a failing of Rangeview, but it does highlight the need to develop adolescent forensic mental health services across Western Australia.

Recommendation 17:

That the Department fund and implement a dedicated Mental Health Nurse position for the juvenile custodial estate.

- 4.47 Juvenile health services were managed under the Department's health services directorate, and much advocacy work was done from the local level (nurse manager and senior management) to ensure juvenile health did not become swamped by standard procedures for health in the adult prison system. For example, in terms of recent moves to standardise processing for health across the Department, juvenile health services will soon adopt a Department-wide electronic appointment and filing system (ECHO), but have refused to modify some forms and assessments used in the juvenile setting to ensure the current breadth of service is not limited to a one-size-fits-all adult approach.
- 4.48 While TOMS⁶⁹ and the Rangeview local database can produce a variety of statistics and reports on the detainee population from an operational point of view, the area of health services was not supported by statistical record-keeping at the time of the inspection. Nursing staff anecdotally identified skin disorders (such as infections and infestations) and drug-related disorders as the two most common health issues upon admission. However, Rangeview could only provide statistics on the health profile of the population on the day and could not identify prevalence rates of common disorders or be able to track increases in workload over time. In consequence, the centre cannot predict or plan for new issues or support submissions for additional resources to meet identified needs.
- 4.49 The nurse manager had undertaken some small local studies over the previous few years via manual record-keeping of statistics. A focus was the tracking of incidences of new admissions presenting with sexually transmitted infections to determine the prevalence over time and the effectiveness of the screening and treating within the centre. This was a positive initiative, but had fallen away due to lack of staff resources. It would be worthwhile

⁶⁹ TOMS (Total Offender Management System) is the main database used to manage detainee and prisoner information within the Department.

for juvenile health services (and the Department's health services generally) to develop and resource systems for data collection, analysis and research, possibly in collaboration with an academic or research institution. Such research would inform the Department of the health needs of the juvenile population in custody and the success or otherwise of services provided in addressing these needs. It would also support future initiatives to improve the overall health outcomes for young people in contact with custodial services. From a community perspective, the health centre at Rangeview (and Banksia Hill) is an important collection point for data on health amongst at-risk youth and in particular Aboriginal at-risk youth, who may not access medical services in the community on a regular basis.

Recommendation 18:

That the Department's Health Services Directorate develop and resource systems for data collection, analysis and research for juvenile health services, which may include collaboration with a suitable organisation or institution and could be broadened to apply also to adult prisoner health services.

- 4.50 As with the previous inspection, this inspection revealed no formal relationship or memorandum of understanding with Princess Margaret Hospital (PMH).⁷⁰ Indeed, the inspection team was told (by health and other centre staff) that PMH refuse to see detainees in restraints. Thus detainees requiring emergency and specialist hospital appointments are taken to Royal Perth Hospital. The poor relationship with PMH, the metropolitan specialist hospital for child and adolescent health, is something that cannot be addressed by the staff at the local level – the Health Directorate must work to improve this. Similarly, there are other health organisations (such as SARC) which do not have formal relationships with the centre, and yet may see the detainees when released in the community or could provide a valuable and needed service to some of the young people held in detention.

FOOD, NUTRITION AND THE CANTEEN

- 4.51 The quality and quantity of food provided at each meal and morning tea was observed to be of a reasonable standard. Special dietary needs were identified and special meals provided appropriately and adequately. No major complaints about the food were heard during the inspection. There were a few isolated incidents of poor quality of specific meals which had been rectified by the centre and evidence of some meals requiring re-heating in the units after delivery from the kitchen. The centre's kitchen manager was conscientious about providing healthy meals, looking for ways of providing healthier options for the detainees that they would eat (such as substituting some desserts for melon and other fruit). The menu was developed on a consultative basis between the kitchen manager, nurse manager and assistant superintendent, following guidelines provided by head office. It was not clear that the needs of juveniles generally, or specific groups (such as Aboriginal or female detainees), were considered in the development of the head office guidelines. A dietician should approve the menus.⁷¹

70 This was the basis for of recommendation 41 in the first inspection report: OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre*, Report No. 29 (August 2005).

71 To some degree the parameters of the menu and quality of the meals produced are dependent on Department-sourced produce, as funds allocated for provision of meals are inclusive of a significant proportion of food produced within departmental industries (bread, meat and milk for example).

-
- 4.52 Delivery of stores was a concern for the kitchen staff. Food stores arrive on a weekly basis and are delivered to the small store-room outside the main gates. There are issues with storage of perishables, exacerbated by the fact that the kitchen staff may not be notified immediately upon delivery – providing no opportunity to check the quality or condition of product delivered before the delivery truck leaves.⁷² There are then issues about transferring the stores inside, as there is no assistance routinely available to move heavy supplies. There is no detainee worker to assist, and while other staff help when they can, it is usually the kitchen workers who have to bring supplies inside.⁷³
- 4.53 The quality of goods (dominated by candy, chips and soft drinks) supplied for purchase at the canteen was initially of some concern to the inspection team. Upon further examination, it was found that the centre had trialled a healthy options canteen list through 2006–2007 which was generally unpopular with detainees and was subsequently judged not to be viable. After consideration, the inspection team determined that the quality of canteen provisions was not an issue that needed to be addressed further by Rangeview. The inspection team was influenced in this decision by a number of factors, including the small amount of money that detainees had available to spend (two dollars per day), thus limiting their daily access to such foods; that children in the community would often access at least one ‘junk’ treat per day in addition to regular meals; and that canteen spends acted as a reward and incentive for the detainees following the rules and behaving appropriately within the centre. More attention should instead be applied to health promotion so that detainees understand the place of such treat items in a healthy diet. This could be encapsulated in plans for regular health education which were being formed at the time of the inspection.

BASIC AMENITIES

Accommodation and cells

- 4.54 Rangeview’s accommodation is arranged in four units: Eyre (Unit 1), comprising the transit unit and Special Purpose Unit (holding cells and observation cells); Gascoyne (Unit 2), the girls unit; Hotham (Unit 3), the standard boys unit; and Jeealia (Unit 4), a newer hierarchical accommodation for boys. As there is only one unit for the girls, when the numbers exceed those that can be accommodated in the unit (16 beds), extra girls are usually housed in Unit 1. Each unit was found to be of an acceptable standard for accommodation, though the older units were looking worn and in need of upgrading. In particular, the living spaces in Unit 1 were small and the unit in general is unsuitable for long stays.
- 4.55 Accommodation areas were observed to be generally clean, although some areas were beginning to degrade from high use. This was particularly true of the kitchens and appliances, all of which were domestic rather than commercial quality and showed a great degree of wear and tear. The Department needs to recognise this and replace items (such as

72 There was also no temperature-recording device in the store-room.

73 This issue has been the subject of specific comment and direction in the environmental health assessment report: see paragraph 2.3 above.

washing machines and fridges) more regularly.⁷⁴

- 4.56 Cell sharing has become standard in all units at times of high population numbers, with two cells in each wing in the standard units and one in each of Unit 4's wings being able to accommodate two detainees. In Unit 4, the double cells had been designed and built as double cells; however in the other units, double-bunked cells are the same size as single cells, making a cramped environment for two detainees sharing. The policy at Rangeview is for sentenced detainees not to share cells and for first-time arrivals not to share before being assessed. All others are subject to the possibility of cell sharing unless specifically assessed as 'not to share'. No complaints about cell sharing were raised by detainees during the inspection, and 61 per cent of detainees indicated in the pre-inspection survey that they had shared a cell during their current term in Rangeview. Of these, most rated the experience as 'okay' (56%) or 'good' (37%); seven per cent rated the experience as 'bad'. There was no cell-sharing checklist in use (unlike in the adult system),⁷⁵ but efforts were made to identify appropriate detainees to share, often placing family or community members together in the first instance.

Clothing and laundry arrangements

- 4.57 It was observed during the inspection that all detainees had clean and presentable clothing that was washed regularly. Detainees receive one set of clothing issued during admission and then access further changes of clothes as required via unit staff. Detainee clothing is washed in the unit by the delegated unit laundry worker or by the individual detainee. While positive in encouraging personal responsibility, there was indication that washing in the units may require better supervision to ensure correct amounts of washing powder and water are used and that washing machines are in good working order.
- 4.58 Bedding and towels are collected weekly and sent to be laundered at Hakea Prison, an arrangement seen to be working well. There was a small main laundry in the centre, used primarily for washing detainee clothing upon intake to be stored in property for release. This laundry was observed to be clean and well run, though affected by storage space pressures as with most of the centre. The only potential issue noted was the often poor and badly soiled clothing some young people present in upon arrest; but there were appropriate procedures in place for managing heavy duty washing and handling of contagious items (such as if detainees present with scabies or similar infections).
- 4.59 Unlike the previous inspection, clothing was not consistently raised as an issue by detainees. In particular, in 2004 the female detainees raised a number of issues with the type of clothing provided, including the issue of recycled underwear, no pyjamas being available for them and see-through shirts that girls were not comfortable wearing. All of these matters were resolved by the centre following the previous inspection. While female detainees did indicate that they had a preference for specific items of clothing they could not access in the

74 This issue has also been the subject of comment and direction in the environmental health assessment report: see paragraph 2.3 above.

