



HMIPS

HM INSPECTORATE OF
PRISONS FOR SCOTLAND

INSPECTING AND MONITORING

HMP CASTLE HUNTLY

FULL INSPECTION

20 JUNE TO 1 JULY 2022



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	02
KEY FACTS	04
OVERVIEW BY HM CHIEF INSPECTOR OF PRISONS FOR SCOTLAND	05
HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH OVERVIEW	06
SUMMARY OF INSPECTION FINDINGS	11
STANDARDS, COMMENTARY AND QUALITY INDICATORS	12
Standard 1 Lawful and Transparent Custody	12
Standard 2 Decency	14
Standard 3 Personal Safety	17
Standard 4 Effective, Courteous and Humane Exercise of Authority	19
Standard 5 Respect, Autonomy and Protection Against Mistreatment	21
Standard 6 Purposeful Activity	23
Standard 7 Transitions from Custody to Life in the Community	27
Standard 8 Organisational Effectiveness	29
Standard 9 Health and Wellbeing	31
ANNEXES	
ANNEX A Summary of Recommendations	35
ANNEX B Summary of Good Practice	38
ANNEX C Summary of Ratings	40
ANNEX D Prison Population Profile on	43
ANNEX E Inspection Team	44
ANNEX F Acronyms used in this Report	45
EVIDENCE REPORT	47

The full inspection findings and overall rating for each of the quality indicators

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This report is part of the programme of inspections of prisons carried out by His Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland (HMIPS). These inspections contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM); which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detention. HMIPS is one of 21 bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland (HMCIPS) assesses the treatment and care of prisoners across the Scottish Prison Service (SPS) estate against a predefined set of Standards. These Standards are set out in the document 'Standards for Inspecting and Monitoring Prisons in Scotland', published in May 2018, which can be found at <https://www.prisoninspectorscotland.gov.uk/standards>.

The Standards reflect the independence of the inspection of prisons in Scotland and are designed to provide information to prisoners, prison staff and the wider community on the main areas that are examined during the course of an inspection. They also provide assurance to Ministers and the public that inspections are conducted in line with a framework that is consistent and that assessments are made against appropriate criteria. While the basis for these Standards is rooted in International Human Rights treaties, conventions and in Prison Rules, they are the Standards of HMIPS. This report and the separate 'Evidence Report' are set out to reflect the performance against these standards and quality indicators.

HMIPS assimilates information resulting in evidencebased findings utilising a number of different techniques. These include:

- Asking the Governor or Director in Charge for a self-evaluation – summary of their progress against previous recommendations, the challenges they face and the successes they have achieved.
- Obtaining information and documents from the SPS and the prison inspected.
- Shadowing and observing SPS and other specialist staff as they perform their duties within the prison.
- Interviewing prisoners and staff on a one-to-one basis.
- Conducting a pre-inspection survey of prisoners and focus groups with both prisoners and staff.
- Observing the range of services delivered within the prison at the point of delivery.
- Inspecting a wide range of facilities impacting on both prisoners and staff.
- Attending and observing relevant meetings impacting on both the management of the prison and the future of the prisoners such as Case Conferences.
- Reviewing policies, procedures and performance reports produced both locally and by SPS Headquarters (SPS HQ) specialists.

HMIPS is supported in our work by inspectors from Healthcare Improvement Scotland (HIS), Education Scotland, Scottish Human Rights Commission, the Care Inspectorate, and guest inspectors from the SPS.

The information gathered facilitates the compilation of a complete analysis of the prison against the standards used. This ensures that assessments are fair, balanced and accurate. In relation to each standard and quality indicator, inspectors record their evaluation in two forms:

1. A colour coded assessment marker

Rating	Definition
 Good performance	Indicates good performance which may constitute good practice.
 Satisfactory performance	Indicates overall satisfactory performance .
 Generally acceptable performance	Indicates generally acceptable performance though some improvements are required.
 Poor performance	Indicates poor performance and will be accompanied by a statement of what requires to be addressed .
 Unacceptable performance	Indicates unacceptable performance that requires immediate attention.
 Not applicable	Quality indicator is not applicable .

2. A written record of the evidence gathered is produced by the inspector allocated each individual standard. It is important to recognise that although standards are assigned to inspectors within the team, all inspectors have the opportunity to comment on findings at a deliberation session prior to final assessments being reached. This emphasises the fairness aspect of the process, ensuring an unbiased decision is reached prior to completion of the final report.

This report provides a summary of the inspection findings and an overall rating against each of the nine standards. The full inspection findings and overall rating for each of the quality indicators can be found in the 'Evidence Report' that will sit alongside this report on our website.

KEY FACTS

Location

Castle Huntly is a castle in Scotland, now used as a prison under the name HMP Castle Huntly. It is located approximately seven miles west of Dundee in the Carse of Gowrie, Perth and Kinross, close to the shore of the Firth of Tay, and can be seen from the main road linking Dundee and Perth.

Role

Castle Huntly is Scotland's only open prison, accommodating low-supervision adult male offenders from all Local Authority area. Following a robust risk management process and a period in closed conditions offenders can progress to Castle Huntly where the emphasis is on careful preparation for release. Activity focuses on enhanced personal responsibility, job readiness and positive citizenship with the aim of reducing the risk of re-offending and contributing to safer communities.



OVERVIEW BY HMCIPS

HMP Castle Huntly provides an important and distinctive function as the only open prison in Scotland. The prison operates with a distinct ethos and purpose from closed establishments; designed to accommodate low-risk male individuals and prepare them for release, with a significant amount of freedoms that do not exist in closed conditions. Individuals held in HMP Castle Huntly have greater access to the community; can have periods of home release; are able to walk around the estate with few limitations; and are responsible for their own day-to-day lives in a way that those in closed conditions are not.

It has the added benefit of geography situated between two urban conurbations, Perth and Dundee and therefore, can play an important role in the Scottish Prison estate in preparing prisoners for their return to the community.

Inspectors found the prison to have good staff/prisoner relationships, strong leadership and robust relationships with the community.

A human rights-based approach requires proportionate limitations of rights to be as minimally restrictive as necessary in pursuit of the legitimate aim. In the context of prison, this means that where an individual is assessed to demonstrate a low risk to the community, they should have various freedoms and opportunities restored. The existence of an Open Prison fulfils this human rights obligation and allows prisoners held in closed conditions to have something to strive for in their rehabilitative journey.

The international human rights framework is also clear that States have a duty to prepare prisoners for release and assist them in their reintegration to the community. An establishment such as HMP Castle Huntly, dedicated to supporting prisoners in this endeavour, and demonstrating evidence to parole authorities of readiness for release, is key to fulfilling this human rights obligation.

With this in mind, HMP Castle Huntly should be a flagship establishment of the Scottish Prison Service – fulfilling a number of key human rights obligations on community reintegration and a less restrictive model. In many ways, our inspection found HMP Castle Huntly to be fulfilling this promise – but, unfortunately, too few prisoners are afforded the opportunity to access it. The establishment is significantly underutilised, with a population under half of its design capacity. With numbers so low, the establishment are unable to offer as many community placements and opportunities as they may like, and secondly individuals are needed for the effective running of the prison. This combination negatively impacts the rehabilitative effect the establishment could offer. Some ameliorating solutions that would support the notion of being prepared to return to the community need to be explored; the provision of self-care as opposed to the traditional model of a kitchen and laundry, use of digital platforms, access to personal vehicles and mobile phones etc.

HMIPS are conducting a thematic review into progression (the way in which prisoners can demonstrate they are less of a risk, and therefore be eligible for transfer to open conditions). While not prejudging the findings of this review, the inspectorate must highlight the disappointing underuse of this facility which – on the face of it – fulfils a number of human rights criteria we expect to see the SPS provide. The Scottish Prison Service therefore has a stark choice. It can either continue running an underutilised and expensive facility or unblock the barriers to progression to ensure more effective use is made of HMP Castle Huntly which, apart from its poor accommodation wings, has some excellent facilities in a unique rural setting that still facilitates external placements in urban areas. A more radical alternative would be to consider closure and affording other prisons the opportunity to run a more open regime in tandem with a closed regime for those prisoners due to be liberated. That might provide open conditions across a wider area of Scotland, potentially closer to families for more prisoners, but it would be hard to replicate the inspiring and restorative tranquillity of HMP Castle Huntly.

HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH OVERVIEW

HMIPS is a Human Rights organisation. As such, we ground all of our inspections in Human Rights principles. Our nine standards are written with the international human rights framework as a close reference point, and our inspectors apply these standards through a human rights based approach.

Amongst many others, our standards are heavily influenced by CPT Standards; UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Mandela Rules); European Prison Rules; UN rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (Havana Rules); Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power; Various Council of Europe Recommendations; UK Domestic Legislation including the Human Rights Act and Scotland Act; European Convention on Human Rights; UN Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Bangkok Rules); International Jurisprudence and best practice; and UN Convention Against Torture.

The human rights-based overview of the inspection of HMP Castle Huntly follows the PANEL headings, illustrating how human rights are applied to the inspection as a whole. This overview is not exhaustive of all human rights observed and engaged, but is intended as a brief synopsis of the implementation of a human rights-based approach in HMP Castle Huntly.

HMIPS' human rights-based approach to inspection is a critical element of ensuring both that the human dignity of the prisoner is upheld and that prisons are places of productive, positive and useful education, work and interaction, leading to better outcomes in reducing recidivism and keeping our communities safer.

Inspection findings relate to the human rights implications of the existence of HMP Castle Huntly and the critique is a matter for SPS HQ. In terms of the day-to-day human rights approach of HMP Castle Huntly – inspectors found this to be satisfactory. HMIPS would encourage the establishment to go further, embedding the culture within staff of all levels, and providing reassurance to prisoners that their voice is heard.

Overall, HMP Castle Huntly is an establishment that respects the basic foundations of a human rights approach in their outcomes and many of their processes.

PANEL

Participation

“Prisoners should be meaningfully involved in decisions that affect their lives”

HMP Castle Huntly demonstrated a relatively good participatory model. There were robust and consistent opportunities for prisoners to have their voices heard across the establishment, stretching from informal dialogue, to formal PIACs.

PIACs can be a good opportunity to meaningfully involve prisoners in decisions that affect the prison; a good PIAC model can greatly influence the participatory success of an establishment and help make prisoners feel heard and engaged. HMP Castle Huntly held monthly PIACs with a quarterly Prisoner Forum, which had greater representation from senior management. The minutes were well organised and inspectors were pleased to see good engagement from across the staff and prisoner group.

We also observed a number of informal processes of consultation and participation from PTIs who consulted on which activities to offer; to an approachable Governor who was regularly available to prisoners; to prisoners having the choice of which room and wing they might prefer, where availability allowed.

Despite all of this positive practice, there remained a view amongst prisoners we spoke to, and from our pre-inspection survey, that their voice was not heard. Prisoners reported that many of these processes felt like lip service, and that they did not have a meaningful impact on the day-to-day running of the establishment. While this was not the finding of inspectors, their views should not be dismissed. We would encourage HMP Castle Huntly to do more to demonstrate to the prison population where prisoner’s voice has made meaningful differences. We would also encourage HMP Castle Huntly to try new methods to help readjust the power imbalance at PIACs, for example by allowing a prisoner to chair proceedings.

In common with the principle of prisoner voice we were pleased to see that prisoners were represented on the Equality and Diversity (E&D) Committee.

Components to the principle of participation include that it must be active, free and meaningful and give attention to issues of accessibility, including access to information in a form and a language that can be understood. HMIPS would expect that any barriers to participation are identified and that those prisoners would be assisted to overcome them in order to meaningfully participate.

Accountability

“There should be monitoring of how prisoner’s rights are being affected as well as remedies when things go wrong”

There was a framework of administrative accountability in the prison. However, HMIPS found prisoners to have a low level of confidence in the complaints system. On review of PCF1 and PCF2 complaints, inspectors found responses to be timely, robust and appropriate.

There was a below average number of formal complaints at HMP Castle Huntly. This appeared to be, at least partly, due to a pervasive view amongst the prison population that complaining could result in an individual being returned to closed conditions. HMIPS investigated this thoroughly and concluded there was no substance to this allegation.

Under article 13 of the UN Convention against Torture, Inhumane and Degrading Treatment, “States parties shall ensure that any individual who alleges he has been subjected to torture in any territory under its jurisdiction has the right to complain to, and to have his case promptly and impartially examined by, its competent authorities. Steps shall be taken to ensure that the complainant and witnesses are protected against all ill-treatment or intimidation as a consequence of his complaint or any evidence given”.

Inspectors were satisfied that ill-treatment or intimidation as a consequence of complaining was not occurring at HMP Castle Huntly. Nonetheless, this erroneous view echoes the findings of the 2016 report and therefore the establishment must work harder to dispel this view amongst the population and reassure prisoners they can complain without adverse consequences. The establishment should take more steps to recognise the disconnect between prisoners and the complaints system. Prisoners need to be assured that their voice is listened to and that authorities are accountable when things go wrong. Despite the process appearing robust when complaints were received, more effort should be taken to provide prisoners with confidence in the process.

Inspectors continue to be dissatisfied with the SPS-wide E&D complaints model. An EDF (equality and diversity form) acts as an addendum to a PCF complaint where the complainer believes the issue to concern an equality and diversity matter. Where such a form is attached, the complaint is sent to the E&D manager to investigate and report back separately. These complaints should be reviewed by the E&D committee (albeit without prisoner representation) to identify and address any systemic issues. The process of dealing with an EDF complaint does not appear to differ in any clear way, in either process or outcome, from a standard PCF complaint – rendering it without value. The E&D Manager appears to have no specific training on dealing with E&D complaints and the SPS E&D forum has not been convened since COVID, which limits the support they can receive. HMIPS would strongly encourage SPS HQ to re-examine processes and procedures in place around E&D complaints.

Overall, the prison has clearly developed robust processes and models for a transparent and accountable framework. It must now tackle the perception issue and restore confidence in the model.

Non-Discrimination

“All forms of discrimination must be prohibited, prevented and eliminated. The needs of prisoners who face the biggest barriers to realising their rights should be prioritised.”

Non-Discrimination requires the duty bearer to go further than not actively discriminating – it is not a passive duty but an active one, to make deliberate efforts to prevent discrimination from occurring in all forms.

At the time of inspection, HMP Castle Huntly had no foreign national prisoners, and no prisoners for whom English was a second language. While the establishment had a robust policy in place for translation services, this was not required for some time. This is partly due to the eligibility of access to Open Conditions criteria. Foreign nationals who are at risk of deportation following the completion of their sentence are considered a risk of absconding, and therefore are not eligible for progression to HMP Castle Huntly.

While non-discrimination was well monitored and actively engaged with at HMP Castle Huntly, inspectors had two overarching concerns.

Firstly, the fabric of the estate mean that there is only one accessible cell for the entire prison. While inspectors were pleased to hear that the cell met with the needs of the occupant, it is concerning that the lack of appropriate facilities may impact an individual's chance to progress to open conditions. Inspectors were told this has not occurred, but the estate clearly needs investment to allow for more accessible cells in the context of an aging prisoner population.

Notwithstanding the physical constraints of the site, HMIPS were very pleased to hear of the flexible and adaptable approach of prison staff and management in advance of an arrival. Familiarisation visits were often arranged and staff would agree requirements of those with mobility issues in advance of a transfer to ensure all of the appropriate adjustment were made. This allowed for a smooth and minimally disruptive transfer. Prisoners with additional support needs were almost unanimously positive about the approach of prison staff. Inspectors were pleased to see HMP Castle Huntly doing the best they could with the facilities they had.

It did not seem that offence protection prisoners had equitable community access to main population prisoners. While outside placements were difficult to secure, the one work party that facilitated reintegration into the community for protection prisoners was usually the first work party to be cancelled when staff needed to be redeployed to cover vacant residential posts. While inspectors appreciate the difficulty in resourcing, the impact of staff redeployment must be balanced across the different population types at HMP Castle Huntly.

Prisoners were supported in their faith by a strong chaplaincy team and a kitchen that had a good understanding of faith-based meals. The E&D committee were actively involved in monitoring and improving the provision of faith-based meals, with active participation from prisoners. This was pleasing to observe and was clearly resulting in better outcomes.

