

Evaluation of Cross-Gender Staffing Pilot Project

Final Report

Prepared for:

Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing
Government of Saskatchewan

Prepared by:

Goss Gilroy Inc.
Management Consultants
Suite 900, 150 Metcalfe Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 1P1
Tel: (613) 230-5577
Fax: (613) 235-9592
E-mail: ggi@ggi.ca

23 March 2009



GOSS GILROY INC.

Management Consultants
Conseillers en gestion

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 History of the PGCC Pilot Project.....	2
1.2 Methodology.....	5
2.0 Findings from Literature and Legal Context Review.....	8
2.1 Inmate-related Arguments	10
2.2 Staff-related Arguments	14
2.3 Conclusions	16
3.0 Implementation of the Pilot Project.....	18
3.1 Recruitment	20
3.2 Policies and Procedures	21
3.3 Training	23
3.4 Redress Mechanisms	24
3.5 Integration of Male Staff	25
3.6 Costs of Pilot Project.....	26
3.7 Conclusions	26
4.0 Impact of the Pilot Project.....	29
4.1 Impact on Inmates.....	29
4.2 Impact on PGCC Staff.....	31
4.3 Views on Future Direction	32
5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations	34
Appendix A: Methodology.....	40



Executive Summary

Introduction

This is the final report of an evaluation of the Cross-Gender Staffing Pilot Project at the Pine Grove Provincial Correctional Centre (PGCC) for Women in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. The purpose of the pilot project is to determine the feasibility of introducing male staff into front-line Correction Worker positions.

Two male correctional workers (CWs) were appointed on a temporary basis to participate in the pilot project and, with some exceptions, they were given the same roles and responsibilities as female CWs. The pilot project was launched in January 2006 and continues to this date.

The objectives of the pilot project are to:

- Provide positive male role models for female offenders;
- Determine the effects of employing male Corrections Workers on the main living unit environment;
- Ensure the right to privacy and safety and the emotional needs of women offenders are respected and are not compromised by the presence of male staff; and
- Ensure the rights of male Corrections Workers to employment opportunities and that they are not restricted unnecessarily.

PGCC is managed by the Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing (Ministry) and cares for adult female offenders on remand or with sentences of less than two years. It employs 114 correctional workers – 110 women and four men, two of whom are management staff.

Since 1980, the Ministry has received exemptions from the Province of Saskatchewan's *Human Rights Code* which allow PGCC to restrict the employment of male CWs. In July 1996, the Saskatchewan Government and General Employees Union (SGGEU) filed a complaint with the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission stating that the hiring practices at PGCC unfairly discriminated against male CWs. The Commission reviewed the situation and, in 1997, concluded that the exemption was justified. However, it recommended that the exemption be reviewed again following the release of the Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) *Third and Final Cross-*



*Gender Monitoring Project Report on Federally Sentenced Women's Facilities.*¹

Subsequently, in October 1999, a male member of the Saskatchewan Government and General Employees Union filed a grievance with the Ministry with respect to this issue. This grievance is being held in abeyance until the pilot project at PGCC has been completed and evaluated.

The *Third and Final Annual Report* was released in 2000 and made, among others, two specific recommendations:

- That males should not be permitted to be front-line workers. “This would include not being permitted to act in a security function with respect to living and segregation units, cell extraction teams regardless of time of day, and escorts of any kind;² and
- That “... elevated risk positions either be filled by females only or changes should be instituted, such that, women are never alone with a male worker in an unobservable area [of the prison].”³

This reversed the recommendation in the *Second Annual Cross Gender Monitoring Project Report on Federally Sentenced Women* (1999)⁴ that allowed the employment of male CWs if specific conditions were met regarding screening and training; policy implementation; respecting women's concerns regarding males in living quarters at night; limiting the proportion of male CWs; and ensuring that an unfair burden does not fall on women CWs. The final report concluded that these conditions were not being met; expressed concern that conditions would not be met; and as a result recommended an end to the use of male CWs in facilities for federally sentenced women.

In 2004, the Ministry requested an amendment to the ongoing exemption to allow two male CWs to work at PGCC as part of the pilot project. However, the Commission denied the amendment on the grounds that the Ministry could choose to not take

¹ *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report*, Correctional Service of Canada (2000)

² The term front-line staff or worker is a “contemporary term referring to the role and position of correctional officers who work directly with inmates on an ongoing and daily basis. These individuals commonly work in the living units and directly supervise personal and private activities of inmates, such as showering, sleeping, etc. Front-line workers are also most likely to be in positions to deal with inmate crises.” (Commission of Inquiry into certain events at the Prison for Women in Kingston” (Arbour Report), Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1996, page 7).

³ Correctional Service of Canada, *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report*, 2000

⁴ <http://www.csc-ccc.gc.ca/text/prgrm/fsw/gender2/toc-eng.shtml>



advantage of the existing exemption and hire according to the usual non-discriminatory rules without an amendment.

This evaluation was carried out for the Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing between June and November 2008. The purpose of the evaluation was to conduct an independent review of the policy and operational impacts of the pilot project. The methodology included:

- A review of internal reports and other Ministry documents on the project;
- A review of the literature on cross-gender staffing in female institutions;
- A review of the legal issues affecting cross-gender staffing, based on a literature review and telephone interviews with six key informants on the legal issues;
- Twenty interviews with managers, supervisors and staff at PGCC;
- Interviews with 21 current PGCC inmates and eight former inmates; and
- Interviews with five external stakeholders who have knowledge of the pilot project.

The issues associated with cross-gender staffing are clear from the literature and legal context review. The purpose of this evaluation was not to weigh these issues but rather to assess the impact of the specific pilot project implemented at PGCC.

The evaluation findings are limited by the paucity of literature on cross-gender staffing; the almost exclusive focus on the views of those involved in the pilot projects (mainly PGCC staff and inmates); the fact that some inmates interviewed had only limited contact with the male CWs; and the possibility that female inmates may not have been comfortable sharing their experiences and feelings about cross-gender staffing. However, there was a high level of consistency in the responses from inmates, suggesting that they are likely a fair representation of inmate views.

Literature and Legal Review Findings

The literature and legal context reviews identified the potential risks with cross-gender staffing. However, there is little agreement in the literature on the issue of staffing men as CWs in female facilities. The information from these reviews set the context for the evaluation of the pilot project, but the evaluation does not weigh the merits of the arguments for and against cross-gender staffing.

The key court decisions and key community-based organizations (including the



Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies) have, over time, reflected positions against cross-gender staffing. They take the position that cross-gender staffing should not happen because of the possibility of abuse of inmates' rights to privacy and security, but also have concerns about the impact on both male and female staff. From the perspective of the inmates, the arguments in favour of maintaining female-only staffing in female institutions rest on two pillars: principles about incarceration (particularly as defined by international standards calling for the fair treatment of inmates) and the unique needs of female inmates. The needs of female inmates are different from those of male inmates – they have often been subjected to abusive relationships with men – and it is difficult, in a correctional setting, to ensure privacy. The argument in favour of cross-gender staffing is that it normalizes the institution environment and that male front-line workers can provide a positive role model for female inmates. From the perspective of the staff, the arguments in favour of cross-gender staffing are that it respects the employment rights of male CWs. However, the courts argued that restricting staffing in female facilities to female CWs, is not an abuse of male staff rights. The arguments against it are that it can adversely affect the work life of female CWs, who have to assume tasks that their male colleagues cannot fulfill and that male CWs can be subjected to inappropriate inmate behaviour.

The opposition to cross-gender staffing identified in the literature reviewed for the evaluation is based primarily on the *potential* risk, rather than an *actual* risk, which has been identified on the basis of scientific evidence proving that the risk of abuse is statistically higher for female inmates with male CWs.

While there are many arguments against cross-gender staffing, many of those who make these arguments do not support the position that there should not be any male staff in female correctional facilities, but rather argue for restrictions on the roles played by males in these facilities so as not to compromise the privacy and dignity of female inmates. In fact, the academic literature reflects a more positive view of cross-gender staffing. It notes that, if concerns about privacy and potential abuse can be addressed, the risks to female inmates can be limited.

Implementation of the Pilot Project

Generally speaking, responses from many managers/supervisors and staff indicated that the pilot project was operating as intended. The project successfully met most of the specific conditions for cross-gender staffing, as identified in the federal Correctional



Service of Canada's *Second Annual Cross-Gender Monitoring Project Report* (1999).⁵ This report outlined the conditions under which cross-gender staffing could be implemented successfully. To address these conditions, PGCC recruited two high quality male CWs, developed adequate training for the new male recruits and the female CWs with whom they would be working, revised its policies and procedures to put in place appropriate restrictions on the roles of the male CWs and put in place mechanisms to accommodate female inmates who are not willing or able to deal with male workers.⁶

Inmates identified the factors that contributed to the ability of the two male CWs to work at PGCC as being the positive characteristics of the two male staff and the apparent success of the procedures/training for the pilot project. However, a few inmates identified that the flirtatious behaviour of some female inmates made integration more difficult.

There are two areas in which the pilot project implementation may have been weak – the lack of systematic distribution of information on the restrictions on the roles of the male CWs and the lack of documentation and transparency with respect to the additional duties assigned to male CW's to compensate for the duties they could not perform.

Impact of the Pilot Project

The results of the PGCC pilot project reflect positive views of cross-gender staffing. Stakeholders most closely involved in the pilot project – managers/ supervisors, staff and inmates – were all positive about the implementation of the PGCC pilot project. There was general agreement on the impacts of the male CWs on inmates:

- Inmates who participated in the interviews reported that there was no difference in their sense of safety with male or female CWs. Almost all inmates felt that the male CWs respected their privacy;
- All managers/supervisors and many staff believed that the presence of male CWs

⁵ Ibid. These conditions relate to: the adequacy of recruitment, screening, and training policies and procedures; the effectiveness of the policies specifying the roles for male workers; the extent to which the project can accommodate female inmates who are not willing or able to deal with male workers in specific contexts; and the proportion of male workers and the burden on female workers.

⁶ Note, however, that these were tested in the PGCC pilot project



had contributed to positive male role modelling. However, almost all inmates indicated that the presence of the two male CWs had not had any impact on their attitudes towards men;

- Almost all inmates participating in the interviews indicated that the presence of male CWs made no difference in their own behaviour. However, about half indicated that the presence of male CWs made a difference in the behaviour of other inmates – referring most commonly to the fact that other inmates often engage in flirtatious behaviour in the presence of male staff. Just over half of the managers/supervisors and staff noted that the presence of the two male CWs appeared to lead to inmates paying more attention to their personal grooming. This reflects perhaps the same flirtatious behaviour, but in a more positive way;
- Just over one-third (eleven inmates) of the inmates interviewed indicated that, if they could choose, they would have no preference between a male and female CW. However, another third (eleven inmates) indicated that they would prefer a female CW. Three indicated that they would prefer a male and four indicated that it would depend on the CW and/or what they need to talk about with the CW; and
- The four inmates who had a male CW as a caseworker (case manager) were somewhat positive, albeit with some reservations, about the impact of the male caseworker.⁷

There were, however, differences in the view of managers/supervisors and staff on the impact of the project on the workload and work life of PGCC female CWs. Many staff believed that the presence of male CWs had resulted in an increase in the workload of female CWs because the restrictions on the male CWs performing certain security functions were not offset by additional duties formally assigned to the male CWs. However, many managers/supervisors indicated that this was more a perception, than reality. It was planned that male CWs would have additional office (paperwork) duties to compensate for the reduced workload in the area of security. However, these additional duties were not documented in institutional procedures. Some additional duties are assigned, but it depends on the time of day and is not done systematically.

All staff and inmates and almost all managers/supervisors supported the continuation of the staffing of male CWs at PGCC. In addition, most managers/supervisors and staff were in favour of expansion – suggesting expansion by one to four male staff. However, the responses from the external stakeholders about continuing cross-gender

⁷ For example, one felt that she was not as comfortable enough to discuss personal issues related to her criminality.



staffing were more mixed and the Elizabeth Fry Society remains opposed to the presence of male CWs at PGCC.

Recommendations

On the basis of these findings, the evaluation team recommends:

Recommendation 1: That cross-gender staffing be continued at PGCC, with the existing restrictions on the duties of male CWs.

Given the clear support for the pilot project, there appears to be considerable goodwill on the part of all PGCC stakeholders to continue cross-gender staffing. In the absence of any evidence of the manifestation of the risks expressed by external stakeholders and identified in the literature, there is no reason to not recommend the continued use of male CWs at PGCC.