75 The Department developed a cell-sharing risk assessment checklist for use in adult prisons, starting in Hakea Prison and implemented throughout the state in 2007. See OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Hakea Prison*, Report No. 45 (September 2007) chapter 5.

centre (in particular jeans and their own shoes), there were no issues of inappropriateness of clothing found previously.

- 4.60 Male detainees are still issued with recycled underwear and this must stop immediately. It is not acceptable from the perspective of maintaining personal dignity and is unsatisfactory from a health perspective. While the average length of stay for a detainee is relatively short (17 days) and so the demand and associated cost for such items would be high, a community standard would not accept the reissue of used underwear.

Recommendation 19:

That the use of recycled underwear at Rangeview ceases and all detainees (male and female) receive their own new underwear upon arrival which they retain for the duration of their stay.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

- 4.61 Overall, the daily management and care of the young people housed in Rangeview is of an excellent standard. Staff in all areas of the centre are child-focused and address the needs of the detainees on an individual basis wherever possible. While the high proportion of Aboriginal detainees is an ongoing concern, these detainees were managed appropriately and a number of Aboriginal services were available for support in the centre.
- 4.62 The areas of community involvement and use of community resources could be improved, as could specialist support services for the health centre – in particular the addition of an Aboriginal health worker and mental health nurse.

Chapter 5

SAFE ENVIRONMENTS

- 5.1 Detainees, staff (custodial and non-custodial) and visiting providers reported generally feeling safe within the centre. Inspection staff observed numerous examples of the positive relationships between staff and detainees. The level of supervision in the centre was quite high: all detainees were under direct staff supervision during unlock hours, with a maximum of eight detainees to one officer (or teacher or programs officer).
- 5.2 Rangeview had sound processes for identifying and managing at-risk, vulnerable or predatory detainees, during the admission process and later through unit management. Any detainee who is considered by staff to need closer scrutiny or management is placed on an individual management regime. This regime is circulated to staff throughout the centre to ensure that all staff are aware of the particular conditions applicable to the young person. If a male detainee is assessed as posing a risk due to predatory or dangerous behaviour, he will generally be moved to Banksia Hill. It is apparent from the relatively low incidence of serious self-harm that the processes for managing at-risk detainees at Rangeview are effective.
- 5.3 Some staff said that the increasing volatility of the detainees was a concern for them, particularly when working alone in the units. This was not found to be a widespread concern during the inspection and could reflect a lack of confidence from less-experienced staff or a lack of regular training in 'verbal judo', self-defence and restraints. Staff respondents to the pre-inspection survey indicated poor satisfaction with training in the areas of conflict resolution and de-escalation (just 29.4% satisfied with the level of training provided) and use of force and restraints (17.6% satisfied).
- 5.4 At the time of the inspection, all remand detainees were classified as maximum-security upon admission.⁷⁶ While a review can be initiated by the Superintendent in consideration of the individual's conduct and the likely length of stay, in practice this never occurs because there are no identifiable advantages to doing so.⁷⁷ Both juvenile custodial facilities are maximum-security environments, and there are insufficient officers available to routinely undertake classification reviews. While generally appropriate for the majority of the population (short-stay, volatile and unsettled remandees), the lack of access to reduced classification for long-term and especially sentenced detainees (generally girls) limits the potential activities they can engage in and provides no incentive to modify their behaviour. One area where lower security ratings could be beneficial is in the creation of work opportunities for suitable long-term detainees, such as work in the kitchen or assisting with stores.

Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and emergency management

- 5.5 The OSH portfolio is managed by Rangeview's resources manager, though it is the responsibility of everyone to maintain safety standards and report hazards immediately. Rangeview had four OSH representatives, all appointed shortly before the inspection.

76 As per Department of Corrective Services, *Juvenile Custodial Rules*, Rule 4.3.2.

77 Classification may be reduced for sentenced detainees at Banksia Hill, linked to access to work positions of responsibility (such as in the kitchen) and progression to improved accommodation and other small freedoms. There is currently no system in place to review the classification of remand detainees, though the Department's juvenile custodial branch have identified the need for this and indicated the intention to address this in the future.

The majority of OSH issues at the centre were raised and dealt with by way of routine maintenance requests submitted by staff becoming aware of issues. Monthly hazard checklists were also completed by the OSH representatives. All hazards, accidents and injuries (staff and detainees) appeared to be reported and recorded appropriately, with prompt action and appropriate follow-up taken.

- 5.6 One issue raised by a number of custodial officers was that if they were injured while participating in sporting activities with detainees, they would not be fully covered by workers compensation. The inspection confirmed that an officer injured under these conditions would only be fully covered for 13 weeks, after which pay would revert to the basic rate less allowances and penalties. However, an officer injured as a result of an incident (such as while restraining a detainee, or from an assault) would be fully covered by workers compensation beyond the 13-week period. This was identified by some staff as a disincentive to interact with detainees on a social basis in recreational activities during their shifts.
- 5.7 Fire safety had an appropriate focus in the centre, with regular fire drills conducted in conjunction with FESA, training in the use of fire extinguishers, and regular maintenance of fire management equipment. The existing controls in the centre, such as the high level of supervision of detainees and absence of matches and cigarette lighters, reduce the risk of fire. However, there were some issues noted regarding fire safety during the inspection. The fire hose cabinet in the workshop was locked and staff in the area did not know where the keys were. Rangeview (and Banksia Hill) has no breathing apparatus capability and staff are not trained in using this equipment.⁷⁸ Under a local memorandum of understanding, FESA will attend Rangeview in case of fires – though there is no dedicated phone line for emergencies, unlike at some prisons and the centre instead must call 000 for assistance.
- 5.8 Staff and management at Rangeview had a reasonable knowledge of evacuation processes and fire emergency processes, though this appeared to be intuitive rather than grounded in operational procedure. There were no clear emergency procedures available in work locations and units. A joint report by the Department of Justice and FESA conducted in 2004 examined the resources and fire related procedures at both Banksia Hill and Rangeview detention centres. The first of thirty recommendations of this report stated that, ‘Fire and related emergency procedures to be available for perusal by staff at all location’.⁷⁹
- 5.9 At the time of the inspection, Rangeview management were in the process of writing operational procedures and updating existing standing orders, which would include emergency procedures. However, this process had been delayed for some time to allow the Department to finalise updates to the Juvenile Custodial Rules⁸⁰ (the overarching document guiding operations at the juvenile centres) to ensure that there is no conflict between orders. This delay also impacted on staff training: local procedures must be in line with departmental policies and Rangeview’s training officer was reluctant to implement

78 Issues regarding fire safety were also identified in the inspection of Banksia Hill. See OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Banksia Hill Juvenile Detention Centre*, Report No. 37 (September 2006) 22–23.

79 Department of Justice and FESA, Gilchrist B & Ryan P, *Findings of the Fire and Related Emergencies Report on the Juvenile Detention Centres* (unpublished report in confidence, 2004)

80 Which, at the time of the inspection, were still awaiting final sign-off endorsement at head office level.

some training packages in case of conflict. This delay can no longer be justified, especially in view of the requirement for comprehensive emergency procedures under the nationally endorsed *Standards for Juvenile Custodial Facilities*.⁸¹

Recommendation 20:

Rangeview should finalise its Standing Orders and Operational Procedures as a matter of priority. This should include updated Emergency Procedures with copies readily available in all work locations.

BEHAVIOUR MANAGEMENT, DE-ESCALATION AND USE OF FORCE

- 5.10 One overriding observation was that staff strived to develop positive staff–detainee relations to model and encourage good behaviour. The atmosphere within the detention centre was found to be not custodial-centred but more welfare and behaviour oriented, supported by policy directives such as the centre’s anti-bullying strategy. Routine interactions between staff and detainees were observed to be respectful and courteous, inappropriate language and swearing by detainees was discouraged, and the use of humour by staff was widely observed which detainees responded to well. Detainees reported that the majority of staff treated them well and spoke to them appropriately.⁸²
- 5.11 Detainees were encouraged to take responsibility for cleaning their own cells and laundering their own clothing, and there was a process for fair allocation of chores and housekeeping duties around the unit. Detainee orientation upon arrival outlined expectations of detainee behaviour, which were reinforced on a daily basis by unit staff and other centre staff. Detainees were encouraged towards socially acceptable behaviours through appropriate rewards and sanctions: privileges (such as televisions in cells and pool use) were automatically extended to a detainee upon admission but could be withdrawn for poor behaviour; gratuities were earned by detainees who participated in the day program of activities, providing money for canteen spends; extra gratuities could be earned by volunteering for additional chores; and for longer-term male detainees, progression to accommodation in Unit 4 was possible, where electronic games, radios, DVDs and CDs were available as incentives for good behaviour.
- 5.12 It is inevitable that in a custodial setting of young people, the detainee group will establish a pecking order based on age, communication ability, maturity, leadership skills and so on. However, the inspections team did not observe ongoing behaviour that could be considered bullying at Rangeview. There was also evidence that bullying was quickly identified and addressed by application of the centre’s anti-bullying strategy which outlines how to recognise and control such behaviour. Anti-bullying posters were prominently displayed in all accommodation units and classrooms and incentives/disincentives were used to encourage and reward appropriate behaviour. A detainee identified as a bully was managed under an individual management regime and strategies to minimise behaviour were applied. Similarly, detainees identified as possible victims of bullying could also be managed on a regime which included additional supervision and support if required. Examples of this

81 Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators (AJJA), *Standards for Juvenile Custodial Facilities* (revised 1999) standard 8.3: Comprehensive emergency procedures have the protection of life as their first priority.