Empowerment

“Everyone should understand their rights, and be fully supported to take part in developing policy and practices which affect their lives”

Much of the discussion above around participation and accountability also applies to empowerment – prisoners cannot be empowered if they do not have opportunities to participate or do not have recourse to hold authority to account. We would expect prisoners to understand their rights and be fully supported in utilising them.

Information provision was good around the prison, with up to date noticeboards and prison rules available from all areas. It was disappointing to see a lack of legal texts available in the library; however, the library was otherwise very good, with a pleasing range of information available. We were also encouraged to see the use of an anonymous suggestion box, but further effort should be taken to report on the contents of suggestions and action taken as a result.

Prisoners also had access to a prisoner information channel which offered a good variety of information. The establishment encouraged prisoners to take ownership of their sentence, placing the responsibility on the prisoner to attend induction, various appointments and work places. This allowed prisoners to get used to a more realistic environment and prepared them better for release where they would have to exercise personal responsibility. This was a good example of empowerment.

The key to a good engagement model is placing prisoners at the centre of policy and decision making. HMP Castle Huntly demonstrated satisfactory progress towards this goal.

Legality

A human rights-based approach requires the recognition of rights as legally enforceable entitlements and is linked to national and international human rights law. It is important that all categories of prisoners enjoy the full range of human rights and that staff are adequately supported. Inspectors have identified areas where they believe further action is required, in particular to ensure that more marginalised prisoners do not fall through the gap.

The realisation of human rights is facilitated in practice by both the provision of information and the need for proactive action to be taken to ensure prisoners are accessing their rights in practice. A human rights-based framework is concerned with anticipating areas of prison life where problems are likely to arise, responding to prisoners needs as they are raised and building in monitoring mechanisms to ensure systems are improved through experience. This is the sort of human rights infrastructure which could always be developed further. That said, inspectors found a relatively good model in place at HMP Castle Huntly.



SUMMARY OF INSPECTION FINDINGS

 **Standard 1 Lawful and Transparent Custody**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 2 Decency**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 3 Personal Safety**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 4 Effective, Courteous and Humane Exercise of Authority**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 5 Respect, Autonomy and Protection against Mistreatment**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 6 Purposeful Activity**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 7 Transitions from Custody to Life in the Community**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 8 Organisational Effectiveness**
Satisfactory

 **Standard 9 Health and Wellbeing**
Satisfactory

STANDARDS, COMMENTARY AND QUALITY INDICATORS

Standard 1 – Lawful and Transparent Custody

The prison complies with administrative and procedural requirements of the law, ensuring that all prisoners are legally detained and provides each prisoner with information required to adapt to prison life.

The prison ensures that all prisoners are lawfully detained. Each prisoner’s time in custody is accurately calculated; they are properly classified, allocated and accommodated appropriately. Information is provided to all prisoners regarding various aspects of the prison regime, their rights and their entitlements. The release process is carried out appropriately and positively to assist prisoners in their transition back into the community.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, two quality indicators were rated as good and six were rated as satisfactory performance giving an overall rating of satisfactory. There were five examples of good practice and one recommendation for improvement.

HMP Castle Huntly did not receive prisoners directly from court. As the only open estate in Scotland, they received prisoners progressing from other establishments. New arrival numbers were low and prisoners already knew their release dates. The prison also had the benefit of knowing who was arriving and when, which allowed them to classify prisoners in advance and agree their location within the prison.

Due to the low number of prisoners arriving, inspectors were only able to observe one new admission during the inspection. However, reception staff were very knowledgeable and able to clearly explain the processes, which were supported by a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). A Reception Risk Assessment (RRA) was completed for every prisoner, and inspectors were content that all prisoners were assessed regarding their ability to understand and had the opportunity to engage with the admissions process in a confidential setting. The admission process was observed which met the required standard and the person was processed quickly.

As stated above HMP Castle Huntly is an open prison and runs differently from any other prison in Scotland. Therefore, it is important for prisoners to understand how it runs. It had a very good process in place for induction with prisoners being responsible for following a week’s induction timetable. Prisoners were provided with an abundance of information about HMP Castle Huntly during the admissions process within reception, via a local induction booklet waiting for them in their room of allocation and during an orientation tour with a peer mentor on their first day. Inspectors were pleased to hear that prisoners were offered use of the staff office phone to let family know they had arrived, pending access to the hall phone and mobile.

Inspectors were pleased to hear that, where possible, familiarisation visits were completed before new prisoners arrived.

There were good processes in place for liberating prisoners and the release process ran smoothly.

Prisoners spoken to were content that they had received the information they required.

HMIPS Standard 1 Lawful and Transparent Custody – Continued

Inspectors took the opportunity to observe prisoners going out on and returning from home leave. It was a very smooth process and inspectors were impressed to see that prisoners who did not own a mobile phone were issued with a prison mobile to allow them to keep in touch with the prison in an emergency.

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this standard:

Participation: Prisoners were invited to engage in the admissions process via the RRA form, which was completed in a confidential setting. They also had responsibility for ensuring their week's induction was completed, with opportunities to raise issues of concern and provide feedback on their experience.

Accountability: There were efficient processes in place for admission into and liberation from HMP Castle Huntly. During the reception process and on arrival at their allocated room, prisoners were provided with information about their entitlements. The liberation process took account of onward travel arrangements and appointments in the community.

Non-discrimination and equality: Prisoners were classified and allocated to an area in the prison in advance of them arriving, so they were quickly placed in the area that best suited their needs. Prisoners who required additional assistance with the admissions process were identified on arrival at reception. Translation services were available and guidance for staff on how to use them. Familiarisation visits could be arranged in advance of a prisoner arriving and could include e.g. agreement of requirements for prisoners with mobility issues. Prisoners were offered guidance and support in advance of their liberation date.

Empowerment: Prisoners were provided with a local induction booklet on arrival at their room of allocation and received a tour from a peer mentor on their first day to provide them with the basics of the prison. There was sufficient information provided in these to enable the prisoner to know their rights in advance of starting their induction week, which provided further valuable information. The RRA enabled staff to identify prisoners with additional needs.

Legality: Staff followed the lawful procedures and completed them in a professional manner.

Encouraging observations:

- Prisoners who did not own a mobile phone and were going on home leave were issued with a prison mobile to allow them to keep in touch with the prison in an emergency.
- Prisoners were offered use of the staff office phone to let family know they had arrived, pending access to the hall phone and mobile phone.
- Familiarisation visits were completed, where possible, before new prisoners arrived.
- Prisoners had responsibility for their own induction.
- The Buddy system that involved peer mentors in the induction process.

Standard 2 – Decency

The prison supplies the basic requirements of decent life to the prisoners.

The prison provides to all prisoners the basic physical requirements for a decent life. All buildings, rooms, outdoor spaces and activity areas are of adequate size, well maintained, appropriately furnished, clean and hygienic. Each prisoner has a bed, bedding and suitable clothing, has good access to toilets and washing facilities, is provided with necessary toiletries and cleaning materials and is properly fed. These needs are met in ways that promote each prisoner's sense of personal and cultural identity and self-respect.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, five quality indicators were rated as satisfactory and one was rated as generally acceptable giving an overall rating of satisfactory. There were no examples of good practice and nine recommendations for improvement.

The establishment was built on the site of Castle Huntly, a castle with original buildings dating back to the second half of the 15th Century, which houses the management and administration offices. There were three residential areas, Murray House containing double occupancy cells and Bruce and Wallace Wings both with single occupancy cells, giving a total of 182 single cell capacity. Two recently refurbished secure holding cells were located within Wallace Wing. An Independent Living Unit (ILU) was located within Bruce Wing but at the time of the inspection was closed as it had been used for COVID-19 isolation during the pandemic and there were no plans to reopen it. HMIPS strongly recommends that this is opened again and the prison should consider whether the ILU concepts could be expanded to the whole prison. There was only one accessible cell within the prison and the occupant confirmed that the cell facilities met his requirements.

The prison was found to have good levels of cleanliness throughout and cleaning schedules for the estate and residential halls were in place. The Industrial Cleaning Team (ICT) were responsible for cleaning most areas of the prison. There were 15 on the team which was a smaller number than pre-COVID-19, but the quality of service provided by them was good. It was noted, however, that only one member of the team was bio-hazard trained, which was low for the size of the establishment.

Of the cells inspected, prisoner's beds, mattresses and bedding were in good condition with only a very small percentage of prisoners using their own personal bedding. The laundry process worked well and was very efficient.