Recommendation 2: That the process associated with any continuation and/or expansion of male staffing at PGCC be focused on managing the potential risks associated with cross-gender staffing.

This would include factors that were associated with the success of the pilot project as well as areas for improvement identified by stakeholders – including a rigorous screening of candidates, adequate initial and ongoing training (including on-the-job training) and careful monitoring of, and performance reviews for the male staff.

The competence of the current male staff appears to have contributed significantly to the success of the pilot project. If less suitable staff are hired, the risks identified in the literature may become reality at PGCC. The challenge will be that, as identified in the legal context review, specific staff selection is very difficult, if not impossible, in a unionized setting such as at PGCC.⁸

Recommendation 3: That PGCC guards against a decline in the vigilance that has characterized the pilot project period.

⁸ The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, 2008. Written submission to Goss Gilroy regarding the Cross-Gender Staffing Project at Pine Grove Correctional Centre, electronic correspondence, September.



As noted in the initial Action Plan for the pilot project, it is important that PGCC guards against becoming complacent about the presence of male CWs at PGCC. The pilot project has worked because of the attention to key components of its implementation – the recruitment, training and mentoring of male CWs and the establishment of adequate policies and procedures to protect the privacy of female inmates. A decline in the level of attention to any of these components, increases the risk of an unacceptable event. Maintaining vigilance means ensuring the same level of screening, training and mentoring of staff and being open to possible revisions to the policies/procedures. This would include specifically ensuring the systematic distribution of the policies and procedures that outline the restrictions on the male CWs and offering refresher training and training for all staff (not just those working directly with the male staff) on the revised policies and procedures. It also means ensuring that adequate information is provided to female inmates, through verbal information and updating the Inmate Handbook to include the provisions to accommodate female inmates who do not wish to work with a male CW.

This evaluation was not able to assess the adequacy of the redress mechanisms that allowed for female inmates to choose to not interact with a male CW (as a front-line worker or case manager). The only such request made was subsequently withdrawn. Therefore, it is important that, if male staffing continues, this provision of the pilot project be evaluated at some future point. The Ministry should monitor the situation and ensure that adequate information is collected to make this possible.

Recommendation 4: Increase the number of positions for male CWs, to a maximum of four positions, as long as the increase still provides the option for female inmates to choose not to interact with a male CW.

Most management/supervisor and staff respondents felt that there could be more male CWs at PGCC. However, individuals expressed the concern that the changes should be gradual and limited to a maximum of four male CWs. The current approach is working. Although there has been no evidence of the manifestation of the risks expressed by external stakeholders and identified in the literature, any change from the current balance should be minimal to ensure that the situation continues as it has in the past two and a half years. It is also important to ensure that there are sufficient female CWs, so that those female inmates, who prefer to interact with a female caseworker, can do so.

Limiting the ongoing staffing of male CWs at PGCC to only four male CWs would also require that the Ministry apply for an extension of its exemption from the Human Rights Commission of Saskatchewan to allow it to staff remaining positions with only female candidates.

Within the concept of risk management, the expansion should occur gradually to ensure their effective integration and allow for effective monitoring of the impact on the inmates (particularly with respect to inmate rights), other staff and the operations of the Centre.

Recommendation 5: That PGCC ensures transparency in determining the appropriate balance of the workloads of male and female CW staff.

There appears to be some disagreement between management and staff on the balance of workload between male and female CWs. Since the additional duties assigned to male CWs to offset the restrictions on their security duties (such as skin searches and continuous observation of females in certain circumstances) are not documented, the evaluation cannot determine if there is, in fact, an imbalance in the workloads or if it is simply a case of lack of transparency. PGCC needs to review the situation and, if required, adjust the workload. At a minimum, the institution needs to ensure that there is transparency (through documentation and sharing of information) in the distribution of the workload, in order to ensure female CWs are not carrying, or perceived to be carrying, an unfair burden.

1.0 Introduction

This is the final report of an evaluation of the Cross-Gender Staffing Pilot Project, implemented at Pine Grove Provincial Correctional Centre (PGCC) for Women in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan from January 2006 to date. The Pine Grove Correctional Centre is Saskatchewan's only provincial correctional centre for adult female inmates. The Centre operates under the authority of the Saskatchewan Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing. In 2006, the Ministry initiated a pilot project at PGCC to integrate two male corrections workers (CWs) into the workforce at the female correctional facility.

The evaluation was carried out for the Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing between June and November 2008. The purpose of the evaluation was to conduct an independent review of the policy and operational impacts of the pilot project. The evaluation was to determine whether the conditions to support cross-gender staffing as identified in the federal Correctional Service of Canada's *Second Annual Cross-Gender Monitoring Project Report* (1999),⁹ could be implemented and sustained in the Centre, and to determine whether the cross-gender staffing model affects the Ministry's ability to provide a safe and secure environment for female inmates that respects the rights of female inmates and employees.

The specific objectives were to:

- Describe the development and implementation of the pilot project, its outcomes and impact as well as its cost and sustainability;
- Identify similarities and differences when units are staffed by males and females in comparison to when units are staffed by women alone;
- Ensure an unfair burden does not fall on female correctional workers;
- Assess whether the need for the exemption from the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission is necessary if male staff are employed as front-line workers; and
- Determine whether Adult Corrections should continue to use male front-line staff in

⁹ <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/prgrm/fsw/gender2/toc-eng.shtml> These conditions relate to: the adequacy of recruitment, screening, and training policies and procedures; the effectiveness of the policies specifying the roles for male workers; the extent to which the project can accommodate female inmates who are not willing or able to deal with male workers in specific contexts; and the proportion of male workers and the burden on female workers.



women's institutions.

Although the evaluation identifies the arguments for and against cross-gender staffing, as identified in the literature and legal reviews, it does not weigh the validity of these arguments. Rather it focuses solely on describing and assessing the impact of the pilot project, taking into consideration the issues identified in the literature and legal reviews.

1.1 History of the PGCC Pilot Project

PGCC provides care for remand, provincially sentenced and federally sentenced inmates who are being assessed for federal placement by Correctional Service Canada (CSC) Parole, awaiting transfer to a federal institution, or remaining in PGCC through Exchange of Services Agreement between Saskatchewan Justice and CSC. Unlike other provincial correctional facilities in Saskatchewan, PGCC houses remand, provincial and federally sentenced inmates together in the same units within the general population.

During 2007-2008, the Centre housed 128 inmates on an average day. The vast majority (87%) of the inmates are Aboriginal. In 2007 - 2008, the average length of time women spent at PGCC was 89 days for sentenced inmates and 25 days for those on remand.¹⁰

The Centre, built in 1967, has four main living units, a maximum security unit (MSU) within the main building and a low-security re-integration unit. Two of the four main living units are dormitories and the other two units have twenty individual cells in each. The MSU has twelve cells, including two observation cells. Due to crowding in recent years, a trailer was converted into low security re-integration unit which holds 22 low security inmates. In addition, two small overflow units with a capacity of ten inmates each were opened to house low security inmates.

PGCC employs 114 correctional workers, which includes 110 women and four men. Two of the male staff are Assistant Deputy Directors and two are employed in the term CW positions created for the pilot project. In addition to the male CWs, males are employed as maintenance and kitchen staff.

¹⁰ Data from Adult Corrections, Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing. Time spent includes actual time served at PGCC, after time off for good behaviour or other changes.



Since 1980, the Ministry has received exemptions from the Province of Saskatchewan's *Human Rights Code* which allow PGCC to restrict the employment of male CWs. In July 1996, a male member of the Saskatchewan Government and General Employees Union filed a complaint to the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission stating that the hiring practices at PGCC unfairly discriminated against male CWs. The Collective Bargaining Agreement of this union states that standards for staff selection may not include restrictions on gender. The Commission reviewed the complaint in 1997 and found that different staffing policies in male and female institutions were justifiable. As a result the complaint was not upheld. The Commission recommended that the exemption for PGCC to give preferential treatment to female CWs be reviewed again following the release of the Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC) *Third and Final Cross-Gender Monitoring Project Report on Federally Sentenced Women's Facilities*.

Subsequently, in October 1999, a male member of the Saskatchewan Government and General Employees Union filed a grievance with the Ministry with respect to this issue. This grievance is being held in abeyance until the pilot project at PGCC has been completed and evaluated.

CSC had been discussing the issue of cross-gender staffing in federal women's institutions for four or more years, following the release of the 1996 Arbour Report on an incident at the female correctional facility – the Prison for Women in Kingston, Ontario.¹¹

The *Third and Final Annual Report* was released in 2000 and made, among others, two specific recommendations:

- That males should not be permitted to be front-line workers. "This would include not being permitted to act in a security function with respect to living and segregation units, cell extraction teams regardless of time of day, and escorts of any kind;¹² and

¹¹ Commission of Inquiry into certain events at the Prison for Women in Kingston" (Arbour Report), Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1996

¹² The term front-line staff or worker is a "contemporary term referring to the role and position of correctional officers who work directly with inmates on an ongoing and daily basis. These individuals commonly work in the living units and directly supervise personal and private activities of inmates, such as showering, sleeping, etc. Front-line workers are also most likely to be in positions to deal with inmate crises." (Commission of Inquiry into certain events at the Prison for Women in Kingston" (Arbour

- That “... elevated risk positions either be filled by females only or changes should be instituted, such that, women are never alone with a male worker in an unobservable area [of the prison].”¹³

In June 2004, the then Ministry of Corrections and Public Safety applied to the Commission to amend the exemption order to allow the present pilot project at PGCC. The Commissioner ruled that an exemption was not required and the department may hire “according to the usual non-discriminatory rules applicable to the situation.”¹⁴ He also extended the present exemption to the Ministry to January 31, 2009.¹⁵

In January 2006, the Cross-Gender Staffing Project at PGCC was initiated after several years of development. The principle of the pilot project is reflected in the “Front Line Staff Protocols”:

The Cross Gender staffing initiative is an attempt to conform to the Bargaining agreement [of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union] while respecting the privacy and dignity of inmates to the fullest extent possible in a correctional facility.¹⁶

Its specific objectives were to:

- Provide positive male role models for female inmates;
- Determine the effects of employing male Corrections Workers on the main living unit environment;
- Ensure the right to privacy and safety and the emotional needs of women inmates are respected and are not compromised by the presence of male staff; and
- Ensure the rights of male Corrections Workers to employment opportunities are not restricted unnecessarily.¹⁷

Report), Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1996, page 7).

¹³ Correctional Service of Canada, *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report, 2000*

¹⁴ Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, letter from Chief Commissioner to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Corrections and Public Safety; August 31, 2004

¹⁵ By that date, the evaluation of the Cross-Gender Staffing Pilot Project was expected to be completed. Once completed, and/or until January 31, 2009, the Ministry of CPSP could apply to the Commission for a continuation of the exemption to hire only female correctional workers or let it lapse. Should the exemption lapse, the Commission has no authority to order its continuation.

¹⁶ “Pine Grove Provincial Correctional Centre: Front Line Staff Protocols” , undated

¹⁷ “Request for Proposal for an Evaluation of the Cross Gender Staffing Project at Pine Grove Correctional Centre”, Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing, March 11, 2008, p. 3



1.2 Methodology

Several lines of evidence were used for this evaluation:

- Review of internal reports and other Ministry documents on the project;
- Review of the literature on cross-gender staffing;
- Review of the legal issues affecting cross-gender staffing in female institutions, based on a literature review and telephone interviews with:
 - ▶ Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission,
 - ▶ Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (National office),
 - ▶ Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan,
 - ▶ Saskatchewan Ombudsman office,
 - ▶ Saskatchewan Government and General Employees' Union; and
 - ▶ Review of the academic and government literature on cross-gender staffing; and
- Fifty-four interviews, as follows:
 - ▶ In-person with eleven staff and nine managers and supervisors at PGCC,
 - ▶ In-person with 21 current PGCC inmates and by telephone with eight former inmates of the Centre, currently either in other facilities or in the community, and
 - ▶ In-person or by telephone with five external stakeholders who have knowledge of the pilot project:
 - Aboriginal Elder and the Chaplain at PGCC,
 - Director of the Saskatchewan Community Training Residence for female inmates,
 - Director, Institutional Operations, Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing, and
 - Provincial Elizabeth Fry Society.

Detailed information on these lines of evidence is provided in Appendix A.

