

PRISON	HMP GLENOCHIL		YEAR (1 APRIL – 31 MARCH)	2022 – 2023	
Total number of visits	59	Total number of missed weeks	0	Total number of IPM hours	242
Total number of prisoner requests received	67	Number of IPMs in the team (as at 31 March)		6	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IPM Team performance was excellent, despite there being a number of vacant IPM posts. Team numbers have since picked up at the time of writing. The small team of IPMs ensured that the statutory duty of one visit per week was met, and that a relatively high number of prisoner requests were dealt with efficiently.

IPMs had no major concerns to report about matters within the direct control of prison staff and management. Rather, the main concerns that IPMs raised related to short staffing (i.e. an SPS corporate matter), poor GEOAmev performance and progression being impacted by the reduced local authority social work resource.

There appeared to be good relationships between prisoners and staff throughout. However, staff said morale was low due to increased risk of violence, prisoner unrest and low staffing levels. It should be noted that morale appeared to improve over the course of the year. IPMs were concerned to note that there were recurring staff shortages throughout the prison, impacting on regime access for prisoners, and on the capacity of staff to work more closely with prisoners to address their needs. There were also staffing pressures on other agencies working at the prison, impacting upon assessments, programmes, progression, and healthcare.

IPMs' initial concern around the tone and culture exhibited by staff on the front desk in their interactions with visitors, seemed to be addressed to great effect over the year.

An estate-wide issue regarding the capacity of GEOAmev to fulfil its obligations in transporting prisoners had a significant impact on prisoners, including numerous occasions where important hospital appointments were cancelled.

The prison's approach to providing for prisoners aged care needs was excellent.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Overall RAG rating

<p>Standard 1: Lawful and transparent custody IPMs confirmed that all prisoners held in the Separation and Reintegration Unit (SRU) were held there legally. IPMs saw clear evidence of appropriate paperwork giving clearance for prisoners to be held in the SRU beyond the initial 72-hour period.</p>	□	□	✓
<p>Standard 2: Decency IPMs noted the increase in the number of elderly prisoners with additional support needs and the resource challenges that that this implied e.g. specialist/palliative care, mobility aids and wheelchair passmen. These prisoners’ needs appeared to be met well.</p> <p>IPMs had concerns that cells considered to be ‘small doubles’ did not meet the Committee for the Prevention of Torture (CPT) standard for minimum living space. However, upon further investigation IPMs concluded that these cells were larger than the required minimum of four-square metres of living space per occupant.</p> <p>At points during the reporting period there were a number of prisoners sharing cells designed for single occupancy, as part of a contingency to manage overcrowding. IPMs did however understand that this was beyond the control of prison staff, who were required to house as best they could the prisoners who were sent to the establishment. The issue held implications for the SPS’s review of population management.</p>	□	□	✓
<p>Standard 3: Personal safety: IPMs observed route movements and concluded that every effort was made to ensure the safety of different prisoner groups, with them being kept separate at all times.</p> <p>IPMs confirmed that all levels in all halls had a folder in which the personal evacuation plans (PEEPs) for each prisoner were kept, and each prisoner held a copy of their PEEP.. IPMs found this to be well organised and impressive.</p> <p>IPMs were concerned about a lack of ‘line-of-sight’ from the desk on Abercrombie 2 to some cells and the communal shower area in Abercrombie 1. IPMs confirmed that there were mirrors in place in order to see those areas but concluded that they did not provide the clear review required. Prison management reviewed the matter and stated they were satisfied that existing arrangements were adequate.</p> <p>IPMs spoke with staff who expressed fear of the prison environment and the amount of attacks on both prisoners and staff. Staff said morale was low due to increased risk of violence, prisoner unrest and low staffing levels. It should be noted that morale appeared to improve over the course of the year.</p>	□	✓	□
<p>Standard 4: Effective courteous and humane exercise of authority: IPMs spent time monitoring the SRU and concluded it was a well-run unit, with staff who worked well for those in their care. Each prisoner had a reintegration plan. IPMs sampled these and discussed them with staff and concluded that they addressed the needs of the prisoners. IPMs were impressed with the work carried out by SRU staff, including efforts to return prisoners who had been in the SRU for a long period of time back to mainstream. IPMs were however concerned about the long-term use of SRU, while acknowledging that this was an estate-wide issue).</p>	□	□	✓
<p>Standard 5: Respect, Autonomy and Protection Against Mistreatment</p>	□	□	✓