Bruce and Wallace wings were built in the 1970s and some parts were found to be tired and no longer fit for purpose, with dampness in places caused by condensation from deteriorating wall insulation. The heating system consisted of large radiators built into the ceilings and walls that could not be individually temperature controlled in each cell. The heating system was also found to be old and porous, regularly requiring repair work.

Many prisoners spoken to felt that generally the accommodation was poor due to its age, the heating systems and the requirement to share toileting and showering facilities. As such it was seen as a backwards step from closed conditions where they had their own toileting and showering facilities.

HMIPS Standard 2 Decency – Continued

The catering building comprised of a fit-for-purpose kitchen including sufficient storage, preparation and serving space. All foodstuffs used in the preparation of prisoner's meals were stored in proper conditions and at the correct temperature.

There was no clear indication for prisoners of nutritional values or allergen information in respect of the food provided to them by the kitchen, or what guidance was followed by the kitchen in respect of ensuring the nutritional value of the food provided met desired standards.

It was noted that there was no dedicated catering manager for the kitchen; this was a dual role for the Offender Outcomes Manager who had no training or background in the catering business. It was clear that this lack of knowledge was felt by staff in the kitchen as the position was to merely sign off purchases and orders generated by staff and did not offer any advice or support when and if required.

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this standard:

Participation: Food focus groups had been suspended during the COVID-19 pandemic but had been reintroduced. The last one was held on 8 March 2022, where recommendations made had been implemented by the prison. Staff and prisoners were aware of how to raise maintenance issues and they were generally dealt with promptly; replacement clothing, bedding, towels and toiletries were readily available on request and in good supply.

Accountability: There were a number of checks and assurances within this standard including mattresses, bedding and towels being replaced without undue delay on request. A process was in place for access to the laundry by all prisoners every weekday for personal items, work clothes and bedding. There was a good maintenance and prevention programme in place through the "Agility" platform to ensure issues were prioritised and dealt with efficiently.

Non-discrimination and equality: Inspectors did not witness any direct discrimination during the inspection.

Empowerment: Prisoners had access to the basic requirements for a decent life and understood the process for raising maintenance issues and essential hygiene items. All prisoners wore their own personal clothing whilst in the halls.

Legality: Inspectors did not find anything during the inspection of this standard that compromised any domestic or international laws.

Areas for improvement

- The ILU should be reopened and the ILU concepts expanded to the whole prison.
- More accessible cells are required.
- The accommodation buildings are old and are structurally in a poor state of repair, continual deterioration dictates that they should be replaced.
- More members of the ICT should be bio-hazard trained providing flexible cover for the entire establishment.
- The ICT should be provided with BICS training and qualification as an essential part of their role.

HMIPS Standard 2
Decency – Continued

- Action should be taken to upgrade the toileting and showering facilities throughout the estate to provide improved privacy and personal hygiene.
- The menu offered to prisoners should display nutritional values and allergen information.
- Prisoners who are employed in the kitchen should not be restricted in accessing the same rights as others in respect of reintegration and progression just because they cannot be spared from their role due to prisoner shortages.
- A dedicated, qualified catering manager for the kitchen would provide much needed advice and support for kitchen staff and ensure managerial oversight of the budget to ensure the provision of varied quality food to prisoners.
- As part of the process for reintroducing communal dining consideration should be given to allowing prisoners to consume their meals in their cells at a later and more appropriate meal time.
- Consideration should be given to the weekend regime having scope for the evening meal to be served up to 17:45 rather than 15:45, thereby reducing the long waiting time for prisoners between meals.



Standard 3 – Personal Safety

The prison takes all reasonable steps to ensure the safety of all prisoners.

All appropriate steps are taken to minimise the levels of harm to which prisoners are exposed. Appropriate steps are taken to protect prisoners from harm from others or themselves. Where violence or accidents do occur, the circumstances are thoroughly investigated and appropriate management action taken.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, six quality indicators were rated as satisfactory performance and one was rated as generally acceptable performance, giving an overall rating of satisfactory performance. There were three recommendations for improvement.

Ninety-one percent of prisoners who completed the pre-inspection reported that they felt always or often safe, and this reflected the positive findings of the inspection team with regard to prisoner safety.

Standard three relies heavily on interaction with those involved in the SPS Suicide Strategy - Talk to Me (TTM), discipline hearings and the Anti-bullying Strategy - Think Twice (TT). Due to the rare occurrences of these strategies having to be used, inspectors were unable to speak to any of the current population who had been managed under these policies to establish if there was a person-centred approach. File reviews on TTM and discipline hearings recorded interaction with prisoners and allowing them to have their say.

There were examples of robust SOPs and Safe Systems of Work (SSOW) throughout the standard.

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this standard:

Participation: Participation by prisoners in their own care was difficult to judge as there was limited evidence. Discipline hearings were rare, with none taking place during the inspection and no one was currently on TT or TTM. Where participation can be assessed, is in reviewing closed files. Again, in most cases when a prisoner was returned to closed conditions, their file went with them. On reviewing discipline hearings paperwork there were robust narratives, indicating good interaction with those appearing on a charge. Files regarding TT gave inspectors a sense that not only the victim but the perpetrator was supported.

Accountability: There were a number of good assurance and auditing processes by way of SOPs and SSOW. A number of weekly and monthly assurance check were in place, particularly around Health and Safety (H&S). Although the prison transferred in prisoners already in the system where there was information around risks and needs. HMP Castle Huntly carried out an admission interview to ensure there were no gaps missing in supporting those returning to the community.

Non-discrimination and equality: There was no evidence of prisoner groups being treated discriminately. There was no segregation between prisoners regardless of type of sentence. Although the survey highlighted some threats or abuse amongst the population, due to the anonymity of the survey it was not possible to identify one group from another.

HMIPS Standard 3 Personal Safety – Continued

Empowerment: Due to a lack of opportunity to talk to prisoners managed under TTM, TT or who had been involved in discipline hearings, it was difficult to gauge the level of engagement within HMP Castle Huntly. However, the few prisoners inspectors spoke to reported that they felt they had been treated fairly and had their say.

Legality: All aspects of Prison Rules and policies appeared to have been complied with. Policies and procedures, including secondary assurance, ensured that as best as possible all those living and working at HMP Castle Huntly stayed safe, by having robust SOPs and SSOWs to deal with all aspects of H&S including SOPs dealing with COVID19.

Emerging concerns

- Although level two or three incidents were almost unheard of, staff training on these roles needs to be increased so that all instant command training (ICT) roles are filled.

Encouraging observation

- Although there were no examples of good practice identified, HMP Castle Huntly felt a safe place to live and work with the pre-inspection survey reporting that 63% of respondents always felt safe and 29% often feeling safe.



Standard 4 – Effective, Courteous and Humane Exercise of Authority

The prison performs the duties both to protect the public by detaining prisoners in custody and to respect the individual circumstances of each prisoner by maintaining order effectively, with courtesy and humanity

The prison ensures that the thorough implementation of security and supervisory duties is balanced by courteous and humane treatment of prisoners and visitors to the prison. Procedures relating to perimeter, entry and exit security, and the personal safety, searching, supervision and escorting of prisoners are implemented effectively. The level of security and supervision is not excessive.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, eight quality indicators were rated as satisfactory performance, one rated as generally acceptable practice and one was not applicable giving an overall rating of satisfactory performance. There were no examples of good practice and four recommendations for improvement.

HMP Castle Huntly offered a more relaxed regime in which prisoners lived and worked. Freedom to move around and the daily movement in and out of prison by prisoners offered a different challenge to those found in closed condition prisons. With no perimeter walls or vehicle locks, a number of derogations (relaxing of policy) were in place to allow the prison to function as an open establishment. However, there were still processes in place to allow the safe running of the prison. Incidents were not common and in particular level two and three incidents, which were almost unheard of. However, it is still important to prepare and be in a position to react, which are highlighted in this standard and therefore staff training in some areas required attention. There were good processes in place for managing prisoners PPC, but there was inadequate storage available for the population, which will be exacerbated if the population increases. The reception area would also benefit from an x-ray machine to reduce delays in processing incoming mail and to aid the searching process. The risk assessment process for prisoners leaving the prison under escort met requirements and handcuffs were rarely used. The process for testing prisoners for alcohol and drugs was robust. By transferring to HMP Castle Huntly, prisoners agreed to take part in the Voluntary Drug Testing Scheme and therefore were regularly tested as part of the prisons local drug strategy. Positive results were low but were analysed and discussed at addictions meetings. Overall the effective, courteous and humane exercise of authority by HMP Castle Huntly was found to be of an acceptable level.