82 This satisfactorily meets the requirements of AJJA standard 7.1.

were observed during the inspection.

- 5.13 Despite these observations, the pre-inspection staff survey indicated a drop in confidence in the effectiveness of policies to manage detainee bullying and standover since the previous inspection – with around 53 per cent of respondents feeling the current policies were effective, compared to 91 per cent in the 2004 survey. This may be a reflection of staff views of the changing population mix and increased volatility of the young people, as well as changing confidence levels in staff. In the pre-inspection detainee survey in 2007, 45 per cent of respondents indicated having been bullied or threatened in the centre, but detainees did not raise bullying as an issue during the on-site phase.
- 5.14 Staff were encouraged to report changes in detainee behaviour, which could lead to intervention by staff at the unit level, shift manager, senior management or by referral to the psychologist or nurse. Rangeview was found to have a culture of incident de-escalation based on a rapid intervention, typically using verbal de-escalation techniques and separation of detainees involved. During this inspection a number of staff reported that the daily use of early intervention with detainees resulted in far fewer incidents occurring. All new custodial officers receive induction training in managing difficult behaviours (including conflict resolution and de-escalation techniques) and some role-playing of managing conflict. However, as noted in Chapter 2, recurrent training was virtually non-existent and most experienced officers had not had recent refresher training in such skills.
- 5.15 On each day shift, there were two officers designated as the ‘recovery’ team, to respond to calls for assistance around the centre. When detainees were required to be separated or taken to the SPU, recovery staff did this to allow officers rostered on general supervision to continue managing the rest of their detainee group. Detainee misconduct was responded to quickly, generally by removing the detainee to another place for ‘time out’ with a custodial officer supervising, or to the SPU cells where they could be monitored by the control operator until their behaviour settled and the matter could be investigated and addressed.
- 5.16 Detainees were generally disciplined by way of loss of privileges or restitution if intentional damage was caused by a detainee; this was generally managed at the unit level or shift manager level, depending on the level of behaviour. No evidence constituting cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment was found in any of the disciplinary processes. Any detainee placed in an observation cell as a result of misconduct or another incident was only held for the shortest period of time, and the nurse would examine any detainee involved in a physical altercation to determine there were no injuries needing attention.
- 5.17 An incident of a detainee injured during a physical restraint in January 2007 led to a number of investigations and reviews, including this Office’s Report No. 41.⁸³ Since the incident,

83 OICS, *Directed Review into an Incident at Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre and its Implications for Management and Reporting*, Report No. 41 (April 2007). Note that as this was a directed review and the resulting report was tabled in Parliament by the Minister of Corrective Services (in May 2007), rather than following the procedure of tabling of inspection reports, the Department did not have the opportunity to provide a written response and action plan for the recommendations of the report before it was published. The Department subsequently did provide the Office with a response to the recommendations of the directed review in September 2007; Appendix 2 of this Report includes the action plan for those recommendations relevant to the juvenile custodial estate.

there has been a greater focus on ensuring the appropriate use of force and restraints within the centre. All incident reports involving restraints are routinely reviewed by the Assistant Superintendent and security officer, and any investigation and follow-up, or staff training and support is determined between these two parties. The training officer also routinely observes staff at work in the centre and provides on-the-spot guidance or training to address any areas needing attention. Weekly staff training sessions (during detainee lock-down periods for such purposes) also regularly cover appropriate use of force training.

- 5.18 Upon examination during this inspection, a culture of defusing and de-escalation of incidents by verbal interaction rather than physical restraint was noted, reinforced regularly by centre management and the centre's training officer. It was concluded that use of force and restraints is indeed used as a last resort if de-escalation of an incident is not successful and the detainee is presenting a risk of injury to themselves or others. This was found to be managed appropriately at Rangeview, in accordance to written policy and standards outlining that: '[T]he detainee must be presenting a risk of physical injury to himself, other detainees or staff and it must be a time of active danger to justify the use of any form of physical force'.⁸⁴

Confidentiality and Complaints

- 5.19 Representatives from the State Ombudsman's Office attended during the on-site week of the inspection to conduct an inspection of the detainee complaint and grievance systems. It reported that detainees were satisfied with how they were treated in the centre and had little to complain about, and that there was an internal system for grievances should detainees wish to complain. A report outlining minor areas for improvement in this area was provided to the Superintendent,⁸⁵ which will be monitored at future liaison contacts.
- 5.20 A standard 'detainee request/complaint form' was available in the units which detainees completed for action either by the unit manager, or to be escalated to other staff in the centre if required. The majority of complaints submitted on this form were forwarded directly to the Assistant Superintendent, who responded promptly and appropriately, notifying the detainees even when no action was to be taken. Detainees also had good access to the AVS (see paragraph 4.11, above), which directed issues and complaints directly to the Superintendent for swift action. Staff across custodial and non-custodial services were also proactive in identifying possible problems and assisting detainees with complaints or issues.
- 5.21 Access to these options to raise complaints in addition to the official complaint form may explain the few official complaints to the Ombudsman's Office.⁸⁶ Detainees interviewed

84 Department of Corrective Services, *Juvenile Custodial Rule– 207 Physical Force*, section 2. This Rule meets the intent of the Australasian Juvenile Justice Administrators *Standard 7.7– Use of Force*, which advocates the use of force (including restraint) only in response to an unacceptable and immediate risk of harm, for the shortest time possible, and in a way to minimise humiliation.

85 Ombudsman Western Australia, Scott B and Bovill M, *Ombudsman Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre with the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services* (unpublished November 2007).

86 In the intervening three years since the previous inspection, the Ombudsman's Office received 11 written complaints and three telephone enquiries from detainees at Rangeview or their family members. This is very low particularly compared with the amount of complaints received from adult prisoners.

during the inspection had little knowledge of the external complaint mechanisms available by way of the confidential mail system or phone contact, though both the Ombudsman's Office and the Office of Health Review were available as free and unrecorded calls through the detainee telephone system. Basic information about the right to complain was included in the detainee orientation process.

Transports and Escorts

- 5.22 The process for detainee transport to court appearances was found to be sound and well established. There were also clear procedures outlined for a range of escorts whether by vehicle or plane (to rural areas), transfers, medical escorts, hospital admissions and funeral escorts. Detainees were treated well by escort vehicle drivers during the escorts viewed as part of the inspection. These drivers were from the Perth Children's Court, which, while nominally managed by Rangeview, generally runs as a separate annex. The transfer of responsibility of metropolitan transportation from the previous contractor AIMS to juvenile custodial services in September 2004, was a positive one.⁸⁷ Regional transportation is still undertaken by police, with a number of negative experiences in police lock-ups and vans recounted by young people interviewed. Earlier in 2007, the Western Australia Police indicated it wanted to divest this responsibility to another agency as non-core business (transportation of juveniles is a costly and time-consuming activity). From the point of view of care and wellbeing of juveniles, the Inspectorate considers that such an outcome would be welcome if a viable alternative can be found.
- 5.23 Transport home after release was in the main arranged by Rangeview, generally by liaison unit staff. No child leaves Rangeview without some travel arrangements in place, either for family or a placement agency to collect them from the centre or Rangeview staff (AWOs or liaison officers) to transport them home if in the metropolitan area. In the case of children from regional and remote communities north of Carnarvon, air travel will be arranged with arrangements for someone (family, juvenile justice officer or another suitable person) to meet the young person at the destination.
- 5.24 An issue related to transport was that the interior of both escort vehicles did not appear to have been cleaned adequately prior to the Monday morning court escorts (generally the busiest court day when those arrested over the weekend are taken to court). Additionally, one of the vehicle's rear tyres was underinflated to the point of being unsafe. Nine detainees were still loaded into this van for transport to court. This matter was taken up with the Superintendent during the inspection, who promptly issued a memo directing that vehicles should be examined for cleanliness prior to each escort. This is the responsibility of the manager of the Perth Children's Court operations (responsible to the Superintendent of Rangeview) and will be monitored at future inspectorate liaison contacts.
- 5.25 Issues with the juvenile custodial vehicle fleet were noted during this Office's *Thematic Review of Custodial Transport* undertaken in 2006, in particular the need to maintain the vehicles to the same standard as contemporary adult prisoner transports. The report