Interpretation of Interview Results

Since the number of participants in the interviews at PGCC was small, it would be misleading to provide percentages when reflecting the results of questions to which the answers can be quantified. As a result, the terms “some”, “most” etc. are used



throughout the report when reflecting the answers to these questions. To ensure consistency in the use of these terms, the following guidelines were used:

- Some = < 25% of respondents
- Few = 25 – 49%
- Many = 50 – 74%
- Most = 75 – 89%
- Almost all = 90 – 99%
- All = 100%

The actual numbers are often also provided.

Evaluation Limitations

The primary source of information for the literature review was a series of reports on cross-gender staffing in the federal correctional system. The review of the legal context provided information from case law, common law, provincial laws, federal laws and international instruments. The literature and legal context review provided good information on the current legal and programming context in Canada. However, the academic literature on the impacts of cross-gender staffing in other jurisdictions is limited and there are relatively few studies of the impact of cross-gender staffing on inmates.

Given that this was an evaluation of a very locally-based pilot project, the list of people identified for interviews focused primarily on those who had a direct connection with the PGCC initiative – including the external stakeholders who did have knowledge of the PGCC pilot project. As such, this evaluation reflects, for the most part, the views of those closest to the pilot project.

However, not all inmates interviewed had the same level of interaction with the male CWs. Inmates had the potential to have the male CW as a correction worker (essentially responsible for inmate supervision) or as a caseworker (responsible for case management).¹⁸ Of the 29 inmates interviewed, nine had not been on a unit with a male CW and only four had had a male CW as a caseworker. This weakens the

¹⁸ Case management involves a range of activities to facilitate the reintegration of inmates. It begins with an assessment of the inmate's security risks and criminogenic factors, the development of a correctional plan (including decisions about programming needs), referral to appropriate programs, ongoing assessment of progress and, finally, release planning.



findings from these interviews with respect to inmates' assessments of the impacts of the pilot project, particularly the role of male CWs as caseworkers. However, there was a high level of consistency in the responses from inmates, suggesting that they are likely a fair representation of inmate views.

Although efforts were made to ensure that female inmates were comfortable enough to take part in this evaluation (notably by having these interviews conducted by an Aboriginal consultant), it must be recognized that they may not have been comfortable enough to discuss their experiences or feelings about cross-gender staffing. If this is the case, it would be another limitation on the findings of this evaluation.

Report Outline

There are two main sections of findings for this evaluation: the findings from the external sources of information (the literature and legal context reviews) on cross-gender staffing (Section 2.0) and the findings from the research on the specific PGCC pilot project, including the implementation of the pilot project (Section 3.0) and the impact on inmates, including stakeholders' views on the future directions for cross-gender staffing at PGCC (Section 4.0). The final section of the report presents the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation team (Section 5.0).

2.0 Findings from Literature and Legal Context Review

This section presents the findings from the review of external sources of information on cross-gender staffing – the legal decisions in Canada and the literature in Canada and elsewhere.

Ever since the release of the Arbour Report in 1996, there has been little agreement in government and commission submissions and reports or in the federal/provincial laws or case law on whether men should be employed in women’s prisons and, more specifically, as front-line workers. As noted in the final report on the CSC monitoring project on cross-gender staffing, “The issue of employing males in [female correctional] facilities is indeed complex. ... Gender integration is a controversial proposition.”¹⁹

Most government reports in Canada have focused on the federal system where, following the report of the Honourable Louise Arbour on an incident at the CSC Federal Prison for Women in 1994, Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) appointed a monitoring team to review the implementation of cross-gender staffing at CSC, specifically with respect to the new regional women’s facilities being set up. The monitoring team reported annually for three years. The reports of this monitoring team have alternated between supporting, and not supporting, cross-gender staffing as it monitored CSC’s implementation of the initiative. The second annual report recommended that males be employed in federal women’s facilities, “if and only if” specific conditions were met – conditions relating to recruitment, screening and training policies and procedures, arrangements to accommodate inmates not willing to deal with male front-line workers and a limit on the percentage of male staff employed in any one facility.²⁰ However, the following year the monitoring team reversed its position because it judged that the conditions had not been met. The third annual report made two main recommendations. The first one was that “males should not be permitted to be front-line Primary Workers. This would include not being permitted to act in a security function with respect to living and segregation units, cell extraction

¹⁹ Correctional Service of Canada (2000), p. 68

²⁰ Correctional Service of Canada (1999), Recommendation 1 (no page number)



teams regardless of time of day, and escorts of any kind.”²¹ The second recommendation was that “elevated risk positions either be filled by females only or changes should be instituted, such that, women are never alone with a male worker in an unobservable area [of the prison].”²²

At the same time, the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) decided to take action in response to a March 2001 complaint against CSC, laid by the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS) and National Women’s Association of Canada (NWAC), supported by a number of other community-based organizations (CBOs). The CHRC launched an investigation on the issue of men as front-line workers. It included extensive research and consultations with external stakeholders, including inmates, government departments and non-governmental organizations.²³ The 2003 report on its investigation, *Protecting Their Rights: A Systemic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women*, was completed in December 2003 recommended, among other things, that CSC formalize appropriate protocols for male staffing in female facilities.²⁴

While it continued to use males as front-line workers in female facilities, CSC accepted the CHRC recommendation and put in place Commissioner’s Directive 577, Operational Requirements for Cross-Gender Staffing in Women Inmate Institutions in March 2006 to ensure that “the dignity and privacy of women inmates is respected to the fullest extent possible consistent with safety and security.”²⁵

While the federal government reports have varied in their support for cross-gender staffing, the limited academic literature seems generally positive about cross-gender staffing in female correctional facilities, as long as male workers are restricted in their contact with females while the latter are engaged in private activities, such as showering, family visiting rooms, and strip search rooms.

The best way to summarize the range of views on cross-gender staffing is to present the arguments as they relate to inmates (Sections 2.1) and staff (Section 2.2).

²¹ Correctional Service of Canada (2000), p. 73

²² Ibid, p. 76

²³ Canadian Human Rights Commission, *Protecting Their Rights: A Systemic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women*, 2004, Preface. In addition, the CHRC supported an application by the Elizabeth Fry Societies for funding under the Voluntary Sector Initiative to carry out its own consultations and help non-governmental organizations engage in policy dialogue and prepare policy submissions.

²⁴ Ibid, p 44

²⁵ Correctional Service of Canada, *Ten-Year Status Report on Women's Corrections*, April 2006, p. 11



2.1 Inmate-related Arguments

The literature reflects a range of arguments, from the perspective of the inmates, both for and against cross-gender staffing.

International standards

The initial inmate-related argument against cross-gender staffing stems from the fundamental principles about incarceration reflected in international standards. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states: “All persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person” and “No one shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his privacy.”²⁶

In 1975, Canada subscribed to the United Nations’ *Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners* (1957/1977).²⁷ While not being legally binding, these rules set out minimum standards and good practices for Canada.²⁸ The Rules provide that:

- (2) No male member of the staff shall enter the part of the institution set aside for women unless accompanied by a woman officer.
- (3) Women prisoners shall be attended and supervised only by women officers.²⁹

However, this does not preclude male staff members, particularly doctors and teachers, from carrying out their professional duties in institutions or parts of institutions set aside for women.³⁰

²⁶ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Articles 10 and 17, http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_ccpr.htm

²⁷ “Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners”, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Adopted by the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, held at Geneva in 1955, and approved by the Economic and Social Council by its resolution 663 C (XXIV) of 31 July 1957 and 2076 (LXII) of 13 May 1977

²⁸ Correctional Service of Canada, *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report*, 2000, p57

²⁹ “Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners”, Article 53[2]

³⁰ *Ibid*, Article 53[3]



Different needs of female inmates

There is general agreement in the literature that female inmates have different needs than men. From the Brown Commission of 1849, which reported on the welfare and programming of female inmates in Ontario, to the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners in 1957, the 1999 Report of Amnesty International on “Not Part of my Sentence” Violations of the Human Rights of Women in Custody, to the Canadian Human Rights Report of 2004, and to many other federal and provincial reports, inquiries and commissions in Canada and elsewhere, there seems to be consensus that female inmates are unique and cannot be treated like male inmates in terms of their care, custody and welfare.

The special needs of female inmates stem from the high likelihood that they have, in the past, been the victims of physical or sexual abuse. The Arbour report notes “... women inmates as a group have a unique history of physical and sexual abuse.”³¹ Female inmates are often marginalized and are extremely vulnerable, given the power conferred on correctional staff.

Aboriginal women are also particularly unique in terms of their distinct identity, cultural values, and being more economically and socially disadvantaged than non-Aboriginal women. The Saskatchewan Commission on First Nations and Métis Peoples suggests that Aboriginal woman inmates feel they have little or no power as compared to their male counterparts and non-Aboriginal women. The vulnerability of Aboriginal women is reflected in the recommendation of the final CSC monitoring project report to the effect that processes for addressing sexual misconduct allegations need to “incorporate an approach for complaints by Aboriginal women inmates that recognize their vulnerability to persons in positions of trust and authority within their own culture as well as outside it.”³²

Privacy concerns

The *Preiss v. BC* case found that as inmates are subject to close supervision and surveillance, it is likely that any front-line staff member would see private activities, and female inmates would experience a profound sense of intrusion and loss of

³¹ Arbour, The Honourable Louise, Commission of Inquiry into Certain Events at the Prison for Women in Kingston, 1996, p. 199

³² Correctional Service of Canada, The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report, 2000, p. 86



privacy.³³ The academic literature also reflects the concerns about inmate privacy.³⁴ Linda L. Zupan reported that “The majority of female inmates, however, objected to the deployment of male officers in certain assignments which required direct physical contact or visual observation of a personal nature (e.g., pat/strip searches, supervision of toilet/shower areas). Inmates stated that such assignments constituted a gross violation of their privacy.”³⁵ However, Arbour made it clear that privacy issues alone are not sufficient to rule out cross-gender staffing. She recommended to CSC that cross-gender staffing be allowed but that under specific conditions, including, among other things, the availability of alternative arrangements, adequate protocols and appropriate physical arrangements to ensure privacy.³⁶

Abuse of power

The ratio of reporting of incidents of sexual abuse/harassment to actual incidents outside the prison context is very low; in the prison context it would be even lower.³⁷ Women inmates are not likely to lodge a complaint about misconduct because of the large power imbalance between inmates and correctional staff, and the fear of retribution and not being believed.³⁸ Because of the potential for abuse, coupled with the potentially devastating results of misconduct, in the case of *Preiss v. BC*, it was determined that it is better to err on the side of caution and not have male front-line correctional workers.³⁹

Normalizing the environment

The main argument in favour of cross-gender staffing, from the perspective of the impact on inmates, is that it can provide a positive male role model for female inmates. Zupan, quoting researchers in the field, notes that male staffing would “create a more “normal” environment in the prison, one which resembles the outside

³³ *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3) 2006 BCHRT 587*, p. 71, 74

³⁴ See, for example, Alpert, Geoffrey P. and Crouch, Ben M. (1991) “Cross-gender Supervision, Personal Privacy and Institutional Security: Perceptions of Jail Inmates and Staff.” *Criminal Justice and Behaviour* 18(3): 304-317 and Zupan, Linda L. (1992) “Men Guarding Women: An Analysis of the Employment of Male Correction Officer in Prisons for Women.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 20:297-309

³⁵ Zupan, p. 308

³⁶ Arbour, p. 252

³⁷ Justice Louise Arbour, 1996 *Commission of Inquiry into Certain Event at the Prison for Women in Kingston*, p. 25 - 26

³⁸ Justice Louise Arbour, 1996 *Commission of Inquiry into Certain Event at the Prison for Women in Kingston*, p. 193;

Canadian Human Rights Commission, *Protecting Their Rights: A Systematic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women*, 2003, p42, *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3) 2006 BCHRT 587*, p76;

Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies, Nov 1, 2004 letter to the Correctional Service of Canada

³⁹ *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3) 2006 BCHRT 587*, p. 77



“free world”.”⁴⁰ This is seen as particularly important as most women inmates, once released back into the community, have to interact with men in many capacities.

However, others argue that the normalization argument for cross-gender staffing is problematic because there is nothing normal about being imprisoned.⁴¹ The opportunity for female inmates to interact with male front-line staff is outweighed by the disadvantages of having men in these roles.

It is not easy, and some social scientists would argue impossible, to be a positive role model in a prison, given the unreal nature of prisons where inmates are confined against their wishes. As noted by the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS), “People in positions of trust must earn that trust every day. They cannot expect merely to have it bestowed upon them by virtue of their positions of relative power or authority.”⁴² Similarly the notion of the normalizing impact is challenged by the imbalance of power between corrections workers and inmates.