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this Standard:

Participation: With no orderly rooms to observe, no one held under rule 95 or on enhanced security measures it was difficult to gauge prisoner participation. The limited access to those who had been subject to these policies reported that they had been treated fairly. When reviewing paperwork inspectors found that those involved in discipline hearings had been offered their say.

Accountability: Paperwork was completed to a good standard with assurance processes in place. PRL undertaken were completed and offered mitigation where the policy was not met, mostly in the form of derogation. Any analysis undertaken by the IMU with regards to trends was reported and actioned by the SMT.

HMIPS Standard 4 Effective, Courteous and Humane Exercise of Authority – Continued

Non-discrimination and equality: There was no evidence that HMP Castle Huntly had been discriminatory towards any prisoner group or individual within this standard. The prison had a relaxed feel and all prisoners have the freedom of movement and are expected to exercise personal responsibility moving and living within the prison.

Empowerment: Those spoken to, which was low in number, who had been involved in either rule 95 or disciplinary hearings reported that they had been given the opportunity to have their view point heard. Prisoners that attended drug testing also confirmed they had been treated well.

Legality: During the inspection there was no evidence of a breach of the law or prison rules. HMP Castle Huntly have a number of derogations to deal with the uniqueness of the prison and its estate. However the pre-inspection identified that 20% of the respondents were not aware why they were being searched which should be addressed.

Emerging concerns

- Staff training needs to be addressed in certain areas.
- More personal property storage space is required.

Encouraging observation

- Good examples of motivational phrases in the orderly room that endorsed HMP Castle Huntly's ethos.



Standard 5 – Respect, Autonomy and Protection Against Mistreatment

A climate of mutual respect exists between staff and prisoners. Prisoners are encouraged to take responsibility for themselves and their future. Their rights to statutory protections and complaints processes are respected.

Throughout the prison, staff and prisoners have a mutual understanding and respect for each other and their responsibilities. They engage with each other positively and constructively. Prisoners are kept well informed about matters which affect them and are treated humanely and with understanding. If they have problems or feel threatened they are offered effective support. Prisoners are encouraged to participate in decision making about their own lives. The prison co-operates positively with agencies which exercise statutory powers of complaints, investigation or supervision.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, six quality indicators were rated as satisfactory performance and two were rated as generally acceptable, giving an overall rating of satisfactory performance. There were six recommendations for improvement.

Throughout the prison, staff and prisoner relationships appeared positive and the atmosphere very relaxed. There was mutual respect and understanding for each other, with both groups on first name terms.

During interviews with various prisoners it was evident they understood their daily regime and all regime plans were published for each prisoner group to view in each residential area. The prison environment seemed positive with its primary focus on providing care and opportunities for prisoners, but in equal measure maintaining a sense of order and calm.

PIACs took place regularly and were scheduled monthly and every quarter a prisoner forum group meeting was scheduled. The PIAC representatives spoken to were well organised and demonstrated a genuine interest in improving conditions for all prisoners.

Information on the complaints procedure, including the appeals process, was on display throughout the establishment including every residential area.

The IPMs were known to both staff and prisoners and were able to carry out their duties unhindered.

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this standard:

Participation: Staff and prisoner relationships were positive and in particular the connection between personal officer and prisoner. This association was often the conduit between prisoner and family in terms of encouragement, direction and support.

The complaints system was robust and forms were available in all residential areas. That being said, there was some negativity around making complaints and therefore prisoners were worried that making complaints could affect their release. The pre-inspection survey highlighted that of those who had an opinion, over half of respondents (64%) think that the complaints system worked well.

HMIPS Standard 5 Respect, Autonomy and Protection Against Mistreatment – Continued

Accountability: There was evidence of prisoners using the complaints system and there was no record of any complaints to the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (SPSO). All residential areas had a copy of the Prison Rules that prisoners could access.

Prisoners have unhindered access to the hall phone during unlock periods and in addition to this could be allocated an SPS mobile phone. Prisoners can now make a request to Independent Prison Monitors (IPMs) on their mobile phones and in the privacy of their own cell.

Non-discrimination and equality: There was no evidence of anyone being treated differently because of a protected characteristic. Vulnerable prisoners were supported well and able to access all services. There was no evidence of discriminatory or inappropriate attitudes of prisoners.

Empowerment: There was a strong sense of empowering prisoners. The prison encouraged them to take ownership of their sentence, placing the responsibility on the prisoner to attend induction, various appointments and work places. This allowed prisoners to get used to a more realistic environment and preparing them better for release where they would have to exercise some personal responsibility. The prisoners dictated prisoner membership of the PIACs and those who represented the group were enthusiastic in their role. There was also a suggestion box located on the wall outside the residential manager's office.

Legality: All accommodation areas had a copy of the Prison Rules, which prisoners could access if requested. Information about IPMs was displayed throughout the establishment. IPMs visited regularly and were well known to staff and prisoners. Where there was incidents of Information breaches, investigations concluded that they had been handled correctly and no further action was required.

Emerging concerns

- Although there was no evidence of prisoners being downgraded for making complaints, there was a perception within HMP Castle Huntly that making a complaint would result in a downgrade. Action should be taken to tackle this myth and reassure prisoners they can complain without adverse consequences.
- PIAC minutes were only available outside the canteen and in the library. Minutes should be available in all residential areas for more direct access.

Encouraging observations

- Respectful and positive relationships throughout the establishment between staff and prisoners.
- Regular PIAC meetings with prisoners selecting representatives.
- The use of peer mentors particularly when supporting new admissions to HMP Castle Huntly.

Standard 6 – Purposeful Activity

All prisoners are encouraged to use their time in prison constructively. Positive family and community relationships are maintained. Prisoners are consulted in planning the activities offered.

The prison assists prisoners to use their time purposefully and constructively and provides a broad range of activities, opportunities and services based on the profile of needs of the prisoner population. Prisoners are supported to maintain positive relationships with family and friends in the community. Prisoners have the opportunity to participate in recreational, sporting, religious and cultural activities. Prisoners' sentences are managed appropriately to prepare them for returning to their community.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, four quality indicators were rated as good performance, ten were rated as satisfactory performance, and one was rated as generally acceptable performance, giving an overall rating of satisfactory.

There were two examples of good practice and four recommendations for improvement.

The prison offered an appropriate range of employment opportunities for prisoners which were based on the operational requirements of the prison. In addition, individual daily work placements in the community were available for a number of prisoners as preparation for release. Community projects were available for offence protection prisoners who were supported on these visits by an officer. Almost all prisoners participated in a work party or placement. However, only around a third of prisoners were able to take advantage of these placements due to the number required to remain in the prison for essential key service work parties.

The process for allocating work parties and potential work placements operated well and considered fully the needs and aspirations of prisoners, as well as taking account of the labour requirements to allow the prison to function operationally.

The Learning Centre provided a welcoming and relaxed environment for prisoners to engage in learning activities. However, attendance was generally low. Prisoners attending classes valued the interaction and support provided by centre staff. The quality of provision was good, with most of the learning delivered on an individual basis. However, overall the curriculum was limited and provided insufficient breadth or depth. More generally, prisoners were not given the opportunity to develop the necessary digital skills to prepare them for release due to not being allowed access to the internet and online facilities. This placed them at a disadvantage on release to cope with and manage many routine tasks.

All prisoners were able to access good quality indoor and outdoor sporting and fitness facilities. Prisoners had the opportunity to attend the gym daily with facilities were available during the day, in the evening and at weekends. Prisoners used outside facilities, including the extensive prison grounds and garden for outdoor exercise. PTIs had good positive relationships with prisoners and this contributed strongly to the relaxed atmosphere which encouraged prisoner participation in health and well-being activities. There were productive partnerships with external organisations, such as Street Soccer and a local running club.

HMIPS Standard 6 Purposeful Activity – Continued

Prisoners were able to access a well-stocked library with good book selection and large collection of DVDs. However, there were no legal texts available or daily newspapers. The library provision was managed through an arrangement with Perth and Kinross local authority and this ensured a good rotation of the stock, ready access to local library materials and inter-library loans.