87 This was inspected in 2005 and found to have positively improved the transportation of young people in custody, particularly in the timely coordination of transports. OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Metropolitan Court Security and Custodial Services*, Report No. 31 (February 2006).

included a recommendation to this end, which at the time of the inspection of Rangeview in October 2007 had not been met:

That as a matter of urgency, the secure vehicles used by Juvenile Custodial Services be upgraded to safe cell standards, and fitted with at least the same standard of monitoring, communications equipment GPS tracking and emergency equipment as the adult fleet.⁸⁸

SECURITY

- 5.26 Staff responding to the pre-inspection survey self-rated their competence in the area of 'security and safety' at a high 85.3 per cent (91% in 2004). No major concerns regarding security at Rangeview were identified during this inspection.
- 5.27 The staff-detainee relations aspect of dynamic security was identified during the inspection as one of Rangeview's great strengths and deserves acknowledgement. The same high level of dynamic security and positive interaction exercised with detainees during unlock and day shift hours, extended to positive interaction via the cell call system during lock down and after hours. Inspections staff listened to random selections of cell call responses from recordings over the six months prior to the inspection, and found that not only were staff responses to cell alarms all handled promptly, they were responded to courteously, respectfully and on many occasions with appropriate humour and banter. Detainees concerns or requests were not ignored or trivialised, but were responded to accordingly.
- 5.28 The use of intelligence was contained to the local level, whereby staff and management would gather information through their dealings with police, community members, families and detainees which could assist with managing the detainees in the centre and identify issues and risks. This information was reported and shared at the local level, and was critical to maintaining a safe environment and managing any issues within the detainee population (particularly in terms of identifying family feuds and conflicts which could affect detainees housed together, and identifying any contraband or misconduct in the units). However, apart from providing daily situation reports to the Department's centralised intelligence branch (JIS), there was little other contact or consultation with JIS regarding security matters. This should be rectified. Training should be made available to orient the security officer with the role and function of JIS and the intelligence systems available.
- 5.29 The position of security officer within the centre could generally be better resourced, with training for intelligence monitoring and investigations being two examples of under-resourced aspects of security at Rangeview. As with the training officer, the position is unfunded and filled on an expression of interest from the custodial officer group (see Chapter 2). A similar situation occurs at Banksia Hill, and was the subject of a recommendation in the previous Banksia Hill inspection report, that there should be a 'full-

88 OICS, *Thematic Review of Custodial Transport Services in Western Australia*, Report No. 43 (May 2007) 92, recommendation 30. At the time of writing, the Department announced that two new vehicles were being commissioned to replace the existing older juvenile transport vans. This is a positive response to the identified problems but is yet to be implemented. This will be monitored at future liaison contacts.

time, stabilised and appropriately classified and resourced' senior security officer position.⁸⁹ The same recommendation now applies at Rangeview, as part of Recommendation 7 above.

- 5.30 Operations at Rangeview are conducted in such a way as to facilitate staff visibility and the highest degree of interaction between officers and detainees. Patrols by the recovery team are random but regular and they maintain a highly visible profile, particularly during detainee school and recreation periods. There was no evidence of staff clustering in offices or control rooms. Population counts and other procedural security activities were conducted regularly.
- 5.31 Searches of cells and common areas were conducted routinely by the recovery team. Detainee searches at the point of admission, and upon return from court or external appointments, were conducted with due decency and respect for the detainee. Detainees were also pat-searched by officers when leaving EdVoc, where detainees have access to scissors and other potentially dangerous tools during class activities. Teachers also account for such items at the end of each class. The effectiveness of this procedural security was reflected in the rarity of items ever missing from EdVoc, and the relatively low levels of contraband and substances discovered in the centre. Security staff also attributed the low contraband levels to the short stays of most detainees, limiting opportunities to arrange trafficking of drugs or other contraband from outside.
- 5.32 The centre is classified as maximum-security and as such was equipped with a variety of security measures to prevent escape and ensure public safety, with all systems operable and in working order at the time of the inspection. There had not been any serious attempts at escape during the history of Rangeview. Indeed, the physical security was possibly higher than actually required when considering the bulk of the population – with some debate about the appropriateness of razor-wire and other such potentially dangerous physical barriers for young and impulsive detainees. The importance of not entering 'out-of-bounds' zones was stressed during detainee orientation, and the high level of supervision acted as a deterrent. There was good camera coverage of all internal outdoor zones, the fence and external car parks, which were monitored and recorded from the control room (staffed 24 hours a day). There were also cameras in all observation cells and inside the SPU, also monitored by the control room.
- 5.33 The control room is the central hub where all security systems are monitored, gate movements are controlled, population counts are recorded, and where cell calls and external phone calls default to at night. In 2005, following a recommendation in the initial Rangeview inspection,⁹⁰ the control room was redesigned and equipment upgraded. This improved the overall security and monitoring capacity of the centre, and was seen by custodial staff and management as a positive improvement for the centre. The only issue reported was the increased demands on the control room operator during peak times of the

89 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Banksia Hill Juvenile Detention Centre*, Report No. 37 (September 2006) 22, recommendation 5.

90 OICS, *Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre*, Report No. 29 (August 2005) 99, recommendation 61.

day (such as at times of frequent gate activity from staff shift changeover and morning court departures). A second officer may be required during these periods, particularly if there are detainees held in observation cells. At these times the transit unit manager or liaison officers may be called in to assist; however, this flexibility is compromised when staff shortages affect the centre.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

- 5.34 Overall, Rangeview offered a safe environment to detainees, staff and visitors to the centre. Sound security procedures and infrastructure supported this, in particular the dynamic security offered by constant staff–detainee interaction. The real strength of the centre hinged on the maintenance of this positive interaction. Staff do utilise a range of strategies for behaviour management, with the use of force and restraints promoted as the last resort if de-escalation and other conflict resolution techniques have failed.
- 5.35 Improvements need to be made in the areas of formal operational and emergency procedures available to all staff. Delays at the head office level in finalising updates to rules for the juvenile estate should not prevent the centre from finalising its own operational procedures to support the daily operation of the centre. Much of the good management of operations was undertaken intuitively by experienced staff – this must now be formalised with accompanying current written procedures.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 Rangeview Remand Centre continues to manage a varied population of high-need juvenile detainees well, with a positive focus on the needs of children and the individual. The detainee population has become more volatile and complex since the first inspection in 2004 and, in particular, the placement of sentenced girls in the centre since October 2005 has created challenges. The centre was originally designed as a short-stay remand facility – the infrastructure is not suited to longer stays, and there is no focus on long-term case management of detainees.
- 6.2 The population of girls, remand and sentenced, has increased dramatically since 2005. Girls remain a minority in the centre, but because of the directive for segregation by gender they are greatly disadvantaged. There are fewer activities available for the girls as compared to the boys, and there is less opportunity to vary current activities because of restrictions placed on their movement throughout the centre. In response to the disadvantage to the girls, funding was made available to build a new girls unit. However, this inspection has found that while an improved living environment for girls is necessary, the plan to build the unit at Rangeview was not the best option and would not address the issues of inequity and disadvantage for the girls in the centre, particularly not in the case of sentenced girls.
- 6.3 The Department now needs to think carefully about the planned girls unit development, and build a precinct for girls including appropriate staffing levels and provision of services and resources to address the complex needs of this sub-population. There is a need generally for an infrastructure update at Rangeview and a strategic plan to upgrade the infrastructure within the juvenile estate to appropriately meet the needs of the detainee population and the staff working within the centres.
- 6.4 There are some very good activities undertaken at Rangeview considering the infrastructure and resource pressures identified. However, much of the daily operations of the centre is dependent on custodial staffing and in recent years there have been acute staff shortages. This situation must be addressed. It affects not only the daily running of the centre, but also the provision of staff training and development which is essential to maintain the skills of those managing the care of detainees in the centre.
- 6.5 The key finding of this inspection was that, despite all the identified pressures, the centre has an appropriate focus on the needs of the young people in custody and attempts to meet these needs. There must now be an investment in the centre and a focus on provision of resources and procedural support to ensure this intent is matched with suitable physical, procedural and human resources to continue and improve the good work already underway.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1:

That the Department commit to the construction of a suitable outdoor covered area at Rangeview Remand Centre as an urgent priority. [2.4–2.5]

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 2:

That Rangeview's observation cells be refurbished, or that 'safe cells' be built within the medical centre, to create an appropriate therapeutic environment for the management and monitoring of at-risk detainees. [2.7–2.9]

Recommendation 3:

That the Department and Rangeview develop a master plan to address the immediate and future infrastructure needs of the centre. This should include, but not be limited to, staff work space (offices, storerooms, amenities), interview rooms, detainee accommodation and facilities, and improvements to the education and programs spaces. [2.2–2.12]

Recommendation 4:

The current proposal to construct a new girls unit at Rangeview should be halted and alternative options for the accommodation of girls considered. Any new girls unit must be resourced for appropriate staffing and services to meet the needs of the girls. [2.18–2.22]

Recommendation 5:

Staffing shortages at Rangeview should be addressed by the Department as a matter of urgency. These shortages relate to custodial officers generally, and female and Aboriginal custodial officers particularly. [2.23–2.26]

Recommendation 6:

That the Mahoney funds allocated for training in the juvenile custodial centres be quarantined and preserved until such time as the proposed training unit can be staffed. In the meantime, alternative methods for addressing the deficits in recurrent training must be explored as a matter of urgency. [2.27–2.28]

Recommendation 7:

The positions of Security Officer and Training Officer at Rangeview should each become discrete, full-time and appropriately classified positions. [2.29–2.30]

Recommendation 8:

The deficiencies of the Department's human resources administration system should be identified and rectified. These include delays in recruitment processes; delays in processing of employment contracts; delays in payment of salaries; and inaccuracies in job description forms. [2.34–2.36]

Recommendation 9:

That processes are put in place for more systematic, structured and timely communication between custodial staff and non-custodial staff at Rangeview in relation to any security issues, special orders or issues relevant to the management of individual detainees. [2.38–2.40]

Recommendation 10:

That the Department advocates for its contracted teachers' period of service to be recognised by the Western Australian College of Teaching (WACOT). [2.44]

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 11:

That the Supervised Bail Program be reviewed with regard to the need for legislative provisions enabling and circumscribing the program, the responsibilities of other relevant agencies (especially the Department for Child Protection, Western Australia Police and the courts), and the need for discrete resources and funding to maintain the program. [3.9–3.10]

Recommendation 12:

That, while girls are being accommodated at Rangeview, a case manager position should be created, based at Rangeview, to address the case management needs of longer-term detainees and (particularly) the sentenced girls. [3.11–3.12]

Recommendation 13:

The Department, together with the teachers at Rangeview, should investigate options for a broader range of education programs and activity options for the girls, in particular sentenced and long-term girls. [3.30]

Recommendation 14:

The position of Recreation Officer at Rangeview should be made full-time and appropriately classified, and be given some autonomy to manage a discrete budget to develop further recreational activities at Rangeview. [3.38–3.39]

Recommendation 15:

Rangeview's detainee telephone system should be replaced to ensure reliable access for detainees and the location for phones re-examined so as to facilitate convenient usage during recreation periods. [4.29–4.30]

Recommendation 16:

That the Department fund and implement an Aboriginal Health Worker position to enhance health services and health promotion within the juvenile custodial estate. In the interim, arrangements to access such services from appropriate community providers should be made. [4.44]

Recommendation 17:

That the Department fund and implement a dedicated Mental Health Nurse position for the juvenile custodial estate. [4.46]

Recommendation 18:

That the Department's Health Services Directorate develop and resource systems for data collection, analysis and research for juvenile health services, which may include collaboration with a suitable organisation or institution and could be broadened to apply also to adult prisoner health services. [4.48–4.49]

Recommendation 19:

That the use of recycled underwear at Rangeview ceases and all detainees (male and female) receive their own new underwear upon arrival which they retain for the duration of their stay. [4.60]

Recommendation 20:

Rangeview should finalise its Standing Orders and Operational Procedures as a matter of priority. This should include updated Emergency Procedures with copies readily available in all work locations. [5.7–5.9]

Appendix 1

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Correctional value-for-money</p> <p>1. That the Department commit to the construction of a suitable outdoor covered area at Rangeview Remand Centre as an urgent priority.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>The construction of an undercover area is included in the planning for the Young Women and Girls project. It has been proposed that the project will develop a dedicated precinct for girls programs and education to enable increased education options and separation from the boys in the centre. This precinct will incorporate an undercover area that will be utilised by the whole centre as a recreation area during inclement weather to allow detainees to participate in protected outdoor activities. It will also serve as a ceremonial facility for hosting visiting dignitaries, guest speakers, Christmas events and NAIDOC Day. The project is subject to budget limitations and has not received final endorsement of scope.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>2. That Rangeview's observation cells be refurbished, or that 'safe cells' be built within the medical centre, to create an appropriate therapeutic environment for the management and monitoring of at-risk detainees.</p>	<p>Supported in part/Moderate</p> <p>The centre will address the refurbishment of existing cells, in line with the centre's regular maintenance program. There is currently no scope to construct new observation cells or convert some of the medical centre into 'safe cells' to accommodate 'at risk' detainees. The centre Psychologists provide support to any detainee deemed to be 'at risk' and appropriate regular checks are made.</p>
<p>Correctional value-for-money</p> <p>3. That the Department and Rangeview develop a master plan to address the immediate and future infrastructure needs of the centre. This should include, but not be limited to, staff work space (offices, storerooms, amenities), interview rooms, detainee accommodation and facilities, and improvements to the education and programs spaces.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>The Department will engage a consultant architect to review and update master plans applicable to Rangeview, subject to budgetary constraints.</p> <p>As noted in the report, there is limited space within the Rangeview precinct to expand, however, the work proposed under the Young Women and Girls project will address improvements to the education and programs space with the addition of a dedicated precinct for girls. It is planned that this will provide targeted and appropriate placement options and services for girls as well as freeing up space in the current education unit for boys.</p> <p>If approved the project will also address in part the improvement to facilities with the proposed construction of an undercover area in the girls programs precinct, which can</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
	<p>be used by the whole site and is in accordance with a previous OICS recommendation during the 2004 inspection stating it was sensible and necessary to convert the previous gym into the TAFE area, but it was an elementary oversight not to provide some alternative covered area outside this space.</p>
<p>Correctional value-for-money</p> <p>4. The current proposal to construct a new girls' unit at Rangeview should be halted and alternative options for the accommodation of girls considered. Any new girls unit must be resourced for appropriate staffing and services to meet the needs of the girls.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>The current proposal to construct a new girls unit at Rangeview was halted in October 2007. It has been proposed that the funding set aside for this unit will be redirected to improve accommodation and services for young women and girls at Rangeview, and, additionally, address the current population crisis by progressing Banksia Hill stage 2. Final costings are not yet available and scope may need to be revised when received.</p> <p>The intention of the project which has been endorsed by the Minister for Corrective Services and has the support of the Department of Treasury and Finance is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide minor renovation work to the 24-bed Jeealia Unit to facilitate the relocation of girls to the unit. This will include painting; upgrade of furniture and cabinetry; upgrade to one cell for mother and baby; screened fencing for privacy and upgraded recreational facilities at the unit. • Provide minor renovations to an 8-bed wing of B-Block to temporarily accommodate any overflow of girls. • Provide minor renovations to the Gascoyne Unit to allow boys to relocate back into this unit including painting and upgraded cabinetry. • Construct a covered area with dedicated program and therapeutic facilities for young women, toilet facilities, storage area and an undercover area that will function as an assembly area. • Construct a new unit at Banksia Hill Detention Centre. Design and documentation work has been completed for this proposal as part of the originally planned phase 2 of Banksia Hill. It can easily be located in the existing 'footprint' of the site and will reflect the overall architecture and if approved, could be completed relatively quickly.

This work will be subject to budgetary considerations.