<p>IPMs' initial concern around the tone and culture exhibited by staff on the front desk in their interactions with visitors seemed to be addressed to great effect, by bringing in more experienced staff to support those less experienced and set a different 'cultural norm'. IPMs latterly observed visitors being handled extremely well by staff.</p> <p>IPMs observed positive prisoner/staff interactions across the establishment.</p>			
<p>Standard 6: Purposeful activity</p> <p>IPMs looked at the process for allocating prisoners work and concluded that the process (using a 'Work Allocation Board') seemed to be open and fair, and prisoners had the opportunity to appeal adverse decisions.</p> <p>The prison did well to increase access to various elements of the regime following the removal of COVID-19 restrictions. IPMs also welcomed the re-introduction of evening activities, particularly where prisoners were allowed out for activities such as attending the gym or visits. Rather than the pre-COVID 19 practice of evening recreation, where cells were opened up and some prisoners felt unsafe.</p> <p>IPMs had a good look at education provision. IPMs heard of the efforts being made to engage prisoner groups where there was a lack of uptake. Course provision was good and Education staff seemed dedicated to making improvements where relevant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Standard 7: Transitions from Custody into the Community</p> <p>IPMs concluded that the Link Centre provided a number of courses to address a range of issues facing prisoners on release, such as budgeting, healthy eating, parenting. They also provide tailored "release packs" for dads including information and guidance etc.</p> <p>A number of prisoners complained to IPMs about progression. IPMs looked into this and were concerned to hear that a lack of social work resource had resulted in delays to risk assessments taking place. IPMs understood that this was an issue with the local authority rather than the SPS, and that work was underway to recruit more social work provision</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Standard 8: Organisational Effectiveness</p> <p>IPMs spoke with prisoners and staff about a range of issues over the reporting period and IPMs concluded that there was a need for faster, clearer and more effective communication within the prison. This included generic communications as well as keeping individual prisoners informed about their individual circumstances.</p> <p>IPMs were concerned to note that there were recurring staff shortages throughout the prison, impacting on regime access for prisoners, and on the capacity of staff to work more closely with prisoners to address their needs. There were also staffing pressures on other agencies working at the prison, impacting upon assessments, programmes, progression, and healthcare.</p> <p>An estate-wide issue regarding the capacity of GEOAmeY to fulfil its obligations in transporting prisoners had a significant impact on prisoners, including numerous occasions where important hospital appointments were cancelled. GEOAmeY eventually started to better prioritise hospital appointments, to the detriment of prison transfers. It should however be noted that prison staff did all they could to address the issue, including taking prisoners to appointments in pool cars.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Standard 9: Health and Wellbeing			□	□	✓
Healthcare provision at the prison was good. The waiting time for prisoners to see a GP was around seven days. Waiting times for Mental Health services was similar. Healthcare staffing levels were generally good. There was a significant waiting list for dental treatment, in part due to the impact of COVID 19 related restrictions. Dental staff said that emergency treatment was prioritised, and that the backlog was made up of general check-ups and minor treatments.					
RAG (Red, Amber, Green) status key:		Some serious concerns	Some slight concerns	No concerns / good practice	
<i>RAG rating: where IPMs felt each standard would be rated given their experience - not a complete analysis but based on the judgement of the IPM team</i>					

KEY ISSUES	
1.	Poor GEOAmeY performance impacted upon prisoners' access to appropriate healthcare.
2.	Low SPS numbers impacted upon prisoners' access to elements of the regime and staff observed low morale. .
3.	Reduced local authority social work resource impacted upon prisoners' ability to progress.

ENCOURAGING OBSERVATIONS
HMP Glenochil had a significantly higher proportion of elderly prisoners in need of additional care support, than anywhere else in the prison estate. The prison's approach to providing for such prisoners' needs was excellent. Appropriate mobility modifications were evident, social care providers were contracted in and were almost ever-present on the hall where these prisoners resided. More able prisoners were encouraged and facilitated to help also.

CONCLUSION
IPMs had no major concerns with regards to the treatment of and conditions for prisoners, nor with regards to how the prison was managed. This was despite staffing shortages and the poor performance of GEOAmeY making for a complex logistical situation. However these issues were beyond the control of the prison management, and contingencies put in place to tackle these complexities seemed to work well in minimising disruption.