Prisoners participated in a good range of cultural activities and events which made a positive contribution to prison life and supported preparation for release. Strong and effective partnership working between prison staff and a number of national and local organisations resulted in a varied array of activities and events in which prisoners could engage. Prisoners had created and maintained two bespoke gardens within the prison grounds. An organised group of trained peer mentors provided support to new prisoners, particularly during the induction period, and assisted with a range of other activities.

As an open prison access to fresh air was almost unlimited up until evening lock up. The facilities available to encourage family contact and make family visits a relaxed and enjoyable experience were also excellent, such as the Barista inside the Links Centre and the crazy golf and picnic tables in a garden area for meeting outside. The vast majority of staff were perceived by prisoners to be helpful and to be doing their best to facilitate relaxed visits, but a few staff were perceived to be unfriendly or unnecessarily assertive when enforcing the rules.

The support provided by the Chaplaincy Team to help prisoners with their faith or simply to provide informal counselling opportunities was of a good standard, and it was commendable that the Chaplaincy Team would schedule their day to be available in the early evening to those returning from an outside placement. The multi-faith centre itself was an excellent facility, providing a warm and relaxing environment for a range of different events and activities.

Case management and parole casework systems were well established, and operated effectively with good collaborative working practices. Individual's needs and risks were appropriately assessed at the earliest opportunity and home leave provided opportunities for prisoners to keep families informed of developments.

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this Standard:

Participation: Prisoners were consulted regularly and involved in decisions around purposeful activity, including work parties and community-based placements. Their views also informed the range of physical wellbeing activities that were available. Prisoners were well supported to maintain contact with family and friends, participate in religious activities and access fresh air whenever they wanted.

HMIPS Standard 6 Purposeful Activity – Continued

Accountability: Prison managers reviewed regularly services and activities to ensure they continued to meet prisoners' needs. Low prisoner participation in community-based work placements was due primarily to the low number of prisoners being transferred to the establishment from across the SPS estate. In general, across this standard the prison showed appropriate accountability with regard to case management and supporting prisoner participation in purposeful activity, visits, family contact, and helping prisoners with their religious faith.

Non-discrimination and equality: Offence protection prisoners who were unable to undertake community-based work placements were given the opportunity to participate in community-based projects, supported on these visits by an officer. All groups in the prison had access to religious services and other support for their spiritual journey and there was no inequality in terms of access to visits. However, opportunities for some prisoners to take part in outside placements which might assist with their prospects for securing parole were curtailed by their input being required to support internal work parties such as the kitchen.

Empowerment: Most prisoners had a clear understanding of their entitlements around purposeful activity and felt able to articulate any concerns to prison staff. The peer mentors provided good additional support for new prisoners to the establishment. In general, prisoners were supported to maintain their rights in relation to this standard, but we would like to see access to religious services in the community reinstated. Prisoners were actively involved in negotiating with officers a work party or placement appropriate to their needs and interests.

Legality: Appropriate regard was taken in this standard to the legal rights set out in domestic and international laws.

Encouraging observations

- The personal officer system was understood by prisoners and made effective contributions to case management and re-integration planning.
- The facilities available for visits, particularly to support visits with family and friends' outdoors, were excellent.
- The Shack provided a warm welcoming environment for a multi-faith centre and the chaplaincy team worked well to support prisoners in their spiritual journeys and provide other counselling services.
- The opportunity for families to leave plaques in memory of their loved one and hold a service of remembrance in the Memorial Garden provided a fitting way to commemorate the loss of life after a death in custody. This is worthy of replication in the closed estate.
- Admission assessment was unique to HMP Castle Huntly, initiating the prisoner's involvement in assessment along with their personal officer, using a comprehensive format which formed a basis for ongoing individualised planning.
- Timely feedback to prisoners immediately following Risk Management Team meetings via the RMT clinic.

HMIPS Standard 6 Purposeful Activity – Continued

Emerging concerns

- SPS HQ should, as a matter of urgency, identify the barriers preventing prisoner progression to the open estate to increase the numbers progressing, with an additional aim of increasing the numbers able to participate in community-based work placements to prepare them better for release.
- SPS should work with senior managers in HMP Castle Huntly and Fife College to find a workable solution to allow prisoners to access online activities to enable them to gain the necessary digital skills to prepare them for release.
- The opportunity to engage in religious services outside the prison had been curtailed in recent years, partly in response to COVID-19 restrictions, but should now be reinstated
- Prisoners do not routinely attend RMT meetings. However, prisoners are actively encouraged to contribute to their dossiers and do receive immediate feedback on the outcome of decisions made.



Standard 7 – Transitions from Custody to Life in the Community

Prisoners are prepared for their successful return to the community.

The prison is active in supporting prisoners for returning successfully to their community at the conclusion of their sentence. The prison works with agencies in the community to ensure that resettlement plans are prepared, including specific plans for employment, training, education, healthcare, housing and financial management.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, all five quality indicators were rated as satisfactory performance. There were five examples of good practice and no recommendations for improvement.

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this Standard:

Participation: Prisoners at HMP Castle Huntly were routinely provided with opportunities to be involved in plans for community access and re-integration. There was an emphasis on the prisoner's role in contacting services involved in their transition to the community. The establishment emphasised the importance of prisoner participation in the ICM process and meetings were focussed on the needs of the individual prisoner.

Accountability: There was a proactive commitment to the identification of development and treatment needs at HMP Castle Huntly. Prison and community based services were working collaboratively to address prisoners' risks and needs. A focus on stabilisation and treatment was ensuring that risks and needs associated with substance use and successful community access were being addressed.

Non-discrimination and equality: Personal officers had a key role in engaging prisoners and supporting them with involvement in planning activities, preparation for community access or involvement in key processes such as case conferences or parole processes. Services involved in pre-release planning for prisoners made consistent efforts to support their understanding of what was being discussed. Good attention had been given to developing therapeutic and trauma informed spaces at HMP Castle Huntly.

Empowerment: The autonomy, rights and responsibilities of prisoners were explained at key stages. Prisoners described having being included in planning, understanding key processes and having opportunities to contribute or express their views on re-integration arrangements. Prison-based services ensured prisoners were well informed about their sentence management and that they understood what was required of them at each stage of key processes. There was a clear shared view that the purpose of HMP Castle Huntly was to prepare people for integration in their communities.

Legality: There were consistently respectful relationships between prison-based staff and the prisoners. An emphasis on re-integration planning and preparation for release was positively reflected in collaborative working across agencies. The roles of community-based social work, the parole board and electronic monitoring services in the supervision of prisoners on release was made clear at appropriate stages of sentence.

HMIPS Standard 7

Transitions from Custody to Life in the Community – Continued

Encouraging observations

- Positive and cooperative relationships between prisoners and professionals.
- Well-developed systems were in place to ensure planning and assessment were focussed on the prisoner's risks and needs relating to community re-integration.
- The prison had given attention to the development of therapeutic and trauma informed environments in the establishment.
- Parole processes were well organised with effective communication across the responsible agencies, resulting in timely provision of information for dossiers and early identification of information gaps.
- Enhanced regime in admissions wing to assess and stabilise substance use in preparation for community access.
- Personal officers had a significant and meaningful role in supporting prisoners with planning for re-integration.
- Key processes in sentence management were explained to prisoners at the earliest opportunity.



Standard 8 – Organisational Effectiveness

The prison's priorities are consistent with the achievement of these Standards and are clearly communicated to all staff. There is a shared commitment by all people working in the prison to cooperate constructively to deliver these priorities.

Staff understand how their work contributes directly to the achievement of the prison's priorities. The prison management team shows leadership in deploying its resources effectively to achieve improved performance. It ensures that staff have the skills necessary to perform their roles well. All staff work well with others in the prison and with agencies which provide services to prisoners. The prison works collaboratively and professionally with other prisons and other criminal justice organisations.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, one quality indicator was rated as good performance, five were rated as satisfactory performance and two were rated as generally acceptable, giving an overall rating of satisfactory. There were five recommendations for improvement, predominantly in relation to equality issues.