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>5. Staffing shortages at Rangeview should be addressed by the Department as a matter of urgency. These shortages relate to custodial officers generally, and female and Aboriginal custodial officers particularly.</p>	<p>Supported in principle/Moderate</p> <p>The current Juvenile Custodial Officer (JCO) recruitment process has 22 new JCOs that will be available to commence operationally in May. From 2008 there will be a JCO recruitment drive every year. The process has been revamped and allows CALD applicants and Aboriginal applicants to be progressed on a priority basis through the selection to ensure the best applicant is to be successful.</p> <p>Due to competition in the labour market, coupled with the all time low national unemployment rate (from the Australian Bureau of Statistics of 4.3% – 3.2% in WA), it has become more difficult to recruit operational staff. In addition to the issues of recruitment, JCS also has a number of JCOs approaching retirement age. A strategic recruitment strategy is currently underway to improve the attraction and recruitment of staff throughout the agency (long-term departmental-wide strategy).</p>
<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>6. That the Mahoney funds allocated for training in the juvenile custodial centres be quarantined and preserved until such time as the proposed training unit can be staffed. In the meantime, alternative methods for addressing the deficits in recurrent training must be explored as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>Supported/Moderate</p> <p>The Mahoney funds are currently quarantined. Two Level 5 Training Officer positions are to be advertised, these positions along with the nine 'backfill' positions will allow for staff training to be implemented.</p> <p>No alternative methods are required as the above will fulfil the requirements of training through the appointment of the above full-time employees.</p>
<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>7. The positions of Security Officer and Training Officer at Rangeview should each become discrete, full-time and appropriately classified positions.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>The Department has initiated discrete full-time and appropriately classified positions for the Security and Training Officers at Rangeview. The Training Officer is currently with HR for advertising and the Security Officer position is to be advertised full-time, by July 2008.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Administration and accountability</p> <p>8. The deficiencies of the Department's human resources administration system should be identified and rectified. These include delays in recruitment processes; delays in processing of employment contracts; delays in payment of salaries; and inaccuracies in job description forms.</p>	<p>Supported in part/High</p> <p>The Department is committed to improving the human resource administrative system and has identified a number of improvement initiatives with this goal in mind, within public sector administrative accountability requirements and controls. The Human Resource Service Centre, which is administered by the Department of the Attorney General, consistently deals with high volumes of transactions for a number of large and complex agencies that have both broad award legislative bases and diversity in operational business activity. This function is challenged by high staff turnover issues which in turn present challenges in maintaining service delivery. The Department will assist managers in the field to improve their understanding of the current human resources processes. It is expected that this will in turn enable managers to improve their provision of timely and appropriate information required to support the human resource functions.</p>
<p>Custody and security</p> <p>9. That processes are put in place for more systematic, structured and timely communication between custodial staff and non-custodial staff at Rangeview in relation to any security issues, special orders or issues relevant to the management of individual detainees.</p>	<p>Supported in part/Low</p> <p>In relation to detainee management, three times a week custodial and non-custodial staff meet to discuss behavioural, medical alerts and psychological issues of certain detainees. This is a forum for the sharing of information between all parties. Further to this Case Management meetings for detainees identified as at risk are convened on a needs basis and include Psychologists, medical staff, education and senior centre management.</p> <p>All staff working at Rangeview (including the aforementioned) are placed on the centre's email distribution list. All changes to procedures, memos or staff instructions are distributed electronically and a hard copy sent to all business areas. It is the staff's responsibility to ensure they are up to date with new instructions. All staff have access to computers and may consult Shift or Unit Managers or the Training Officer if they have problems accessing this email.</p> <p>In relation to operational procedures they are currently in draft form and are awaiting sign off. These operational procedures are reviewed annually to ensure that they reflect</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
	supportive and effective communication between custodial and non-custodial staff.
<p>Staffing issues</p>	<p>Supported in principle/Low</p>
<p>10. That the Department advocates for its contracted teachers' period of service to be recognised by the Western Australian College of Teaching (WACOT).</p>	<p>The Principal of Juvenile Education Services does advocate for teachers, however the law must be changed to allow for full registration, however the changing of the law is outside of the Department's mandate. WACOT does not recognise the Rangeview and Banksia Education Centres as schools as far as is understood by the regulations. Teachers are registered for a period of 3–4 years under provisional registration so this is not an immediate issue; however the Principal will be meeting with WACOT this year to commence negotiations and continue to advocate on behalf of teachers in a juvenile custodial setting.</p>
<p>Rehabilitation</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p>
<p>11. That the Supervised Bail Program be reviewed with regard to the need for legislative provisions enabling and circumscribing the program, the responsibilities of other relevant agencies (especially the Department for Child Protection, Western Australia Police and the courts), and the need for discrete resources and funding to maintain the program.</p>	<p>The Department's Policy and Legislation branch has been briefed regarding the legislative requirements of the Supervised Bail Program. A working party has been established and will continue to develop rigour around the service.</p> <p>The Department for Child Protection (DCP) has convened a meeting with JCS and WA Police to review current protocols. This complements the existing protocols with Crisis Care and the DCP Consumer Advocate. Dialogue between the various stakeholders is ongoing. JCS are currently reviewing the Aboriginal Legal Service's submission, <i>The Over-Representation of Young Aboriginal People in the Western Australian Juvenile Justice System</i>, and have given qualified support to most of the recommendations contained in it, including proposed legislative changes to both the <i>Young Offenders Act 1994</i> and the <i>Bail Act 1982</i>. An increase in funding has been obtained for a Supervised Bail Co-ordinator.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>12. That, while girls are being accommodated at Rangeview, a case manager position should be created, based at Rangeview, to address the case management needs of longer-term detainees and (particularly) the sentenced girls.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>A business proposal has been submitted requesting funding for a case manager. The current support afforded through Case Planning at Banksia Hill is under review as part of the Young Women and Girls project.</p>
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>13. The Department, together with the teachers at Rangeview, should investigate options for a broader range of education programs and activity options for the girls, in particular sentenced and long-term girls.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>The Department has investigated and initiated a number of programs for young women:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A drama group is run through programs and assisted by teachers. 2. An art and music teacher has been provided for Rangeview in classroom 1; this program will be offered to young women and boys on a rotational basis. 3. A woodwork and metalwork program is provided by education two afternoons a week outside of school hours to give girls access to the workshop. 4. Physical education programs for the girls are run by programs and assisted by the teachers. 5. There is a three days a week youth worker employed by education who is trained to teach textiles, driver's education and 'Deadly Foods', an Aboriginal food program to the young women of the centre. <p>Recreation Officer specific programs teach young women the value of passive recreation activity. These include: grooming and deportment, aerobics, stretching through yoga, art and recreational options.</p> <p>The Department will investigate further ways to improve programs, education and services for female detainees as part of the Young Women and Girls Project.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>14. The position of Recreation Officer at Rangeview should be made full-time and appropriately classified, and be given some autonomy to manage a discrete budget to develop further recreational activities at Rangeview.</p>	<p>Supported/Acceptable</p> <p>The Department has developed a submission which supports this recommendation and progress is subject to budgetary considerations.</p> <p>To support this submission, the Department has created storage bins for recreational equipment at each unit which will support and sustain the development of other recreational activities that can be conducted by operational staff. Further the Department has created documentation for operational staff in a manual that will assist in the facilitation of recreational activities.</p>
<p>Care and wellbeing</p> <p>15. Rangeview's detainee telephone system should be replaced to ensure reliable access for detainees and the location for phones re-examined so as to facilitate convenient usage during recreation periods.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>The process for implementing a replacement detainee telephone system at Rangeview is currently underway, with selection of the successful tender now complete.</p>
<p>Health</p> <p>16. That the Department fund and implement an Aboriginal Health Worker position to enhance health services and health promotion within the juvenile custodial estate. In the interim, arrangements to access such services from appropriate community providers should be made.</p>	<p>Supported/Low</p> <p>The Department welcomes this recommendation as it is consistent with funding requests that the Department has been making for a number of years in order to obtain this important service for detainees.</p>
<p>Health</p> <p>17. That the Department fund and implement a dedicated Mental Health Nurse position for the juvenile custodial estate.</p>	<p>Supported/Moderate</p> <p>The Department welcomes this recommendation as it is consistent with funding requests that the Department has been making for a number of years in order to obtain this important service for detainees.</p>

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE 2007 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>Health</p> <p>18. That the Department's Health Services Directorate develop and resource systems for data collection, analysis and research for juvenile health services, which may include collaboration with a suitable organisation or institution and could be broadened to apply also to adult prisoner health services.</p>	<p>Supported/Acceptable</p> <p>Health Services is currently implementing an electronic health record, which will allow collection of data and information. Health Services have recently engaged a research officer, who is looking at issues relating to Women's Health and this may be expanded to Juvenile Health. In addition, Health Services have engaged an Aboriginal medical student to complete a survey on the juvenile population. The outcome from this survey is expected to be available to the Department in the near future.</p>
<p>Health</p> <p>19. That the use of recycled underwear at Rangeview ceases and all detainees (male and female) receive their own new underwear upon arrival which they retain for the duration of their stay.</p>	<p>Not supported/Acceptable</p> <p>Following recommendations in the initial OICS Inspection of Rangeview (2004) all female detainees are issued with an allocation of personal underwear for use during their time in custody. Underpants become personal property and may be taken from the centre on release.</p> <p>Given the high number and turnover of male detainees, underpants for male use continue to be recycled in line with other DCS facilities.</p>
<p>Administration and accountability</p> <p>20. Rangeview should finalise its Standing Orders and Operational Procedures as a matter of priority. This should include updated Emergency Procedures with copies readily available in all work locations.</p>	<p>Supported in part/Moderate</p> <p>The new version of the JCS Rules have been drafted and are approximately four weeks away from completion. Once completed they will be sent to the Minister for her approval. Once approval is received, Rangeview's Standing Orders will be revised to incorporate changes to the JCS Rules. Rangeview's Operational Procedures (currently in draft format) will then subsequently be completed to incorporate these changes. This will include the distribution of more comprehensive emergency procedures.</p>

Appendix 2

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF REPORT 41, PART 1 (RELEVANT TO THE JUVENILE CUSTODIAL ESTATE)