An individual who has been abused by men or women is not going to learn how to trust in a short period of time. As noted in the 1995 *Gender Staffing Report on Adult (Custody) Centres in British Columbia* (commonly referred to as the “Korbin Report”), “While abused women do need to learn that there are men they can trust, this learning occurs over an extended period of time, greater than the period of provincial incarceration.”⁴³

Views of female inmates

Zupan’s study, reported in the *Journal of Criminal Justice*, found that women inmates respond positively to the presence of male officers and actually favour male to female officers in a number of areas.⁴⁴ They would rather be supervised by a male officer; tend to respect male officers more than female; are more likely to complain about female correctional officers; believe male officers make better officers, are more respectful to residents, are more likely to help residents with problems and overlook minor rule violations. The women also indicated that male officers are less likely to

⁴⁰ Zupan Linda L. (1992) "Men Guarding Women: An Analysis of the Employment of Male Correction Officer in Prisons for Women." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 20:297-309, p. 304

⁴¹ *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3)* 2006 BCHRT 587, p77; Arbour as cited in *Preiss*, p25

⁴² November 1, 2004 letter by the CAEFS to the Acting Deputy Commissioner for Women, Correctional Service of Canada

⁴³ Korbin Report, "Gender Staffing Report on Adult (Custody) Centres in British Columbia, May 2005", as cited in *Preiss v. B.C (Ministry of Attorney General) (No.3)*, December 1, 2006, BCHRY 587, p. 15



use physical force on a resident, show favouritism towards certain residents and to get into verbal arguments with residents. On the other hand, they report that male officers are more easily conned. The only areas in which the female inmates preferred female officers were, not unexpectedly, in the discussion of their personal problems. They also preferred to be pat or strip-searched by female officers and to be supervised in the shower or toilet areas by female officers.

Difficulties with implementation of cross-gender staffing

Challenges with the implementation of cross-gendering practices may limit the extent to which employers wish to pursue this practice. The literature identifies a number of the challenges in implementation. Justice Arbour indicated that a key to success lies in staff selection.⁴⁵ The case of *Preiss v. BC* highlighted the limitations of some components of implementation, noting that protocols and policies, and monitoring of their implementation, will not stop improper behaviour by some, and breaches of protocols and policies have happened at both the federal and provincial correctional contexts.⁴⁶

2.2 Staff-related Arguments

There are staff-related arguments for and against cross-gender staffing and liability implications for employers.

Male staff rights

The first argument often made for the employment of males in female facilities is the argument suggesting that limiting the staffing to females contravenes male staff rights. Specifically, restricting front-line positions to solely female employees contravenes the non-discriminatory provisions of the Saskatchewan *Human Rights Code*. Restricting front-line staff to solely female employees adversely impacts the collective agreement seniority rights of male correctional workers.

⁴⁴ Zupan Linda L. (1992), p. 308

⁴⁵ Louise Arbour, 1996 *Commission of Inquiry into Certain Events at the Prison for Women in Kingston*

⁴⁶ *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3)* 2006 BCHRT 587, p. 76; Correctional Service of Canada, *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report, 2000*; confidential interview

Impact on male correctional staff

While there are arguments in favour of cross-gender staffing to reflect the rights of male staff, others raise concerns about the impact on correctional staff – both male and female – of cross-gender-staffing. There are risks to male staff if they are employed as front-line correctional workers. Their presence may give rise to unfounded accusations by female inmates of misconduct, attempts by female inmates to compromise the male staff, and inappropriate behaviour by female inmates.⁴⁷ Concerns about inappropriate behaviour were also reflected by the Canadian Human Rights Commission. It noted that to employ males as front-line CWs would have an adverse effect on some women, not only because of some would fear for their physical safety, but also because they might attempt to form inappropriately close relationships with male correctional workers.⁴⁸

In addition, the evidence of the frustration of male front-line workers with the way they are viewed in the correctional facility may argue against cross-gender staffing. Their inability to perform all the functions of a front-line worker and the concerns about the potential for abuse of female inmates by male front-line staff reflects, for them, an apparent lack of trust of the male workers. Male staff are sensitive to and perceive restrictions on their roles as an insult to their individual commitment to professionalism. These workers want to carry their full work responsibilities, to fulfill all aspects of their job, competently and completely. “Their perception is they are “being viewed as potential harassers and rapists” regardless of who they really are.”⁴⁹

Impact on female correctional staff

The limitations that are imposed on the roles that male CWs can play in a female facility may have an impact on female staff. There may be an unequal distribution of labour because the female staff will have to conduct the tasks, which will be unpopular with the female inmates, that the males cannot do (e.g. strip-searching). This could create a situation where the workload of the female corrections workers is, or is perceived to be, greater than that of male staff.

⁴⁷ *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3) 2006 BCHRT 587*, p71, 74

⁴⁸ Canadian Human Rights Commission, *Protecting Their Rights: A Systematic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women*, 2003, section 5.2.1.1.; *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3) 2006 BCHRT 587*, p. 35, 71

⁴⁹ *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report*, Correctional Service of Canada (2000), p. 5



Employer's liability

A reading of CSC's *Third and Final Annual Report* would suggest that an employer would, in most circumstances, be held liable for any physical or sexual abuse inflicted by a staff member on an inmate.⁵⁰ It would be held directly liable in circumstances in which it was negligent in its hiring or supervision of employees, but would likely be held to the higher standard of vicarious liability for most prison staff given the specific nature of the employment and vulnerability of the inmates. Employment policies and practices are unlikely to provide a defence to an incidence of abuse by a correctional worker.⁵¹ The report notes "Screening, training, supervision, restriction of duties of male guards and/or hiring only female [correctional workers] relate to prevention, and thereby avoidance of claims for liability, in keeping with the deterrence rationale for vicarious liability."⁵² On the other hand, protection from liability provided by a policy of having only female correctional workers would not be absolute.

2.3 Conclusions

In conclusion, there is little agreement on the issue of the staffing of men as CWs in female facilities. The key court decisions (*Conway v. the Queen*, *Preiss v. BC*) and the key CBOs (CAEFS, NWAC, Amnesty International) have, over time, reflected positions against cross-gender staffing. The courts took the position that restricting staffing in female facilities to female CWs, is not an abuse of male staff rights. The corrections context is unique, where security is paramount⁵³ and the restriction of having only female staff is rationally connected to providing a safe environment in that context. This is reflected in the case of *Preiss v. BC*, which found that, taking into consideration the arguments against cross-gender staffing, from a substantive equality perspective, there is no discrimination on the basis of sex in the employment of all-female front-line correctional workers.⁵⁴ The CBOs also argue their opposition to cross-gender staffing from the perspective of protection of the rights of female inmates. Some literature identifies potential risks with cross-gender staffing. However, the risks identified were *potential* risks, rather than *actual* risks, which would be based on scientific studies showing that there is a significantly higher risk of

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 62

⁵¹ Correctional Service of Canada, *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report*, 2000, p. 65

⁵² Ibid., p. 65

⁵³ *Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3)* 2006 BCHRT 587, p. 247

⁵⁴ Ibid, p. 587



abuse with the use of male guards in female institutions.

While there are many arguments against cross-gender staffing, many of those who make these arguments do not support the position that there should not be any male staff in female correctional facilities, but rather argue for restrictions on the roles played by males in these facilities so as not to compromise the privacy and dignity of female inmates. In fact, the academic literature reflects a more positive view of cross-gender staffing, noting that, if concerns about privacy and potential abuse, can be addressed, the risks to female inmates can be limited.

In reality, cross-gender staffing, with limitations on the roles that male CWs can play in a female facility, remains a reality in the federal correctional system. However, adequate safeguards, including the following, are important:

- Careful selection and training of male staff to protect female inmates from abuse and privacy violations;
- Explicit working protocols and policies on male restrictions regarding their contact with female inmates, which are key to successful gender integration;⁵⁵ and
- Adequate monitoring to help ensure against violation of female inmates' rights.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Justice Louise Arbour, *1996 Commission of Inquiry into Certain Events at the Prison for Women in Kingston*, p193-194

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, p 193-194



3.0 Implementation of the Pilot Project

Planning for the implementation of the pilot project began in 2004 with the development of a pilot project Action Plan.⁵⁷ PGCC built on the recommendations on cross-gender staffing in the CSC's *Second Annual Cross-Gender Monitoring Project Report* (1999).⁵⁸ This report identified the conditions under which cross-gender staffing could be successfully implemented. As such, the Action Plan reflected four important components to the implementation of the pilot project: the recruitment of high quality staff; development of appropriate policies and procedures, appropriate staff training and an effective inmate redress mechanisms. The initial plans in each component included:

- Recruitment: The recruitment of two male staff for twelve-month term assignments. Plans included revisions to the CW job descriptions, development of screening tools, interviews and reference checks;
- Policies and procedures: Policies and procedures would be modified to reflect the job restrictions for male CWs, with respect to strip searches, escorts, night shifts and deployment outside the pilot project units. Feedback from union stewards and peers on the policies and procedures was to be integrated;
- Staff training: The training would be based on existing training and modified to align with PGCC cross-gender staffing initiative. This training would be a women-centred program and would be delivered at the beginning of the pilot project and then continued on in phases; and
- Redress mechanisms: Inmates would be provided with the option of not being assigned to the designated project unit and would be provided with information on redress mechanisms at an orientation meeting.⁵⁹

Stakeholder consultations were undertaken with existing PGCC staff, inmates, the Elizabeth Fry Society, the Joint Union Management Committee and the PS/GE Bargaining Council.

⁵⁷ "Pine Grove Correctional Centre Human Rights Exemption/Cross-gender Staffing Pilot Project Action Plan", Revised April 28, 2004

⁵⁸ Correctional Service of Canada, *Second Annual Cross-Gender Monitoring Project Report* (1999) <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/prgrm/fsw/gender2/toc-eng.shtml>

⁵⁹ "Pine Grove Correctional Centre Human Rights Exemption/Cross-gender Staffing Pilot Project Action Plan", Revised April 28, 2004



No physical changes to PGCC were planned. Since no changes were made, the physical infrastructure posed a challenge for the project because it included one of the dormitories, as well as areas with temporary beds required to address overcrowding in the institution. However, many managers/supervisors (6 of 9) and staff (8 of 11) indicated that the physical infrastructure was adequate to protect the privacy of female inmates. This is somewhat surprising, given the level of overcrowding at the institution. PGCC was reportedly intended to house 65 – 85 inmates and, although a trailer which houses 22 low security inmates was added, PGCC currently has an average daily count of 128.

A Cross-Gender Staffing Committee was set up to implement the project and a plan put in place to provide regular feedback to the Assistant Deputy Minister and the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.⁶⁰ At the time it was expected that the project would be implemented, with male CWs in place, by September 2004. There was considerable delay in the implementation of the project, primarily because of difficulties in recruiting.⁶¹ As a result, the project was not fully implemented until January 2006.

An internal review of the project was conducted by PGCC management in late 2006.⁶² The report of the review indicated that the implementation had been so effective that the Ministry and PGCC management proposed, in March 2007, to expand the pilot project by adding two additional male staff.⁶³ However, it was noted, at the time, that the Elizabeth Fry Society was not in favour of an expansion of the pilot project. The Society's objections were noted in a letter to the Minister of Corrections and Public Safety in March 2007.⁶⁴ The letter indicated that "This position is supported by a mountain of substantive research and precedent not only in Canada, but internationally."⁶⁵ It goes on to cite the case of *Preiss vs. Province of British Columbia*, which itself cites the abundant research and precedent. Ultimately it was decided to postpone any decision on expansion until the completion of a formal external evaluation of the pilot project before making any decisions on expansion.

⁶⁰ Ibid

⁶¹ Reportedly it is difficult to recruit staff for PGCC generally – including female CWs.

⁶² Memorandum from D. Mills, A/Director, Pine Grove Correctional Centre to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Director of Institutional Operations, SGEU Agreement Administration Advisory, Union Representative, Chief Shop Steward, Vice Chief Shop Steward, Deputy Director of Operations and Training Coordinator, November 8, 2006

⁶³ Notes of the Cross Gender Staffing Pilot Project Committee, March 26, 2007

⁶⁴ Letter from Executive Director, Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan to the Minister of Corrections and Public Safety, March 15, 2007

⁶⁵ Ibid.

The following sections describe the various components of the implementation of the pilot project and provide feedback on the implementation from those interviewed for this evaluation.