The range of partnership working at HMP Castle Huntly was impressive, with a strong focus on rehabilitation and community integration. Staff were motivated and committed, with a shared belief in the value of what Castle Huntly had to offer and what they were trying to achieve there, underpinned by strong communication within the prison and good team working. There was clear evidence of effective business planning and both engagement and action in response to internal assurance processes and external scrutiny. Although many activities that would help showcase what the prison had to offer, such as Heritage Open Days and family Open Days, had unfortunately had to stop during the pandemic, there was clearly an appetite to bring these back. This is to be encouraged.

The main area of concern related to equality of access for all prisoner groups. While it was encouraging to see that a local E&D Strategy had been developed, the E&D Committee had been meeting regularly and the E&D Manager was committed to the agenda, three equality issues troubled inspectors:

- It was more difficult for protection prisoners to secure an outside placement and the one work party that facilitated reintegration into the community for protection prisoners was usually the first work party to be cancelled when staff needed to be redeployed to cover vacant residential posts. Additional resourcing, or an alternative way of covering vacancies, need to be adopted to ensure this work party and group of prisoners are not disadvantaged.
- Conversely those who did secure external placement felt they missed out on opportunities to engage in some recreational activities that ran midweek but not at weekends.
- Accommodation for prisoners with disabilities was likely to need additional investment to future-proof it and ensure accessible accommodation does not become a barrier to progression.

HMIPS Standard 8 Organisational Effectiveness – Continued

In terms of the **PANEL** principles for this Standard:

Participation: The prison did consult prisoners through PIACs, and the SPS does invite participation in their own prisoner survey, but our own survey and focus group suggested a lack of belief amongst prisoners that much would change in response to their suggestions.

Accountability: There were effective mechanisms in place to improve performance through the various groups and committees operating within the prison and communication with staff and prisoners was strong. There was a mixed picture with regard to staff training; an excellent-looking initiative was underway to promote a local developmental programme for Castle Huntly staff, but work needed to ensure core training competencies were brought into compliance, albeit with clarity of focus established around that.

Non-discrimination and equality: The prison was proactive in supporting prisoners who were vulnerable or marginalised and there was clear evidence of appropriate governance around E&D, but more work needs to be done to ensure equality of opportunities for protection prisoners and those on external placements. Further investment in accessible accommodation would be desirable to ensure no one is prevented in future from progressing to the Open Estate.

Empowerment: It was encouraging to see the efforts staff made to ensure prisoners were able to participate in community life, and that 80% of prisoners taking part in our pre-inspection survey described their personal officer as helpful. It was also pleasing to hear of plans to raise greater awareness at induction around neuro-diversity and the support available for those needing it. However, in our focus group discussions, prisoners appeared sceptical of their ability to influence change.

Legality: The prison was well run and compliance with SPS rules and legal obligations was robust.

Emerging concerns

- Equality of opportunities for protection prisoners had not been fully achieved and was compromised further by the community projects work party often being the first to be redeployed to cover absences elsewhere.
- Those on external placements missed out on some important recreational activities that only ran midweek.
- Accessible accommodation at HMP Castle Huntly was still limited and might limit opportunities in future for some prisoners to progress to the Open Estate.

Encouraging observations

- Motivated committed staff who believed in the value of what they did and the role HMP Castle Huntly can play in the rehabilitation of offenders.
- Effective communication and unity of purpose across the prison.
- Strong partnership working internally and with external partners.

Standard 9 – Health and Wellbeing

The prison takes all reasonable steps to ensure the health and wellbeing of all prisoners.

All prisoners receive care and treatment which takes account of all relevant NHS standards, guidelines and evidence-based treatments. Healthcare professionals play an effective role in preventing harm associated with prison life and in promoting the health and wellbeing of all prisoners.

Inspection Findings

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

In this standard, two quality indicators were rated as good, nine were rated as satisfactory and five were rated as generally acceptable, giving an overall rating of satisfactory performance. There were eight examples of good practice and seven recommendations for improvement.

HMP Castle Huntly was an open prison accommodating low-supervision adults and aimed at supporting prisoners to transition into the community. Prison healthcare was hosted by Perth and Kinross Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP) through the justice healthcare manager.

When individuals are transferred to HMP Castle Huntly, they will be nearing the end of their sentence and preparing for liberation so are a relatively stable population. The prison healthcare team aimed to deliver a primary care model that was similar to what happens in the community, to help prepare prisoners to transition on release.

Healthcare staffing was managed by a core staffing complement. There were vacancies in all teams, but cover was provided consistently in HMP Castle Huntly. Mental health services were provided in line with demand for services. As highlighted in other reports, recruitment challenges are a national issue being experienced across the wider NHS and HSCP. Overarching nursing and leadership support was provided by the Senior Team based in HMP Perth.

Although regular informal one-to-one meetings took place with staff, there was no structured approach to these or clinical supervision at the time of inspection. However, senior nursing staff were keen to reinstate this formal process. Inspectors were shown evidence of a new training record proforma which will include details of one to ones and clinical supervision dates.

A programme was in place to ensure all training requirements, including induction and prison-related training, was completed by all staff.

HMIPS Standard 9 Health and Wellbeing – Continued

Primary care

The Primary Care Team contact the sending establishment to seek any information on the individual's current prescribed medications to ensure continuity of treatment on transfer to HMP Castle Huntly. All individuals who transfer to HMP Castle Huntly were assessed by a nurse on arrival using a validated assessment tool and if required, a follow-up appointment with a GP will be made. Patients with long-term health conditions were identified by nursing staff at the admission. Healthcare assessment information was collated in the electronic Vision system. Patients could self-refer to healthcare services within the prison using a confidential self-referral system. The pre-inspection survey noted that 96% who responded said that it was easy to access a nurse/nurse practitioner. There were robust systems and processes for the identification and management of anyone who was unfit to remain in prison, including an easy to follow flow chart of this process. Protocols were in place to ensure that patients requiring social care were involved in any assessment for this care.

HMP Castle Huntly can face challenges assuring follow-up care and having community prescriptions in place when patients are liberated. For patients with no fixed abode or GP identified, the system relied on patients contacting the Health Centre to provide their address.

Mental Health

At the time of the inspection, there was no waiting list for patients at HMP Castle Huntly to see a mental health nurse or psychiatrist. Of those responding to the pre-inspection survey, 69% said it was easy to access mental health support.

Patients referred to psychology were waiting 35 weeks between assessments to treatment. The Psychologist delivered psychology provision across the two prisons in NHS Tayside and the waiting times were collated. Inspectors were told that considerations were being made to separate the waiting lists, which in turn, would likely reduce the wait for the two patients at HMP Castle Huntly.

Processes were in place at admission for identifying patients requiring access to mental health services using a validated mental health assessment tool. Patients received regular reviews and had comprehensive care plans in place which were jointly developed with staff and the patient. A Mental Health Nurse attended HMP Castle Huntly once a week and the Psychiatrist once a month, however this could be increased depending on the clinical need. This level of service delivery was deemed to be appropriate to the population and needs of patients at HMP Castle Huntly. The Occupational Therapy Team and caseworkers provided support with reintegration into the community which was good practice.

Systems and processes were in place to ensure that any patient requiring inpatient mental health care was assessed and transferred promptly to hospital under the Mental Health Care and Treatment (Scotland) Act 2003. Robust systems and processes were in place to ensure patients requiring community follow-up on release from prison were referred to Community Mental Health Teams.

HMIPS Standard 9 Health and Wellbeing – Continued

Substance misuse

Patients requiring support with drug and or alcohol dependence were identified at health screening on transfer to the prison or as part of health assessment. This was done with the use of a validated screening tool and documented in the patient record. A range of therapies and treatments, appropriate for the patient population, were provided within the prison. Written systems, protocols and procedures were in place to describe the joint working with substance misuse and primary care services for patients with co-morbidities. Of those taking part in the pre-inspection survey, who said they have needed it, 87% said they had received support for drug use and it has been helpful.

Long-term conditions, palliative and end of life care

Systems and processes were in place to support early identification of long-term health condition needs during the transfer process. Inspectors saw care plans described as enhanced care plans on Vision and were electronically available for completion and stored on the system. These documents were well completed with detailed clinical data. A SOP was in place identifying the remit for the completion of these plans.