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response ⁹¹
<p>i. The Department of Corrective Services should re-cast the Juvenile Custodial Rules, Local Orders and the training and re-training packages so as to emphasise methods of prevention and de-escalation of confrontational situations that might otherwise require the use of restraints.</p>	<p>Supported/Acceptable</p> <p>The Rangeview Standing Orders are currently being recast in conjunction with a set of clear operational orders to emphasise the clear lines of responsibility of all staff and the need for de-escalation as a number one priority. Systematic flow-on effect to the Juvenile Custodial Rules (which are also in the process of being updated).</p> <p>Emphasis on the appropriate training will be a priority when staffing levels permit comprehensive training models to be implemented in relation to Mahoney recommendation 134b.</p>
<p>ii. Particular attention should be given to the Victorian model for reinforcing de-escalation techniques through on-the-job observation and coaching.</p>	<p>Supported in principle/Acceptable</p> <p>Although Victoria may clearly articulate their expectations, there have been criticisms in recent years of their management of juveniles in custody. The Director and Deputy Commissioner will assess their model when visiting Victoria later this year. Implementation of any new model/procedure may be subject to funding (additional psychological resources may be required). It should also be noted that a recent Victorian delegation was most complimentary of WA's 'Managing Difficult Behaviours' package and was keen to incorporate this approach there.</p>
<p>iii. Where the point is reached that restraints need to be used, the Department should continue to emphasise the requirement that the intervention should be the least forceful that is consistent with achieving the objective of stabilising the situation and ensuring the safety of the persons involved.</p>	<p>Supported/Acceptable</p> <p>This point is consistently raised through every avenue such as internal staff training, staff meetings and Superintendent's notices. The operational orders will have weighted emphasis on this issue.</p>
<p>iv. The methods of restraint that are used should be further reviewed, taking into account the profiles of the detained population, in particular as to age and sex, and the potential risk posed to the restrained person by the particular method, and the training and re-training packages should reflect these matters.</p>	<p>Supported in principle/Low</p> <p>There is no common accreditation or consensus in the national context for juvenile restraint methods. WA's juvenile restraint techniques were recently reviewed by experts in the adult custodial estate, who were complimentary of the methods used, whilst acknowledging the difference between adults and children.</p> <p>However, training packages in use will continue to be reviewed to take these issues into account.</p>

91 Note that these responses to the Recommendations of Report 41 were provided by the Department on 3 September 2007.

THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF REPORT 41,
PART 1 (RELEVANT TO THE JUVENILE CUSTODIAL ESTATE)

Recommendation	Acceptance Level/Risk Rating/Response
<p>v. Each incident involving the use of restraints should be promptly reviewed by the management of the Centre and a report prepared addressing and analysing the circumstances from the point of view of their compliance with the applicable standards.</p>	<p>Supported/Low This process has been put in place at Rangeview and is recorded accordingly. The Assistant Superintendent is responsible for reviewing all restraint reports and providing appropriate feedback in consultation with the Training Officer or other relevant staff.</p>
<p>vi. In addition to reviewing each incident, the Department should collect data relating to all such incidents in such a way as to enable factor and trend analyses to be carried out so as to enable the ongoing evaluation of risk situations, opportunities for prevention and de-escalation, and effectiveness of training.</p>	<p>Supported/Low The TOMS ['Total Offender Management System' database] system is currently being reviewed in terms of providing effective analysis to be carried out. The description of 'actual restraints' will be more clearly recorded and analysed. Data specifications have been written to update TOMS for improved data recording and collection. This will then provide a basis for ongoing monitoring and evaluation.</p>
<p>vii. As an aspect of data collection, the various modes of restraint and use of force must be differentiated.</p>	<p>Supported/Low The various modes of restraint (physical, mechanical) are currently reportable from TOMS. The issue that reflects poorly on the centres is that, by definition, even when a young person is physically escorted from one location to another location this is currently recorded as a restraint when quite clearly this should only be recorded as an escort. TOMS will be enhanced so as to better capture a more accurate record of events.</p>
<p>viii. The standards derived as a result of the above recommendations should be applicable not only across the juvenile estate but also in relation to any other situation where children and young people are held in state institutions in circumstances where restraints may lawfully be applied to them – in particular institutions administered by, or managed on behalf of, the Department for Community Development [now Department for Child Protection].</p>	<p>Not for action by Department of Corrective Services</p>

Appendix 3

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
	Report No. 29, <i>Report of an Announced Inspection of Rangeview Juvenile Remand Centre.</i>					
1.	Staffing issues Strategies for the recruitment of women and Indigenous professionals are reviewed, with a view to increasing the numbers of staff from these groups.		•			
2.	Staffing issues Staff training modules are reviewed in consultation with group workers with a view to providing a program that is responsive to staff needs and provides balanced training in security/emergency procedures and cultural/ developmental areas of young people.		•			
3.	Staffing issues Centre management provides training in assessments and suicide prevention for all staff who: (i) are currently engaged in the initial assessment of young people and who have not received this training; (ii) are currently engaged in the initial assessment of young people and who have received training in the past but require a refresher course; and (iii) are new staff.		•			
4.	Correctional value-for-money Consideration is given at a Departmental level to the building of an assessment area specifically designed for that purpose, when resources permit.			•		
5.	Staffing issues A review of rostering is undertaken particularly in regard to the workload of group workers in the evenings and on weekends when initial assessment as well as supervision duties may conflict, with a view to ensuring more adequate staff coverage during these periods.				•	
6.	Care and wellbeing The Rangeview Orientation Video is shown routinely to all young people on admission to the Centre. Young people are encouraged to view the video again post-admission and staffs facilitate this access at all times.			•		
7.	Administration and accountability The processes surrounding the transfer of personal information			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2004
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
	from Rangeview to adult prisons are reviewed and where necessary, strategies are put in place to ensure information sharing is confidential, thorough and timely.					
8.	Rehabilitation The Department consolidates its community links with a view to reinvigorating the Regional Supervised Bail Program.				•	
9.	Rehabilitation The Memorandum of Understanding between the Department and DCD be strengthened to address the identified problems.			•		
10.	Human rights Rangeview management liaises strongly with legal service providers with the view to developing a program of attendance at the Centre to ensure all young people have regular access to comprehensive legal advice and representation.			•		
11.	Staffing issues The Department must ensure that sufficient Departmental vehicles are made available to ensure that AWOs can meet the demand placed on them for transport services provided by them to young people and their families.				•	
12.	Racism, Aboriginality and Equity Education is provided through staff and detainee orientation programs on the role of the AWO with a view to ensuring that all detainees requiring welfare services have sufficient access.		•			
13.	Staffing issues Juvenile Custodial Services conduct a review of the resources allocated to the AWO positions at Rangeview and develop (in consultation with AWOs) a training and orientation package that includes ongoing structures for supervision and professional development.			•		
14.	Administration and accountability Clear and simple information is available in Perspex holders (fixed to the wall at a height accessible to all age groups) in each of the accommodation units, to assist detainees in the lodgement of written complaints through internal or external processes.			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
15.	Human rights Rangeview management commence regular forums allowing detainees to voice their concerns and grievances. Issues raised by detainees to be recorded, considered, addressed and the detainee informed of the outcome within a reasonable period of time, taking into consideration the short term remand periods of some detainees.				•	
16.	Administration and accountability The confidential yellow envelopes are redesigned to: (i) provide space for the name of a legal practitioner or MP to be inserted, to ensure that it does not require opening to determine the recipient; (ii) include the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services and the Office of Health Review in the list of recipients; and (iii) correctly list the Corruption and Crime Commission of WA in the list of recipients, replacing the Anti-Corruption Commission.				•	
17.	Administration and accountability Juvenile Custodial Rule 605 is amended to include the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services, the Office of Health Review and the Corruption and Crime Commission of Western Australia.			•		
18.	Administration and accountability Education is provided to staff and detainees during their orientation periods on the purpose and processing of confidential mail.			•		
19.	Human rights Detainees are given direct telephone access to at least the Ombudsman and the Office of Health Review to allow them to make verbal external complaints.			•		
20.	Care and wellbeing The role of the AWO is emphasised to detainees at the time of admission and during their remand period, to ensure they know who they can go to for assistance, especially in relation to telephone access to families.		•			
21.	Care and wellbeing Maintenance is urgently undertaken on the existing detainee		•			