3.1 Recruitment

When the pilot project was set up, two term positions were created for male CWs at PGCC. The initial posting for these positions was delayed by the extensive review of the job advertisements by union and Human Rights Commission representatives to ensure that they were not discriminatory. The initial advertisement was posted at adult and youth correctional centres, probation offices and the Community Training Residence in the Prince Albert area. Two applications were received, but both candidates subsequently withdrew from the competition. A second posting of the positions in the same locations resulted in five applications. During the second posting, interested applicants were invited to call the PGCC Director to discuss any concerns about working in a female facility. The response from applicants to this opportunity to talk to the Director appears to have contributed in the increase in applications.

These candidates were subjected to an extensive review process involving an assessment against pre-screening indicators, interviews and reference checks. As a result of the selection process, two male staff were hired and assigned to two of the PGCC “Main Units” (Unit 1 where inmates are housed in cells and Unit 2 where they are in a dormitory).

Almost all managers/supervisors (8 of 9), felt that the recruitment process was successful in recruiting good male CWs for the positions. Anecdotal information from the interviews suggests that both management/staff and inmates interviewed felt that two very high quality male staff had been recruited. This was also noted in the 2006 internal review of the pilot project. The memorandum reflecting the results of the review “...credited the personal attributes, attitudes and character of [the two male CWs] as being a large part of the reason for their success.”⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Memorandum from D. Mills, A/Director, Pine Grove Correctional Centre to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Director of Institutional Operations, SGEU Agreement Administration Advisory, Union Representative, Chief Shop Steward, Vice Chief Shop Steward, Deputy Director of Operations and Training Coordinator, November 8, 2006, p. 2



3.2 Policies and Procedures

The development of adequate policies and procedures was a key component of the pilot project. It was readily recognized that, although the job descriptions for male and female CWs are the same, the male CWs would not be able to carry out all the same functions as female CWs. To clarify their functions, PGCC developed Front Line Staff Protocols and revised the existing institutional procedures.

These changes addressed both the CWs security and case management functions. As part of its focus on dynamic security at PGCC, all correctional staff work closely with inmates and are constantly interacting with, and monitoring, the dynamic interactions among inmates. As such, all CWs are also case managers, with responsibility for counselling and managing access to programs for inmates. Both CWs maintain a caseload of three or four inmates, for whom they were responsible for all aspects of the case management process.⁶⁷

The Front Line Staff Protocols identified the following conditions for both security and case management work under the pilot project:

- Those male front-line correctional workers are always paired with a partner when patrolling living units, and when casework with female inmates is conducted in private offices without video surveillance;
- That restrictions are placed on male staff patrolling living units at night;
- That male front-line staff be required to announce their presence on a living unit or dorm and at an individual's cell or room;
- That restrictions are placed on observation on individual cells, bathrooms, shower rooms and secure observation rooms by male front-line staff;
- That male front-line staff will not use video surveillance to monitor individual cells with washroom facilities or any area which is an obvious privacy concern such as shower rooms, family visiting unit, and strip search rooms. Male front-line staff will not use video surveillance to monitor dorms or cells at night. Dorms and living areas which may be video monitored by male front-line staff must have warnings posted and all inmates must be advised at orientation/intake;

⁶⁷ Case management assignments for sentenced inmates are divided equally between permanent CWs such that each permanent CW maintains an average daily caseload of approximately four inmates. Throughout the course of a year, 20 to 40 individual inmates could be assigned to a CW.



- Male front-line staff will only conduct one-on-one casework and interviews with female inmates in highly visible areas; and
- Escorts outside the Centre will have a female CW paired with a male CW.⁶⁸

The protocol also specifies that all new admissions to the Centre will be informed of the cross-gender staffing pilot project and the operational procedures and will receive a copy of the protocol during orientation/intake process.

These concepts were then reflected in revisions to the detailed “Pine Grove Institution Procedures.”⁶⁹ Initially the text of the protocols was not included in the Institution Procedures but, in the spring of 2008, it was included as an introduction to the revised Procedures. All sections of the Procedures relevant to these tasks were updated to reflect one of the following restrictions:

- Male staff exempt from the function;
- Male staff can carry out the function only with a partner;
- Male staff can carry out the function only with a female partner;
- Male staff may observe only from a designated area; or
- Male staff cannot be assigned to the specific post.

Exhibit 1 summarizes the major restrictions on male staff at PGCC.⁷⁰

Exhibit 1: Summary of Restrictions on Male Staff Duties

Level of Restriction	Functions/posts
Male staff exempt from function	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skin searches of female inmates • Accessing the Family Visiting Unit • Conducting urinalysis • Medical cell checks
Male staff can perform only with a partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inmate counts • Metal scan of inmates • Searching visitor’s belongings • Escorting inmates movements outside the unit • Inmate supervision during recreation
Male staff can perform only with a female partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit and cell checks/searches • Escorting inmates movements outside in the community
Male staff may observe only from a designated area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pat downs
Male staff cannot be assigned to post	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected Security and Operational Team

⁶⁸ “Pine Grove Provincial Correctional Centre: Front Line Staff Protocols”, undated, p. 2 - 4

⁶⁹ “Pine Grove Institution Procedures” Revised on various dates between September 2005 and November 2007

⁷⁰ Ibid



Level of Restriction	Functions/posts
	Responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Float Pool Deployment

The key restrictions to protect the privacy of female inmates were summarized in a memorandum to staff as follows:

- Male staff will announce themselves before entering units;
- Male staff will not check the shower area when someone is using the facilities;
- Males staff will not strip search inmates; and
- Male staff will not view inmates in a state of undress, i.e. bathroom facilities, maximum secure unit, confined inmates, night cell checks.⁷¹

These restrictions are also similar to those placed on males working in other female facilities in Canada, for example, in CSC’s Commissioner’s Directive 577, “Operational Requirements for Cross-Gender Staffing in Women Inmate Institutions”⁷² and Manitoba’s “Custodial Policy on Cross Gender Staffing in Female Facilities or Living Units.”⁷³

Most managers/supervisors (8 of 9) and staff (7 of 9)⁷⁴ considered the policies/procedures for operations of the project to be adequate.

3.3 Training

At the implementation of the pilot project in January 2006, a four-day cross-gender training course was provided to:

- Two male CWs;
- All other male staff working at PGCC, including kitchen and maintenance staff and two senior male managers;⁷⁵ and
- Nine permanent female CWs assigned to the two units on which the male CWs would be working.

⁷¹ Memorandum from T. Haugen to all staff, April 5, 2004

⁷² Commissioner’s Directive 577, Operational Requirements for Cross-Gender Staffing in Women Inmate Institutions, March 2006

⁷³ Manitoba Justice, “Custodial Policy on Cross Gender Staffing in Female Facilities or Living Units”, April 16, 2008

⁷⁴ Two staff were not aware of any policies/protocols for the integration of male CWs. However, it is not known if these staff were at PGCC at the time of the launch of the pilot project.



The training was developed in partnership with the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology (SIAST) and the Ministry. The training package included background research and articles relevant to the key training modules:

- Background on the history and culture of PGCC;
- Gender issues in the workplace;
- Issues of power and control; and
- Addictions.

The training included an assessment of participant satisfaction. Information from the interviews for this evaluation indicated that most managers/supervisors (7 of 9) and staff (9 of 11) believed that the training was sufficient.

The initial Action Plan for the pilot project included reference to continuing training and this has reportedly been discussed over the years. The plan was to integrate the four-day training into the regular three-week training for new CW recruits. However, this has not happened. Individual respondents suggested that further, perhaps ongoing, training was required.

3.4 Redress Mechanisms

The pilot project Action Plan identified the need to establish redress mechanisms for inmates who were not comfortable with male staff. The established redress mechanisms specify that female inmates with valid concerns with the male staff would have the option of being assigned to Units 3 and 4 or having a female case manager.⁷⁶ The redress mechanisms were communicated verbally to inmates and in a memorandum to all staff.⁷⁷

Most managers/supervisors (7 of 9) and almost all staff (10 or 11) felt that the procedures for accommodating any female inmate who did not want to have a male CW were adequate. However, the “Pine Grove Correction Centre: Inmate Handbook” contains no mention of the cross-gender pilot project or the redress mechanisms for

⁷⁵ Two senior managers were only able to attend for half a day

⁷⁶ Memorandum from T. Haugen to all staff on “Cross Gender Staffing”, April 5, 2004

⁷⁷ Ibid



inmates⁷⁸. Yet inmates are reportedly generally well aware of the redress mechanisms for any complaints at the Centre.

PGCC management report that no inmate had asked to be placed on a unit that does not use male CWs. Only one incident of an inmate asking to be reassigned from a male case manager was reported. The concern was addressed at a meeting with the inmate, the case manager and a representative of PGCC management and was found to be based on a misunderstanding. As a result, the inmate's concerns were alleviated and she continued with the male case manager, without incident. None of the inmates interviewed indicated that they had requested to not have a male CW.⁷⁹

3.5 Integration of Male Staff

The integration of the male staff was facilitated through the distribution of memoranda and e-mails from the administration to staff, a poster notice to inmates and discussions at unit meetings with inmates and staff. For example, a memorandum to all staff in April 2004 outlined the restrictions on male CWs and the redress mechanisms for inmates.⁸⁰

All changes to the PGCC Institution Procedures are forwarded to staff and included in procedure binders. Although all staff received a briefing on PGCC's "Front Line Staff Protocols," no training was provided to staff specifically on the revised procedures (beyond the initial pilot project training).

Each male CW was assigned a female CW mentor. However, the roles and responsibilities of the mentors were not documented and, although in at least one case, the relationship lasted for about a year and a half, the relationships remained informal. These informal approaches included regular meetings with the mentor and the male staff member and scheduled six-month and twelve-month reviews.

Almost all staff (10 of 11) indicated that the activities to integrate the new male CWs were sufficient.

⁷⁸ "Pine Grove Correction Centre: Inmate Handbook", June 25, 2008

⁷⁹ Since no inmates identified that they had requested to not have a male CW, there was no opportunity for the evaluation to assess, in the inmate interviews, the adequacy of the mechanisms to transfer from a male to a female CW.

⁸⁰ Memorandum from T. Haugen to all staff on "Cross Gender Staffing", April 5, 2004



PGCC management indicated that there were no formal complaints or grievances made to management directly related to relations with male CWs. While this suggests relative satisfaction with the male CWs, it also means that the evaluation cannot assess how any such grievances would have been addressed by the Centre.

3.6 Costs of Pilot Project

The only known costs of the pilot project are shown in Exhibit 2. The costs reflected include only the cost of staff time for the initial training. The internal staff costs (opportunity costs) for designing and implementing the project, including developing the training, are not known.⁸¹

Exhibit 2: Training Costs for Pilot Project

Item		Cost
9 male staff (including 2 male CWs and kitchen/maintenance staff)	4 days of training; 8 hours/day; \$25/hour	\$7,200
9 female CWs from project units	4 days of training; 8 hours/day; \$25/hour	\$7,200
Cover off costs for replacement of staff	Estimated	\$7,000
Total		\$21,400

Source: Memorandum from Director, Pine Grove Correctional Centre, undated and amended in interview with subsequent Director

3.7 Conclusions

Generally speaking, responses from many managers/supervisors (6 of 9) and staff (7 of 11) indicated that the pilot project was operating as intended. The project successfully met most of specific conditions for cross-gender staffing that were included in the recommendations of the CSC’s *Second Annual Cross-Gender Monitoring Project Report*:⁸²

- PGCC successfully recruited two high quality male CWs;
- It developed adequate training for the new male recruits and the female CWs with whom they would be working;

⁸¹ The Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology contributed, as partners, to the development of the training materials but no costs were involved.

⁸² <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/prgrm/fsw/gender2/toc-eng.shtml> These conditions relate to: the adequacy of recruitment, screening, and training policies and procedures; the effectiveness of the policies specifying the roles for male workers; the extent to which the project can accommodate female inmates who are not willing or able to deal with male workers in specific contexts; and the proportion of male workers and the burden on female workers.



- It revised its policies and procedures to put in place appropriate restrictions on the roles of the male CWs; and
- It put in place mechanisms to accommodate female inmates who are not willing or able to deal with male workers, although these have not yet been fully tested at PGCC.

