

<b>PRISON</b>	<b>HMP EDINBURGH</b>		<b>YEAR (1 APRIL – 31 MARCH)</b>	2022 – 2023	
<b>Total number of visits</b>	70	<b>Total number of missed weeks</b>	3	<b>Total number of IPM hours</b>	237
<b>Total number of prisoner requests received</b>	126	<b>Number of IPMs in the team (as of 31 March)</b>	6		

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It was a challenging year for HMP Edinburgh, with staff shortages having a detrimental impact across all aspects of prison life. Despite some good work, and a very determined management and staff team, the Governor’s vision for purposeful activity had not been realised, and the regime continued to be more restricted than we would wish to see. The complicated population groups that HMP Edinburgh hold, catering for men and women, long and short-term prisoners, convicted and remand, mainstream and offence and non-offence cohorts, mean this is a testing prison to provide a decent regime.

In general, staff and prisoner relationships were positive, although there were some exceptions and examples of poor behaviour by staff. However, most prisoners were complimentary of staff overall. One prisoner explained about the staff on Glenesk, the remand hall, ‘they go out of their way to help you and talk to you like you are a human’. Given the volatile nature of remand halls, the IPMs were impressed that staff normally appeared upbeat and engaged with prisoners, if less enamoured with the regime.

The limited regime, with a lack of evening activity was raised by prisoners across all halls. Prisoners were also frustrated by the regular closure of work sheds and activity areas. As was the case in numerous other prisons, progression was of concern for many. On the whole, the team involved in managing this were up to date with the individuals’ needs.

Communication was reasonable and the frustrations were caused by a lack of capacity across the estate for Offending Behaviour programmes.

Issues around healthcare were also of considerable concern throughout the year. Despite the concerns, there was a marked improvement towards winter, and the plans put in place by the NHS appeared to be having an impact. However, some of this appeared to slip back, and serious focus will be required to bring it to the standard required. Linked to this, the problems encountered at all prisons with the GeoAmey contract have had a detrimental impact on many prisoners.

Whilst there were challenges, the prison did well in the main to manage this, and for that, the staff and management team deserve recognition.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	Overall RAG rating		
<p><b>Standard 1: Lawful and Transparent Custody</b></p> <p>Induction was generally good, but too many prisoners had chosen not to attend. Reception was well run, and the staff were considerate of the prisoners needs. In Glenesk, which houses the majority of remand prisoners and those on first night, the staff and prisoner relationships were generally excellent. On nearly all IPM visits staff were positively engaging with the prisoners, and prisoners were complimentary about them.</p>	□	□	✓
<p><b>Standard 2: Decency</b></p> <p>The prison was generally kept clean, although the outside areas around Glenesk needed attention. The cost of living was raised by prisoners throughout the year. As in the community, canteen prices had increased but wages had not. The prison had taken some steps to address this by providing an additional payment to prisoners. This appeared to be linked to concerns about the quality of food, with a growing number of prisoners complaining about the meals. Some explained that as canteen prices had risen it had become harder to supplement the meals on offer. One group of prisoners who had been in a 'salad club' where they would buy salad and fruit together said this was becoming untenable. Some prisoners expressed frustration with limitations on the amount of a single item they were allowed to purchase, a rule apparently introduced during covid, meaning, for example they could only purchase a limited amount of tinned tuna per week.</p>	□	□	✓
<p><b>Standard 3: Personal Safety</b></p> <p>Overall the prison seemed relatively safe, and this tended to be how prisoners reported. Whilst there were inevitably incidents of violence, these seemed to be well managed. The halls tended to feel controlled, and staff mainly had a good idea of what was happening on the halls. There was a peak in violence and drug use around the Autumn, and a further spike in drug use in March 2023. Drugs were a serious concern but the prison was working hard to combat this.</p>	□	✓	□