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
	telephone to ensure its reliability and the provision of an additional telephone is considered to alleviate some of the pressures associated with telephone access.					
22.	Care and wellbeing The telephone time allowance is reviewed to ensure detainees have adequate opportunity to call family and significant others located in remote communities across the State.			•		
23.	Care and wellbeing It is communicated to detainees, during the orientation process and during their remand period, that they have a right to purchase additional telephone calls if required.				•	
24.	Care and wellbeing Group workers are trained in adding pin and phone numbers to the Centre telephone system to ensure that detainees are not restricted in their ability to contact family and significant others at times when they are distressed and vulnerable.			•		
25.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity Consideration is given to engaging with community-based service providers to assist with providing interpreter services for Indigenous young people from traditional language groups, with a view to ensuring that all young people, regardless of language, are able to communicate their needs, understand information provided to them and access services.			•		
26.	Rehabilitation Centre management urgently review the constructive day program for all detainees, giving particular attention to the needs of post compulsory school-aged and female detainees.			•		
27.	Correctional value-for-money An adequate undercover recreation area is provided to rectify the loss of the gymnasium during the redevelopment of the Centre in 2001. If there are considerable delays, a short-term stop gap measure is considered.	•				
28.	Health Local management, in consultation with the Recreation Officers and female detainees, develops a program of			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
	coordinated physical, passive and leisure activities for females, which is reviewed on a regular basis.					
29.	Rehabilitation The Centre confirm and enhance the involvement of community groups in activities offered at Rangeview through consultation with detainees as to their recreational interests and needs.		•			
30.	Health Centre management urgently replace existing issued underwear with personalised issued items. No communal underwear is issued by the Centre and detainees are not required to purchase their own underwear while in custody.		•			
31.	Health Centre management urgently address the following practices for female young people in the Centre: the use of recycled underwear; the use of unsuitable see-through polo shirts; the absence of Centre-issued sleepwear; the restrictions placed on access to sanitary items; and the absence of Centre-issued deodorant.					•
32.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity Rangeview management consider introducing an Indigenous Speakers' Program into the Centre to provide young people with access to individuals who may act as role models in their engagement with the community.			•		
33.	Custody and security Management of Juvenile Custodial Services develops and maintains a strong working relationship with the Western Australian Police Service based on agreed protocols and practices in line with police security policies and the aims and objectives of the Department. Such an agreement is to include the transportation of young people both within the metropolitan area and from regional Western Australia to custodial facilities.			•		
34.	Care and wellbeing Rangeview consider a trial bus service one day per week (ie. Sundays) to transport families and significant others from a central location to and from the Centre.			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE 2004
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
35.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity Young people are educated on the role of the AVS both during their Orientation to the Centre and throughout their period on remand. This may occur through the use of videos, posters or brochures or through more interactive means such as regular presentations by AVS or Centre staff on the role of the service.		•			
36.	Rehabilitation The policy governing outside community in-reach is examined and some pilot initiatives are identified and tested in consultation with the young people at Rangeview.		•			
37.	Health Consideration is given to achieving sufficient ventilation in accommodation units (particularly in cells) to reduce the impact of extreme weather conditions on the health and wellbeing of detainees.		•			
38.	Health Increased resources for the assessment of detainees by medical practitioners as soon as possible after admission and a review of medical officers with particular attention to the existence of skills and experience in adolescent and mental health issues.			•		
39.	Racism, Aboriginality and equity The appointment of an Aboriginal Health Worker to provide health care to Indigenous young people and connect with Aboriginal community service providers and families in relation to the health and medical needs of young people in custody.	•				
40.	Health The Health Services Directorate conducts a review of the relationship with and referral policy to the Sexual Assault Referral Centre, with a view to establishing a process that reflects the position and needs of young people in custody, specifically in relation to issues of consent to medical care.	•				
41.	Health Consideration is given to the development of a relationship between Juvenile Custodial Services and Princess Margaret Hospital for Children, with a view to the provision of comprehensive, age appropriate health care across services, for	•				

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
	the benefit of young people in custody.					
42.	Health A review is conducted of the mental health care provided to young people in custody, with a view to establishing a more holistic service, which aims to provide both intensive psychiatric care and more general mental health support to detainees.		•			
43.	Health A collaborative approach to health education, promotion and prevention is developed across health services, education, programs and the daily management of young people, with a view to establishing a holistic focus within the Centre which reinforces the benefits of healthy choices and decision-making in relation to health issues.			•		
44.	Health The development of a Health Services Manual for juvenile justice health policies that focuses on the health care needs unique to young people.		•			
45.	Administration and accountability A review of procedures for the storage of medical records is conducted with a view to compiling historical and current records of each young person, for easier access to accurate information and comprehensive, informed patient care.			•		
46.	Rehabilitation Rangeview and DROPP staff meet initially to clarify the criteria for eligibility for the program and then have regular meetings to discuss any issues arising from the detainees' involvement in the program.			•		
47.	Rehabilitation An assessment is conducted as to the need for individual counselling at Rangeview and steps are taken to secure a formal contract for the provision of ongoing program services.			•		
48.	Health The Centre conducts an internal dietary review through consultation with young people, with a view to providing a menu responsive to:			•		

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the nutritional requirements recommended in the 'Dietary Review of Custodial Facilities in Western Australia' and the independent 'Menu Review'; - the special dietary needs of young people including their preferences in relation to food choice and food preparation; and - the cultural needs of Indigenous young people with regard to access to foods that reflect cultural and spiritual traditions (for those who choose to). 					
49.	<p>Health</p> <p>Management seek expert advice regarding the practices associated with food preparation at Rangeview.</p>				•	
50.	<p>Health</p> <p>A method of providing fresh milk to detainees is developed to eliminate the need for plastic milk bags to be opened by detainees.</p>		•			
51.	<p>Rehabilitation</p> <p>Education Services develop a realistic, appropriate and consistent view of the purpose of education at Rangeview. This is achieved through consideration of the past educational experiences and the future educational needs of the client population.</p>				•	
52.	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>A significant increase in time is made available to teachers to allow them to collaborate with colleagues in the planning of their educational and individual programs, complete necessary record-keeping activities, deal with professional issues and engage in service review. Localised leadership is essential to support this.</p>				•	
53.	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>Education staff is given increased opportunities to attend professional development activities as a group and as individuals, to bring in line with the general provisions within the teaching profession.</p>				•	
54.	<p>Staffing issues</p> <p>Teachers become involved in the development of program planning (both generally and for individual students), assessment, monitoring and evaluation so that it becomes part of the operational culture of education services.</p>				•	

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
55.	Staffing issues A culture of self-assessment and review by education staff as a team is developed and encouraged.				•	
56.	Administration and accountability An appropriate structured record-keeping system is implemented to strengthen teaching and learning and inform evaluation and review, and strategies are implemented to integrate all areas of service provision.			•		
57.	Rehabilitation Programs for post compulsory school-aged students are expanded to provide variety, choice and to accommodate the needs of both male and female detainees; and post compulsory school-aged students be able to access academic programs or support for at least a part of the week.			•		
58.	Rehabilitation Consideration is given to establishing a program at Rangeview that is specifically designed to meet the needs and experiences of Indigenous young people. International initiatives such as 'The Outdoor Classroom' should be considered when establishing such a program.			•		
59.	Rehabilitation Arrangements for the delivery of the YPDP be urgently re-examined with a view to providing proper support and supervision to facilitators and allowing sufficient time for facilitators to prepare sessions, to maximise the value of the program.		•			
60.	Rehabilitation Consideration is given to developing strategies to integrate the content of programs into other areas of service provision within the Centre.		•			
61.	Correctional value-for-money A review is conducted of the technology processes, tasks and staffing of the control room to bring it in line with contemporary standards, ensuring security, safety and efficient movement control.				•	

SCORECARD ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS AGAINST THE
2004 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation Number	By type of Recommendation	Assessment of the Department's implementations				
		Poor	Less than Acceptable	Acceptable	More than Acceptable	Excellent
62.	Custody and security The process of population counting is reviewed and simplified with a view to establishing an efficient and well-documented procedure. All staff are trained in the new procedures.			•		
63.	Custody and security A documentation process is introduced as well as audio recording of all detainee calls for assistance through the night cell call system.			•		
64.	Custody and security All group workers receive initial and ongoing training in the Managing Difficult Behaviours Program to assist them in appropriately responding to the behaviour of young people in custody. Continual evaluation of the program is conducted to ensure it is responsive to the needs of the Centre.			•		
65.	Custody and security Rangeview management, the Department of Justice and AIMS (whilst it remains responsible for medical escorts of juvenile detainees and other external escorts) should review and amend their practice in relation to the use of force and mechanical restraints during escorts and appointments.			•		
66.	Custody and security Local management reassess Rangeview's fire prevention procedures and practices and the applicability of the FESA/ Department of Justice Review. A review is conducted of Rangeview's fire prevention, fire fighting and fire rescue needs both in terms of equipment and training, and seek the necessary resources from the Dept to bring these systems up to standard.			•		

Appendix 4

THE INSPECTION TEAM

Professor Richard Harding	Inspector of Custodial Services
Mr Bill Cullen	Director of Operations
Ms Fiona Paskulich	Inspections and Research Officer
Ms Natalie Gibson	Inspections and Research Officer
Mr Pieter Holwerda	Inspections and Research Officer (seconded from the Department of Corrective Services)
Ms Elizabeth Re	Inspections and Research Officer – Environmental Health
Mr Joseph Wallam	Community Liaison Officer
Mr Kieran Artelaris	Research Officer
Ms Dragana Pjevac	Student Placement
Mr Alex Wright	Student Placement
Dr Adam Brett	Expert Adviser, Department of Health
Ms Louise Morrison	Expert Adviser, Department of Education and Training
Ms Dace Tomsons	Expert Adviser, Drug and Alcohol Office
Mr Bob Scott	State Ombudsman’s Office
Ms Michelle Bovill	State Ombudsman’s Office

Appendix 5

KEY DATES

Formal notification of announced inspection	5 July 2007
Pre-inspection community consultation	5 September 2007
Start of on-site phase	7 October 2007
Completion of on-site phase	12 October 2007
Inspection exit debrief	15 October 2007
Draft Report sent to the Department of Corrective Services	22 January 2008
Draft report returned by the Department of Corrective Services	7 March 2008
Declaration of Prepared Report	31 March 2008



THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY



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