Inmates reflected that these achievements contributed to the success of the pilot project. They were asked to identify the factors that contributed to the ability of the two male CWs to work at PGCC and many identified factors related to the male staff themselves or the procedures/training:⁸³

- *Characteristics of the male CWs:* Some inmates identified characteristics of the male CWs as contributing to their integration (e.g. the fact that good men were chosen for the position, their respect for female inmates and the protocols) or making integration more difficult (e.g. their nervousness/shyness at first in being with women); and
- *Adequacy of the procedures and training:* A few inmates indicated that the procedures/training (e.g. the protocol requiring male CWs to announce themselves before entering a unit, not entering alone and the quality of the training) appeared to them to contribute to the integration of the male CWs.

A few inmates identified that the behaviour of the female inmates themselves was a challenging factor. The flirtatious behaviour of some female inmates made integration more difficult. The impact of the presence of male CWs on offender behaviour is discussed in greater depth in Section 4.1.

“I do see some flirtatious behaviour coming from the women [inmates] towards the male guards.” (Inmate)

Three of the five external stakeholders indicated that they perceived that the implementation had been good, specifically in terms of the adequacy of the selection process, the training and the operating procedures in place.

There appear to be two areas in which the pilot project implementation may have been weak:

- There remain some questions about the systematic distribution of information on the

⁸³ Nearly half the respondents did not respond to the question

restrictions on the roles of the male CWs. Two staff members interviewed indicated that they were not aware of any policies/procedures for the integration of the two male CWs. The new Front Line Staff Protocols were not integrated into the Institution Procedures until the spring of 2008. The pilot project (and the associated restrictions or redress mechanisms) are not covered in the June 2008 version of the Inmate Handbook.

- PGCC may not have fully addressed the recommendations of the CSC report in the area of the pilot project's impact on the female CWs. Concerns were raised by staff about the duties of the male CWs, including the restrictions on their duties and the implications for female CWs. This is further discussed in Section 4.2.



4.0 Impact of the Pilot Project

The evaluation assessed the impacts of the pilot project on the inmates and staff. The chapter concludes with the views of all stakeholder groups on the future of the cross-gender staffing project.

4.1 Impact on Inmates

4.1.1 Impact of Males as Correctional Workers

Both inmates and staff were asked to assess the impact of the project on inmates (either themselves or others) with respect to the sense of safety, privacy and inmate behaviour and attitudes towards men.⁸⁴ Finally, inmates were asked to identify their gender preferences for CWs.

Inmate sense of safety

Most inmates (23 of 29) indicated that there was no difference in their sense of safety with male or female CWs. Some (6) indicated that they felt safer with a male CW, primarily because they felt that male CWs were able to control better the female inmates in the situation of a fight or riot.

Inmate privacy

Almost all inmates (27 of 29) felt that the male CWs respected their privacy. Two respondents qualified their assessment with concern about the male CW's access to cameras at front control.

"I feel [privacy] has been respected; the male guards follow the guidelines of being announced before entering units." (Inmate)

Inmate behaviour

Almost all inmates (26 of 29) indicated that the presence of male CWs made no difference in their own behaviour. However, the responses were somewhat different when they were asked to comment on changes in the behaviour of other inmates. Just

⁸⁴ Note that some inmates (9 of 29) in the sample had not had experience directly with a male CW but they still responded to the questions on the impact the CWs had on them personally.

“I have had bad experiences with men in my past... sexual abuse, physical abuse... but I do feel comfortable with [the two male CWs] and it has changed my view to a more positive one of men.” (Inmate)

over half (15 of 29) indicated that the presence of male CWs made no difference in the behaviour of others. But an almost equal number (14 of 29) indicated that there was a difference – referring most commonly to the

fact that some other inmates engage in flirtatious behaviour in the presence of male staff. Just over half the managers/supervisors (5 of 9) and staff (7 of 11) noted that the presence of the two male CWs appeared to lead to inmates paying more attention to their personal grooming. This reflects perhaps the same flirtatious behaviour, but reflected in a more positive way.

The 2006 internal review of the pilot project noted the same behaviour. “Both [male CWs] have indicated that they have had instances in which they have received inappropriate comments from inmates; however, these comments were promptly addressed. These gentlemen are very aware of appropriate boundaries and [are] skilled at enforcing them.”⁸⁵

All managers/supervisors and many staff (6 of 11) believed that the presence of male CWs had contributed to positive male role modelling. A number of respondents believed that this could be attributed to the very positive behaviour of the two male CWs selected for the pilot project. This finding is consistent with

“I noticed better behaviour of inmates whenever males were around.” (Staff)

evidence from the 2006 internal review, which indicated that the two male CWs

“Males seem to have a calming effect on inmates who were disruptive.” (Staff)

identified a number of positive aspects of the pilot project. These included the male staff having a calming effect on inmates, the building and the staff; providing

greater support for female staff dealing with negative situations; and being seen as positive role model for inmates.⁸⁶

Inmate attitudes towards men

Almost all inmates (26 of 29) indicated that the presence of the two male CWs had not had any

“Inmates found out for the first time in their world that not all men are abusers and jerks.” (Manager/supervisor/ staff)

⁸⁵ Memorandum from D. Mills, A/Director, Pine Grove Correctional Centre to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Director of Institutional Operations, SGEU Agreement Administration Advisory, Union Representative, Chief Shop Steward, Vice Chief Shop Steward, Deputy Director of Operations and Training Coordinator, November 8, 2006, p. 2

⁸⁶ Ibid



impact on their attitudes towards men. The three who did not clearly indicate that there had been no change, indicated that their attitudes were already positive.

Inmate preferences

The majority of inmates saw little difference (in terms of their safety and privacy or their behaviour and attitudes towards men) as a result of the presence of the male CWs. Just over one-third (11 of 29) indicated that, if they could choose, they would have no preference between a male and female CW. However, another eleven indicated that they would prefer a female CW. Three indicated that they would prefer a male and four indicated that it would depend on the CW and/or what they need to talk about with the CW.

4.1.2 Impact of Males as Caseworkers

The evaluation attempted to assess the impact on inmates of having a male as a caseworker. Unfortunately, only four inmates in the sample had had a male caseworker. The four were somewhat positive, albeit with some reservations, about the impact of the male caseworker. They noted that:

“I would choose a female if I really needed someone to talk to, and it was for more personal stuff.” (Inmate)

- The male caseworker had been helpful;
- The inmate had accomplished more with the male than a previous female caseworker;
- The inmate saw no difference between male and female caseworkers; and
- Although the male caseworker had been more lenient than a female caseworker and had worked very hard on her behalf, the inmate did not completely trust him – not enough to discuss personal issues related to her criminality.

4.2 Impact on PGCC Staff

Since the male CWs were restricted from performing certain security functions, it was planned that they would have additional office (paperwork) duties to compensate for the reduced workload in the area of security. However, these additional duties were not documented. Some additional duties are assigned, but it depends on the time of day. The assignment of additional duties was not done systematically. Individual

comments were made about possible resentment among the female CWs, as they see their workload increase due to the restrictions placed on male CWs. Individuals suggested that the male CWs may also be taking advantage of having restricted duties and not working as hard as their female colleagues.

In this evaluation, there were differences in the view of manager/supervisors and staff on the impact of the project on the workload and work life of PGCC female CWs.

Many staff (8 of 11) believed that the presence of male CWs had resulted in an

“...the female CW seems to do more tasks than the men. This creates some resentment among the females as they see their workload increase due to the job restrictions placed on men.” (Staff)

increase in the workload of female CWs because of the restrictions on the male CW functions that were not offset by additional duties formally assigned to the male CWs.

However, many managers/supervisors (7 of 9) indicated that this was perception, rather than the reality. Many (6 of 9) also indicated that no special measures were put in place to address issues between male and female staff, beyond what is already available to staff, but the existing measures were adequate. Only a few staff (3 of 11) were able to identify any measures and they were generally unable to assess their adequacy. Most inmates (24 of 29) indicated that they had not observed any change in the work of the female CWs or interactions among female and male CWs.

“Since the males have extra duties assigned to them to compensate for the restricted security and surveillance duties that they are not permitted to do, the workload for both male and female balances out at the end of the day.” (Manager/supervisor)

The internal review of the pilot project also noted these challenges, stating “... when there is one female staff on main [unit] with a male staff it creates more work for the female staff as the male staff cannot just enter the units.”⁸⁷

Many managers/supervisors (5 of 9) noted that the presence of male CWs had had a positive impact on the stability of PGCC’s workforce.

“I don’t see any changes happening in the female guards; they got along with the male guards.” (Inmate)

4.3 Views on Future Direction

All stakeholders were asked to comment on whether the cross-gender staffing project should be continued at PGCC. The responses from managers, staff and inmates were

⁸⁷ Ibid

supportive of the continuation of the staffing of male CWs at PGCC:

- All inmates interviewed supported PGCC continuing the employment of males as CWs. However, fewer (19 of 29) would support having males as caseworkers.
- Almost all managers/supervisors (8 of 9) agreed that cross-gender staffing should be continued; and
- All staff supported continuing cross-gender staffing.

Individuals expressed the view that the majority of CW staff should remain female and that a maximum of four males CWs should be recruited.

However, the responses from the external stakeholders about continuing cross-gender staffing were more mixed. Three of five respondents from this group reported being in favour of the continuation of cross-gender staffing. One respondent was hesitant about continuing male staffing because of concerns for possible abuse of privacy and safety of female inmates. The Elizabeth Fry Society also remains opposed to the presence of cross-gender staffing in female facilities. Its concerns have been outlined in a number of documents, including a letter to CSC's Acting Deputy Commissioner for Women in 2004, in which it states that there have been "inappropriate, harassing and even criminal actions of men against women prisoners in the past" but that the writer was "was not, and [is] not, at liberty to provide particulars, [they] have been made aware that problems still exist."⁸⁸ The underlying concern is that there is not an "environment in the [CSC] women's prisons that is supportive of, or conducive to, women staff or prisoners feeling comfortable to report the inappropriate or illegal actions of staff."⁸⁹

Managers/supervisors and staff were asked to comment on whether the cross-gender staffing project should be expanded. Most managers/supervisors (8 of 9) and staff (9 of 11) were in favour of expansion – suggesting expansion by one to four male staff, with the most common suggested increase being to four male CWs. The suggested allocation was two for each of the two main units. Inmates were not asked to comment on the expansion of the project, but five indicated in comments in the interview that they believed the number should be increased.

⁸⁸ Letter from Kim Pate, Executive Director, Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies to Anne Kelly, Acting Deputy Commissioner for Women, Correctional Service of Canada, 1 November 2004, p. 1, 3. Similar arguments are made in the "Submission of the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies to the United Nations Human Rights Committee Examining Canada's 5th Report Regarding the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights", September 2005, Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 3

5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The literature and legal context reviews identified the potential risks with cross-gender staffing. Concerns – primarily about the possible abuse of inmates’ rights to privacy and security, but also about the impact on both male and female staff – are expressed in the submissions of CBOs, in government reports and in the academic literature. They have also been reiterated by the courts. The opposition to cross-gender staffing identified in the literature reviewed for the evaluation is based primarily on the *potential* risk, rather than an *actual* risk, which has been identified on the basis of scientific evidence proving that the risk of abuse is statistically higher for female inmates with male CWs. However, the academic literature also reflects the potential benefits of cross-gender staffing, as long as there are restrictions on the roles of male CWs.

The results of the PGCC pilot project reflect similar positive views of cross-gender staffing. Stakeholders most closely involved in the pilot project – managers/supervisors, staff and inmates – were all positive about the implementation of the PGCC pilot project. They reflected, in large numbers, the belief that cross-gender staffing should continue at PGCC – and potentially be expanded. The external stakeholders were more reserved in their support for the initiative because of the potential risks that are identified in the literature.⁹⁰

However, views on the impacts of the presence of male CWs at PGCC were not consistent across all stakeholders at the Centre. For the most part, inmates reflected little impact of the presence of male CWs – reflecting that little had changed with respect to their privacy, security or behaviour since the beginning of the pilot project. The one exception was a theme that emerged was the increased flirtatious behaviour of female inmates in the presence of male CWs. This change was reflected, more positively, in the observations from managers/supervisors and staff about inmates’ increased attention to personal grooming. Managers/supervisors and staff were also more positive about the impact of the male CWs, believing that the project had contributed to positive male role modelling.

Manager/supervisors and staff were generally positive about the various components

⁹⁰ See letter from Executive Director, Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan to Minister of Corrections and Public Safety, March 15, 2007

of the implementation of the pilot project – the recruitment, policies/procedures, training, ability to accommodate female inmates who did not want a male CW, monitoring of male CWs and physical infrastructure at PGCC.⁹¹ The only area in which there appears to be less agreement across stakeholders was with respect to the balance of the duties of male and female CWs. The discrepancy between the views of management and staff on the balance between male and female duties suggests that this may be an evolving issue for staff. The implications of this issue may not be seen fully as this has only been a pilot project, but may become more evident if cross-gender staffing is continued.