<p><b>Standard 4: Effective, Courteous and Humane Use of Authority</b></p> <p>The SRU tended to be full, housing prisoners who had no other suitable locations within the prison estate. Some prisoners were held in segregation for too long; one prisoner having been housed there for over a year. The prison recognised this and were working with NHS, Scottish Government and the Mental Welfare Commission to look at how to escalate concerns about those needing hospital treatment being held in prisons. There was also work ongoing to look at phased returns for prisoners to residential halls. However, SPS, through the Population Management Meetings should do more to assist establishments and ensure that people do not spend extended periods of time in isolation.</p> <p>The staff in the SRU were knowledgeable about those in their care and demonstrated compassion and empathy.</p> <p>The IPM Team were concerned to learn that female prisoners were still subjected to full searches in reception, despite this not being the practice at other prisons holding female prisoners.</p>	□	✓	□
<p><b>Standard 5: Respect, Autonomy and Protection Against Mistreatment</b></p> <p>The majority of prisoners continued to report positive relationships with staff, with most saying that staff on the halls generally tried to help solve problems. Across the halls the level of knowledge staff had regarding those in their care was good. IPMs were concerned on some halls of the practice of shouting out prisoners' names. This practice should cease immediately. There were also concerns on some residential halls regarding staff clustering around desks, rather than engaging with prisoners on the halls. Too many prisoners said they did not know who their personal officer was.</p> <p>Most prisoners did not trust the complaints system. Some prisoners explained to IPMs that they did not like complaining in case there were repercussions, most notably around getting employment. Of the 800 PCF1s submitted about 10% were upheld, which demonstrated some ability by the prison to recognise and rectify issues. However, on occasions, where an Internal Complaints Committee made a decision, it did not appear this was fed back to relevant staff to be implemented. Of the 247 PCF2 complaints submitted, only 20 were deemed to be confidential matters.</p> <p>Prisoners raised concerns about PIACS, and these did not appear to run routinely on all halls. Where issues were raised by the IPM Team the prison was responsive with the offer to hold focus groups, which IPMs were invited to observe.</p>	□	✓	□
<p><b>Standard 6: Purposeful Activity</b></p> <p>Evening activity and the closure of work sheds continued to be a major frustration amongst prisoners. Whilst some evening activity was taking place, many prisoners were spending too much time in their cells. This was of particular concern to prisoners on Ratho and Glenesk. Evening meals were provided far too early on occasions. IPMs witnessed it being issued at p.m., after which prisoners would spend the rest of the night in their cells.</p> <p>The shortage of staff was having an impact on the work sheds and activities being run. Most work sheds were not being used on a regular basis. Whilst numbers attending education and activities were up on the previous year, they remained</p>	✓	□	□

<p>too low. When activity did take place it was exemplary – for example the bus refurbishment and the work in the Recovery Café. The Christmas Panto was also incredibly well received.</p> <p>The move to allow women to work in the kitchen on some sessions was welcomed, increasing the range of activity available for them.</p> <p>There were significant delays in the issuing of mobile phones during the year. Many prisoners were waiting an unacceptable amount of time to have theirs delivered.</p> <p>There were lots of visit sessions available, but the population meant they could not all be taken, and sometimes prisoners cannot get visits when they would like. The prison is aware of this and making changes.</p>			
<p><b>Standard 7: Transitions from Custody into the Community</b></p> <p>One of the main issue prisoners raised was in regard to progression. Many prisoners feel they have no way of moving forward in their sentence and getting to a National Top End or the Open Estate. The IPM Team acknowledge this was mainly due to the waiting lists to the National Top End. The IPM Team noted this was perverse given the spaces in the Open Estate.</p>	☐	✓	☐
<p><b>Standard 8: Organisational Effectiveness</b></p> <p>The IPM Team have concerns about staffing levels and SPS HQ failure to recruit throughout the year. There were also concerns about the succession planning for the Senior Management Team.</p> <p>In general, equalities issues appeared to be well considered. However there were a couple of incidents where the IPM Team were concerned matters were not resolved by the personal officers and hall staff or managers, that should not have needed escalating to management to be resolved.</p> <p>GEOAmev capacity and performance issues, across the SPS estate, resulted in hospital cancellations. This was an ongoing national concern which had been escalated to the HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland and who escalated concerns to the SPS Chief Executive Officer and the Scottish Government Cabinet Secretary.</p>	✓	☐	☐
<p><b>Standard 9: Health and Wellbeing</b></p> <p>Throughout the year concerns were raised about all aspects of healthcare, especially waiting times to see doctors or to get mental health support. The times medication was issued was also of particular concern, with several prisoners saying they were given medication at inappropriate times, not in line with their prescription.</p> <p>IPMs were aware of the work being done by the Healthcare Team to address the staffing shortages and other logistical issues to ensure that all prisoners received the treatment they need, and noted this had some impact towards the end of the year.</p>	✓	☐	☐

<b>RAG (Red, Amber, Green) status key:</b>	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>			

<b>KEY ISSUES</b>	
1.	Staffing
2.	Regime
3.	Management changes

<b>ENCOURAGING OBSERVATIONS</b>
Some of the activity taking place in the prison was second to none. The pantomime held by prisoners from Ratho was noted as a very positive experience and a clear sign of the very positive staff and prisoner relationships that exist in the prison. The work of the prison to become a leader in Trauma Informed Practice is also noteworthy.

<b>CONCLUSION</b>
<p>The prison has done well to provide the service it has in challenging circumstances. The Governor and the management team are visible around the prison, and staff were generally clear on what was expected of them and the aims of the establishment. Most staff were well engaged and dealt with those in their care with respect. However, the limitations of the regime cannot be ignored, and more needs to be done around time out of cell and purposeful activity in particular. The staff shortages must be addressed as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Related to this are concerns about the upcoming changes in the senior management, with both the Governor and the Deputy due to leave their posts in summer 2023. This will provide a real test to the prison. The hard work that has taken place over the last few years can quickly be undone, and it will be important that the SPS provide the appropriate support to the prison over the coming months to ensure the prison moves forward and delivers the outcomes required.</p>