The literature and legal context review identified the risks of cross-gender staffing. However, none of these risks manifested themselves in the PGCC pilot project. Yet there are signs of two potential risks – the flirtatious behaviour of inmates, which put both inmates and male staff at risk and the potential management challenge of at least a perceived imbalance in the workload between male and female staff.

The fact that the risks have not manifested themselves may speak to the attention given to implementation of the pilot project, particularly the selection and preparation of the current male CWs. Respondents from all stakeholder groups spoke positively about the respect that these two staff had for the inmates and adherence to the policies/procedures.

“The male guards here are doing an excellent job.” (Inmate)

Respondents attributed a large part of the success of the PGCC pilot project to the quality of the two male staff recruited. Both inmates and staff noted the importance of the ability of the male CWs to interact well with women – balancing a clear respect for the policies and procedures and the need to be sensitive, without becoming influenced by the flirtatious behaviour. The current male CWs appear to have been able, throughout the period of the project, to avoid the risks identified in the literature.

“Given the excellent candidates that were chosen, the process was successful.”
(Managers/supervisors/staff)

Stakeholders were generally positive about the provisions put in place for the pilot project. In addition to the rigorous staffing process, the factors that appear to have contributed to the successful integration of male CWs include:

⁹¹ As noted in earlier, the fact that the physical infrastructure was considered adequate was somewhat surprising, given the level of overcrowding at PGCC.

- Provision of adequate information to staff and inmates prior to the implementation of the project;⁹²
- Development of policies to restrict the duties of male staff with respect to duties related to invasive security functions and duties that bring officers in contact with female inmates engaged in personal activities;
- Suitable physical arrangements to ensure privacy;
- Good initial training for male staff; and
- Ongoing monitoring of male staff.

However, the fact that none of the risks of cross-gender staffing identified in the literature have been observed at PGCC may also just be a factor of the length of the pilot project. Over time, it is possible that the disadvantages of cross-gender staffing may become apparent. This speaks to the need for a clear risk management approach to any continued cross-gender staffing. The risks were managed during the project by the attention to the specific components for implementation but, if the cross-gender staffing continues, it will be important to maintain the focus on assessing and managing the risks and ensure the PGCC management and staff do not become complacent about the success of the initiative. Not only will the Centre have to preserve the good components of implementation but also consider the improvements suggested by stakeholders:

- Ensure ongoing training for all staff;
- Ensure an appropriate balance between the duties of male and female staff and an appropriate sharing of this information with all staff; and
- Provide regular updates on the cross-gender staffing to stakeholders that work with inmates in the community.

On the basis of these findings, the evaluation team recommends:

Recommendation 1: That cross-gender staffing be continued at PGCC, with the existing restrictions on the duties of male CWs.

Given the clear support for the pilot project, there appears to be considerable goodwill on the part of all PGCC stakeholders to continue cross-gender staffing. In the absence

⁹² Although some staff indicated that they were not aware of the procedures, it is not known if these staff were at PGCC at the time of launch of the pilot project.

of any evidence of the manifestation of the risks expressed by external stakeholders and identified in the literature, there is no reason to not recommend the continued use of male CWs at PGCC.

Recommendation 2: That the process associated with any continuation and/or expansion of male staffing at PGCC be focused on managing the potential risks associated with cross-gender staffing.

This would include factors that were associated with the success of the pilot project as well as areas for improvement identified by stakeholders – including a rigorous screening of candidates, adequate initial and ongoing training (including on-the-job training), ensuring the continued adequacy of, and respect for, the policies and procedures and careful monitoring and performance reviews of male staff.

The competence of the current male staff appears to have contributed significantly to the success of the pilot project. If less suitable staff are hired, the risks identified in the literature may become reality at PGCC. The challenge will be that, as identified in the legal context review, specific staff selection is very difficult, if not impossible, in a unionized setting such as at PGCC.⁹³

Recommendation 3: That PGCC guards against a decline in the vigilance that has characterized the pilot project period.

As noted in the initial Action Plan for the pilot project, it is important that PGCC guard against becoming complacent about the presence of male CWs at PGCC. The pilot project has worked because of the attention to key components of its implementation – the recruitment, training and mentoring of male CWs and the establishment of adequate policies and procedures to protect the privacy of female inmates. Decline in the level of attention to any of these components, increases the risk of an unacceptable event. Maintaining vigilance means ensuring the same level of screening, training and mentoring of staff and being open to possible revisions to the policies/procedures. This would include specifically ensuring the systematic distribution of the policies and procedures that outline the restrictions on the male CWs and ensuring that adequate information is provided to female inmates, through

⁹³ The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, 2008. Written submission to Goss Gilroy regarding the Cross-Gender Staffing Project at Pine Grove Correctional Centre, electronic correspondence, September.

providing verbal information and updating the Inmate Handbook to include the provisions to accommodate female inmates who do not wish to work with a male CW. It also means refresher training and training for all staff (not just those working directly with the male staff) on the revised policies and procedures.

Since this evaluation was not able to assess the adequacy of the redress mechanisms for inmates who do not wish to work with a male CW, as the only request that was made was withdrawn, it is important that, if male staffing continues, this provision of the pilot project be evaluated at some future point. The Ministry should monitor the situation and ensure that adequate information is collected to make this possible.

Recommendation 4: Increase the number of positions for male CWs, to a maximum of four positions, as long as the increase still provides the option for female inmates to choose not to interact with a male CW.

Most management/supervisor and staff respondents felt that there could be more male CWs at PGCC. However, individuals expressed the concern that the changes should be gradual and limited to a maximum of four male CWs. The current approach is working. Although there has been no evidence of the manifestation of the risks expressed by external stakeholders and identified in the literature, any change from the current balance should be minimal to ensure that the situation continues as it has in the past two and a half years. It is also important to ensure that there are sufficient female CWs, so that those female inmates, who prefer to work with a female caseworker, can do so.

Limiting the ongoing staffing of male CWs at PGCC to only four male CWs would also require that the Ministry apply for an extension of its exemption from the Human Rights Commission of Saskatchewan to allow it to staff remaining positions with only female candidates.

Within the concept of risk management, the expansion should occur gradually to ensure their effective integration and allow for effective monitoring of the impact on the inmates (particularly with respect to inmate rights), other staff and the operations of the Centre.

Recommendation 5: That PGCC ensures transparency in determining the appropriate

balance of the workloads of male and female CW staff.

There appears to be some disagreement between management and staff on the balance of workload between male and female CWs. Since the additional duties assigned to male CWs to offset the restrictions on their security duties are not documented, the evaluation cannot determine if there is, in fact, an imbalance in the workloads or if it is simply a case of lack of transparency. PGCC needs to review the situation and, if required, adjust the workload and, as at minimum, ensure that there is transparency (through documentation and sharing of information) in the distribution of the workload in order to ensure it maintains the buy-in of all staff for cross-gender staffing.



Appendix A: Methodology

The methodology included four lines of evidence: an administrative document review, a literature review, a review of the legal context for cross-gender staffing and interviews.

Document Review

The purpose of the review of PGCC and Ministry internal documents was to provide background information for the evaluation team and the information necessary to address specific evaluation issues. The documents reviewed included:

“Cross Gender Training” package, undated

Letter from Executive Director, Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan to Minister of Corrections and Public Safety, March 15, 2007

Memorandum from D. Mills, A/Director, Pine Grove Correctional Centre to the Assistant Deputy Minister, Director of Institutional Operations, SGEU Agreement Administration Advisory, Union Representative, Chief Shop Steward, Vice Chief Shop Steward, Deputy Director of Operations and Training Coordinator, November 8, 2006, p. 2

Memorandum from T. Haugen to all staff, April 5, 2004

Manitoba Justice, “Custodial Policy on Cross Gender Staffing in Female Facilities or Living Units”, April 16, 2008

Notes of the Cross Gender Staffing Pilot Project Committee, March 26, 2007

“Pine Grove Correctional Centre Human Rights Exemption/Cross-gender Staffing Pilot Project Action Plan”, Revised April 28, 2004

“Pine Grove Institution Procedures” Revised on various dates between September 2005 and November 2007

“Pine Grove Provincial Correctional Centre: Front Line Staff Protocols”, undated
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, Exemption Decision; February 24, 1992
Commissioner’s Directive 577, Operational Requirements for Cross-Gender Staffing in Women Inmate Institutions, March 2006



Literature Review

A review was carried out of the academic and government literature to identify the experiences in other jurisdiction and academic research on cross-gender staffing. The document included:

Alpert, Geoffrey P. and Crouch, Ben M. (1991) "Cross-gender Supervision, Personal Privacy and Institutional Security: Perceptions of Jail Inmates and Staff." *Criminal Justice and Behaviour* 18(3): 304-317.

Amnesty International, *Rights for All, Not Part of My Sentence, Violations of the Human Rights of Women in Custody*, 1999

Arbour, The Honourable Louise, *Commission of Inquiry into Certain Events at the Prison for Women in Kingston*, 1996

Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies, November 1, 2004 letter to the Correctional Service of Canada

Canadian Human Rights Commission, *Protecting Their Rights: A Systemic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women*, 2004

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, *Female inmates in Canada*, 2005, Vol.28, No.1

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, *Returning to Correctional Services After Release: A Profile of Aboriginal and non- Aboriginal adults involved in Saskatchewan Corrections from 1999/ 2000 to 2003/ 2004*, Vol.25 No.2

Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, *Adult Correctional Services in Canada*, 2005/2006, Vol.28, No.6

Canadian Human Rights Commission, *Protecting Their Rights: A Systemic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women*, December 2003

Correctional Service of Canada, *The Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women, "Creating Choices" Report*, 1990

Correctional Service of Canada, *Annual Report*, June 1997

Correctional Service of Canada, *The Cross Gender Monitoring Report First Annual Report*, 1998

Correctional Service of Canada, *The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Second Annual*



Report, 1999

Correctional Service of Canada, The Cross Gender Monitoring Project: Third and Final Annual Report, 2000

Correctional Service of Canada, Action Plan in Response to the Report of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, Protecting Their Rights: A Systemic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women, 2005

Correctional Service of Canada, Ten-Year Status Report on Women's Corrections, April 2006

Department of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing, Cross Gender Training Manuel, January 2006

Department of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing, Prison Statistics and various documents, Summer, 2008

Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons – Chapter 4: Correctional Service Canada Reintegration of Women Inmates, Office of the Auditor General of Canada, April 2003

Saskatchewan Justice and Saskatchewan Corrections and Public Safety, Working Together For Safer Communities, Submitted to the Commission on First Nations And Métis Peoples And Justice Reform, January 2003

Saskatchewan Justice, Corrections and Public Safety, Working Together For Safer Communities, the Commission on First Nations and Métis peoples and Justice Reform, 2004

Saskatchewan, Government Of, Creating a Healthy, Just, Prosperous and Safe Saskatchewan, A Response to The Commission on First Nations and Métis peoples and Justice Reform, 2005

United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Female Prisoners, 1957 and 1977

Walters, Stephan (1993) "Changing the Guard: Male Correctional Officers' Attitudes Toward Women as Co-Workers." *Journal of Inmate Rehabilitation* 20:47-60

Zupan Linda L. (1992) "Men Guarding Women: An Analysis of the Employment of Male Correction Officer in Prisons for Women." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 20:297-309



Legal Context Review

A review of the legal issues affecting cross-gender staffing in female institutions was carried out. It included a review of case law, common law, provincial laws, federal laws and international instruments relevant to the issue of cross-gender staffing. Other relevant documents, such as Canadian reports in the area of corrections (e.g. monitoring reports, human rights commission reviews, and commission of inquiry reports) were also reviewed. The documents included a number of document also included in the administrative and literature review. However, additional documents included:

Canadian Human Rights Commission, *Protecting Their Rights: A Systematic Review of Human Rights in Correctional Services for Federally Sentenced Women*, 2003
Conway v. the Queen (1993), 105 D.L.R. (4th) 210 (S.C.C.)
Preiss v. B.C. (Ministry of Attorney General) (No. 3) 2006 BCHRT 587
R. v. Golden, [2001] 3. S.C.R. 679; Exemption Decision, Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, July 19, 1982

In addition, a written submission was received from the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

Interviews were conducted with:

Chantelle Johnson, Policy Analyst and Researcher, Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission
John Hill, Chief Commissioner, Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission
Dr. A. Watkinson, Board member, Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan
Kim Pate, Executive Director, Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies
Ernie Brossart, Shop Stewart, Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union
Renee Gavigan, Ombudsman Assistant (ACR), Ombudsman's Office, Government of Saskatchewan

Interviews

A total of 54 interviews were conducted with the following groups of people:



PGCC Management/Supervisors and Staff

In-person interviews with nine PGCC managers and supervisors:

Dwayne Mills, Former Director

Valerie Dewhurst, Deputy Director

Blayne Nelson, Assistant Deputy Director

Lorie Ross, Assistant Deputy Director (and supervisor of two male CWs)

Roy Fremont, Deputy Director of Administration

Gerri Pickard, Acting Assistant Deputy Director

Roberta Burns, Director of Children's Visiting Programs

Michele Gaudet, Program Case Management Co-ordinator

Cathy Suchorab, Nursing Supervisor

11 staff (including the two male CWs)

Current and Former Inmates

Current PGCC inmates (21), by in-person

Former inmates of the Centre (8), by telephone

External Stakeholders

Florence Allen, Aboriginal Elder

Jennie Rensberry, Chaplain at PGCC

Laura Cook, Director, Women's Community Training Residence, Saskatoon

Heather Scriver, Director, Institutional Operations, Ministry of Corrections, Public Safety and Policing,

Caroleen Wright, Executive Director, Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan

Interview Guides

Interviews were conducted using the following interview guides:

Employment and/or Human Rights Law Experts (including representative of the Elizabeth Fry Society)

1. Please describe your background and the role in your organization in the cross-gender staffing project at Pine Grove Correctional Centre.
2. What is, if any, the role of your organization in the complaint of discrimination (on the basis of gender) by male front-line correctional workers at Pine Grove?
3. How does the process of granting exemptions work?
4. What do you assess to be the rationale for the decision?
5. What might be the implications of an exemption?
6. Are there any key Canadian court cases, particularly from Saskatchewan (or other provinces)? On the topic of cross-gender staffing? (If no, on the topic of non-discrimination in employment on the basis of gender?)
7. How do the issues and findings of these cases relate to the issues at Pine Grove? Would you have a summary or copy of the case(s) that you could forward to me?
8. What would need to be demonstrated in order for a provincial (or federal) human rights commission to grant an exemption from a non-discrimination provision in the province's (or Canada's) human rights code in the context of employment? To sustain the exemption?
9. Is there anything else you could add that would assist in our understanding of the legal context vis-à-vis the employment of male front-line workers at an all-female correctional facility?
10. Are there any other legal professionals/experts with whom you could recommend that I speak on these issues? Are there any other documents of relevance of which you have a copy?

Union Representative

1. Please describe your background and the role in your organization in the cross-gender staffing project at Pine Grove Correctional Centre.
2. What is, if any, the role of your organization in the complaint of discrimination (on the basis of gender) by male front-line correctional workers at Pine Grove?
3. What is your understanding of the process of granting exemptions by a human rights commission?
4. What do you understand would need to be demonstrated in order for a provincial (or federal) human rights commission to grant an exemption from a non-discrimination provision in the province's (or Canada's) human rights code in the context of



- employment? To sustain the exemption?
5. What do you assess to be the rationale for the decision of granting an exemption?
 6. What might be the implications of an exemption?
 7. What is the name of the pertinent collective agreement for front-line staff at Pine Grove?
 8. Is there an article in this collective agreement that prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender?
 9. What is the grievance procedure for staff who believe they have been discriminated against? Could you send me a copy of these and any other relevant articles of your collective agreement?
 10. Was there an arbitration case pertaining to a complaint of discrimination of male correctional workers at Pine Grove? If yes, may I obtain a copy of the decision?
 11. Are there any key Canadian court cases, particularly from Saskatchewan (or from other provinces) on the topic of cross-gender staffing? (If no, on the topic of non-discrimination in employment on the basis of gender?)
 12. How do the issues and findings of these cases relate to the issues at Pine Grove? Would you have a summary or copy of the case(s) that you could forward to me?
 13. Is there anything else you could add that would assist in our understanding of the legal context vis-à-vis the employment of male front-line workers at an all-female correctional facility?
 14. Are there any legal professionals/experts with whom you could recommend that I speak on these issues? Are there any other documents of relevance of which you have a copy?

Other Stakeholders Familiar with PGCC Pilot Project

1. What involvement or role did you have in the Cross-gender Staffing project at PGCC?

Implementation

2. Are you aware of, or have you received any feedback on, the implementation of this pilot project?
3. If so, could you comment on the adequacy of:
 - a. Process for selecting the two male workers?
 - b. Training provided for these workers?
 - c. Training or information provided to other staff and inmates at PGCC to facilitate the integration of male staff?
 - d. Procedures to manage the role of the male workers?
 - e. Physical infrastructure at PGCC?



Impacts

4. What was the impact of the project on inmates? (Probe for sense of safety, privacy, behaviour, attitudes to men.)
5. What was the impact of the project on the female correctional workers?

Future direction

6. Are there any new issues that have arisen since the launch of the pilot project that would have an impact on whether it is continued? If so, please describe. (Probe for legal, human resource, operational issues.)
7. Do you think the project should be continued or expanded? Why or why not?
8. If the program is to be expanded, how could it be improved?
9. Do you have any other comments on the program?

Other Stakeholders Not Familiar with PGCC Pilot Project

1. Are you aware of the Cross-gender Staffing project at PGCC? What information do you have? How have you received that information?

Implementation

2. Have you received any feedback on this pilot project?
3. What, if any, impressions to you have of the benefits and challenges of the pilot project?

Impacts

4. What do you believe are the impacts of having male correctional workers working in a female correctional facility on: (Please provide specific examples)
 - a. Inmates?
 - b. Staff?
 - c. Facility management?

Why do these impacts occur?

5. How, if possible, can the risks of negative impacts be managed?

Future direction

6. Have there been any recent legal decisions, research findings or policy changes at the federal or provincial/territorial level that would impact on the ability to use male correctional workers in a female facility? If so, what are they?
 - a. What impact would they have on the use of male correctional workers in Saskatchewan?
7. Do you think the project in Saskatchewan should be continued or expanded? Why or why not?
8. If the program is to be expanded, what, if any, issues need to be addressed?

PGCC Management and Supervisors

Note: Not all questions will be relevant for all respondents. The evaluation consultant will select the most appropriate questions for each interview.

Background

1. How long have you been involved in the Cross-gender Project?
 - a. What has been your involvement or role?

Implementation

2. Was the project implemented as intended?
 - a. If not, what were the barriers that had to be overcome?
 - b. How were the barriers addressed?
3. What process was used to select the two male staff working directly with the female inmates?
 - a. Was the process successful in attracting and hiring good candidates for the position?
4. How do their duties differ from the female workers who work directly with the inmates?
5. What training was developed to prepare the two male workers for the project?
 - a. Was the training sufficient? If not, why not?
6. What activities and/or training took place with other staff and inmates to facilitate the integration of the male workers?
 - a. Were they sufficient? If not, why not?
7. What monitoring protocols are in place for the two male staff? Are they different from those used with other workers?
8. What policies and/or procedures were developed to operate the project?
 - a. Were they adequate? If not, why not?
9. Is the physical structure of PGCC adequate to protect the privacy of female inmates (e.g. when they are using the toilet, changing clothes etc.) when a male worker is working directly with the inmates? If not, why not?
10. Was PGCC able to accommodate female inmates who did not want to deal with male workers in specific contexts?
 - a. If so, how? Was it adequate?
 - b. If not, why not?

Impacts

11. What was the impact of the project on the workload and work life of female workers?
 - a. Were special measures put in place to address issues between female and male workers? Were they adequate? If not, why not?
12. What impact, if any, do you think the presence of male workers has had on:
 - a. Interaction between inmates and the male correctional workers?



- b. Interaction between inmates and the female correctional workers?
 - c. Interaction among inmates?
 - d. The inmates' participation in case management activities?
 - e. The operation of the Centre?
 - f. Inmate behaviour?
 - g. Inmate's perceptions of men?
 - h. Any other effect (please specify)?
13. What impact, if any, did the presence of male correctional workers have on the stability of PGCC's workforce?
14. What were the financial costs of the implementation of this pilot project? Were there any costs that exceeded the costs of having only female correctional workers? If so, what were they? (For the Director, A/Director and Deputy Director, Finance only)

Future directions

15. Would you like to see this project continue?
- a. Why or why not?
 - b. If you think it should be continued, what needs to be done to improve the project?
16. Do you have other comments on the project?

Thank you for participating in this interview.

PGCC Staff

1. How long have you been involved in the Cross-gender Project?
- a. What has been your involvement or role?

Implementation

1. Do you think the project is operating the way it should?
- a. If no, what needs to be improved?
2. Do you think the two male correctional workers were sufficiently trained for the project? If not, why not? What else should be included?
3. What policies and/or procedures were developed to operate the project?
- a. Were they adequate? If not, why not?
4. What training was developed to prepare the two male workers for the project?
- a. Was the training sufficient? If not, why not?
5. What activities and/or training took place with other staff and inmates to facilitate the integration of the male workers?
- a. Were they sufficient? If not, why not?
6. Is the physical structure of PGCC adequate to protect the privacy of female inmates (e.g.



when they are using the toilet, changing clothes etc.) when there a male worker is working directly with the inmates?

7. Was PGCC able to accommodate female inmates who did not want to deal with male workers in specific contexts?
 - a. If so, how? Was it adequate?
 - b. If not, why not?

Impacts

8. What impact, if any, do you think the presence of male correctional workers has had on;
 - a. The interaction between inmates and the male correctional workers?
 - b. The interaction between inmates and the female correctional workers?
 - c. Interaction among inmates?
 - d. The operation of the Centre?
 - e. Inmate behaviour?
 - f. Inmate's perceptions of men?
 - g. Any other effects (please specify)?
9. What impact, if any, did having a male caseworker have on the inmates?
 - a. Did it have any impact on their case management activities (counselling, assessments etc.)? If so, please explain.
10. What was the impact of the project on the workload and work life of female workers?
 - a. Were special measures put in place to address issues between female and male workers? Were they adequate? If not, why not?
11. Have there been any negative impacts on the male correctional workers? (Probe for unwarranted complaints of abuse etc.)
12. Have there been any incidents or grievances associated with the presence of male workers? If so, please explain.

Future directions

13. Would you like to see this project continue?
 - a. Why or why not?
 - b. If you think it should be continued, what needs to be done to improve the project?
14. Do you have other comments on the project?

Current and Former PGCC Residents

Background

1. How long (months, years or days) have you been doing time at PGCC?



Impact of having a male correctional worker on the unit

2. Were you on a unit with a male correctional worker?
 - a. How long (months, years or days) were you on the unit with the male correctional worker?
3. Did you ever make a request to not deal with male workers in any specific context?
 - a. If so, was it accommodated and how? Was it adequate? If not, why not?
 - b. Do you believe that you could have used the grievance process if you were not accommodated? Do you think it would have been helpful? If not, why not?
4. If you had to choose between a male and a female correctional worker who would you choose? Why?
5. What things made it possible for (or difficult for) these men to work at PGCC? (Probe for the selection of male workers, training, procedures, physical infrastructure)
6. How has having a male correctional worker in your unit affected you in terms of your:
 - a. Sense of safety? Please explain.
 - b. Privacy? Please explain.
 - c. Behaviour? Please explain.
 - d. Views towards other men? Please explain.
 - e. Any other areas of your life that you can think of? Please explain.
7. Have you noticed any changes in the behaviour and/or attitude of other female inmates? Please explain.
 - a. Has there been any change in the interaction among inmates? Please explain.
8. Have you noticed any changes in the work of the female correctional workers or the interactions between female and male correctional workers? Please explain.

Impact of having a male caseworker

9. Were you ever assigned a male correctional worker as your caseworker?
 - a. How long (months, years or days) did you have a male caseworker?
10. How did it affect your involvement in case management activities (counselling, assessments etc.)?
 - a. Were you comfortable having a male caseworker? Please explain.
11. If you were not comfortable with having a male caseworker, were any other arrangements proposed to you? If yes, what were they?

Future directions

12. Would you recommend that PGCC continue to employ men as:
 - a. Correctional workers? Please explain.
 - b. Caseworkers? Please explain.
13. If the decision is made to continue, do you have any suggestions on how to improve the integration of men as correctional workers or caseworkers at Pine Grove?
14. Do you have any other comments you want to make about this pilot project?