At the time of the inspection, no patients in the prison had been identified as having palliative or end of life care needs. Inspectors reviewed the palliative care pathway in place. This outlined access to palliative care services and how to refer and sign post to urgent advice. Healthcare staff were familiar with this pathway. There was evidence of a positive team-working relationship between the Prison Healthcare Team, NHS board palliative care service and community services. At the time of the inspection, HMP Castle Huntly had no requirement to have anticipatory care plans (ACP) in place, but would benefit from developing this work in order to use them if required.

Infection, prevention and control

All areas where healthcare was delivered were in a good standard and were visibly fresh and clean. The cleaning resource provided was sufficient and cleanliness was of a high standard. During the inspection, inspectors found the clinical equipment was clean and ready for use and completed cleaning schedules were available for review. Inspectors saw evidence of a rolling programme of audits in place. Staff were knowledgeable about standard infection control precautions and had adequate supplies of PPE.

Emerging concerns

- NHS Tayside/ Perth and Kinross Health and Social Care Partnership (HSCP) must ensure that all patients on the mental health caseload have a regular review of risks of self-harm and suicide that is recorded within their patient care record.
- NHS Tayside/HSCP should review the psychology provision to ensure national waiting times are not exceeded following the results of the needs assessment carried out by clinical psychology at HMP Castle Huntly.
- NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that patients with long-term health conditions have individualised, person-centred care plans which evidence that patients have had an explanation regarding their condition and have had involvement in the planning of their care needs.

HMIPS Standard 9 Health and Wellbeing – Continued

- SPS must reinstate the health promotion support available regarding oral health and hygiene.
- NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that anticipatory care plans are in place for patients with palliative and end-of-life care needs.
- NHS Tayside/HSCP and SPS must have a recognised robust agreed protocol in place for accessing healthcare support in the absence of trained staff.
- NHS Tayside/HSCP must reintroduce clinical supervision as a priority within the Healthcare Team to support staff with the sustained pressures from staffing shortages.

Encouraging observations

- The Occupational Therapy Team conduct familiarisation visits for people with complex needs and are involved in liberation planning.
- Caseworkers and occupational therapy work focussed on supporting individuals to reintegrate into the community by establishing links with community services and engagement in groups or meaningful activity.
- Prompts on Vision system alerted staff that reviews were due for patients with long-term health conditions.
- NHS Tayside/HSCP developed a liberation referral form to advise the community drug and alcohol service of the patient's requirements to ensure continuity of care on liberation.
- Liaison with a patient's preferred community pharmacy takes place, where required, to ensure a seamless supply of medication on liberation.
- Healthcare staff complete a daily exception report as well as a night report.
- This was shared with senior leadership and SPS and include details of any concerns regarding prisoners and also documents of any staffing issues. This mode of communication was good practice and provided continuity of care for prisoners in the out of hours period.
- Healthcare staff politely challenged staff and prisoners entering the Health Centre without wearing masks.
- Complaints forms were available for patients and a feedback box for staff to make anonymous suggestions. Any suggestions were discussed at staff meetings.

ANNEX A

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: SPS need to create more accessible cells in the establishment to accommodate the potential for an increase in prisoners progressing who have mobility issues.

Recommendation 2: SPS should upgrade HMP Castle Huntly with modern accommodation facilities, with single accommodation for all prisoners, including in-cell shower and toilet facilities, in-cell technology and telephony to enhance its role as Scotland's only Open Estate and key progression objective.

Recommendation 3: HMIPS strongly recommends that the ILU is reopened and the prison should actively consider whether the ILU concepts could be expanded to the whole prison.

Recommendation 4: HMP Castle Huntly should increase the training of those working in ICT in bio-hazard trained to provide flexible cover for the entire establishment.

Recommendation 5: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that the ICT should be provided with BICS training and qualification as an essential part of their role.

Recommendation 6: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that the menu offered to prisoners displays the nutritional values and allergen information.

Recommendation 7: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that prisoners who are employed in the kitchen are not restricted in accessing the same rights as others in respect of reintegration and progression because they cannot be spared from their role due to prisoner shortages.

Recommendation 8: HMP Castle Huntly should consider changing the weekend regime to allow the evening meal to be served up to 5.45 pm rather than 3.45 pm thereby reducing the long waiting time for prisoners between meals.

Recommendation 9: HMP Castle Huntly should employ a dedicated, qualified catering manager for the kitchen, who would provide much needed advice and support for kitchen staff and ensure managerial oversight of the budget to ensure the provision of varied quality food to prisoners.

Recommendation 10: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that testing of the command room is carried out regularly and that they have sufficient staff trained in ICT roles.

Recommendation 11: As restrictions ease, HMP Castle Huntly must make efforts to increase the competency of staff with regards to H&S.

Recommendation 12: SPS HQ should conduct a review into the high number of faults occurring with kettles and consider whether a change in model is needed.

Recommendation 13: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure all staff required to carry out C&R are competent as a priority.

Recommendation 14: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that all prisoners have a clear understanding of the authority the prison has by quoting The Prisons and Young Offenders Institutions (Scotland) Rules 2011, rule 92 - Searching of prisoners, as to why they are being searched.

Recommendation 15: SPS HQ and HMP Castle Huntly should work together to provide adequate storage within the reception area for the population.

Recommendation 16: HMP Castle Huntly Reception should be provided with an x-ray machine to reduce delays in processing property and to aid the searching process.

Recommendation 17: HMP Castle Huntly should review the SOP for Death (Or serious Illness) of a relative as it was now past its review date.

Recommendation 18: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that cellular accommodation; particularly those where there is double occupancy, have a safe of appropriate size for each prisoner to store their confidential information.

Recommendation 19: HMP Castle Huntly should provide a copy of PIAC minutes in all residential areas in addition to the Links Centre and Canteen, and make sure staff are aware when PIAC minutes are available

Recommendation 20: HMP Castle Huntly should take action to dispel the myth that prisoners may be downgraded or their release affected for using the complaint system.

Recommendation 21: HMIPS should aim to increase the number of IPMs to eight.

Recommendation 22: HMP Castle Huntly to update their induction booklet to highlight access to the IPM telephone number via prisoner mobile phones.

Recommendation 23: SPS HQ should, as a matter of urgency, identify the barriers preventing prisoner progression to the open estate to increase the numbers progressing, with an aim of increasing the numbers able to participate in community-based work placements to prepare them better for release.

Recommendation 24: SPS HQ should work with senior managers in HMP Castle Huntly and Fife College to find a workable solution to allow prisoners to access online activities to enable them to gain the necessary digital skills to prepare them for release.

Recommendation 25: HMP Castle Huntly should reinstate the opportunity to attend places of worship in the community as an aid to community reintegration and support for an individual's spiritual journey.

Recommendation 26: HMP Castle Huntly should consider reinstating the ability for visitors arriving for the early evening midweek visit slots to order a hot meal in advance.

Recommendation 27: SPS HQ should encourage reconvening of the national network of E&D Managers and work with the network to consider if further specialist training for E&D managers would be helpful.

Recommendation 28: SPS HQ and HMP Castle Huntly should jointly reconsider the case for further investment in accessible cell accommodation at the Open Estate to ensure with an ageing prison population this does not become a barrier to progression.

Recommendation 29: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure protection prisoners get regular access to community project work and that every opportunity is explored to provide other external placement opportunities, with clear explanations provided to prisoners when their suggestions cannot be facilitated.

Recommendation 30: HMP Castle Huntly should review the scope to provide more opportunities for outside exercise activities such as bike riding and hillwalking for those who miss out on opportunities when away on outside placements midweek.

Recommendation 31: HMP Castle Huntly must continue its efforts to bring all staff core competency levels into compliance as soon as possible.

Recommendation 32: NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that all patients have a regular review of risks of self-harm and suicide that is recorded within patient care record.

Recommendation 33: NHS Tayside/HSCP should review the psychology provision to ensure national waiting times are not exceeded.

Recommendation 34: NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that patients with long-term health conditions have individualised, person-centred care plans. The care plans must evidence that patients have had an explanation regarding their condition and have had involvement in the planning of their care needs.

Recommendation 35: HMP Castle Huntly must reinstate the health promotion support available regarding oral health and hygiene.

Recommendation 36: NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that anticipatory care plans are in place for patients with palliative and end-of-life care needs.

Recommendation 37: NHS Tayside/HSCP and SPS must have a recognised robust agreed protocol in place for accessing healthcare support in the absence of trained staff.

Recommendation 38: NHS Tayside/HSCP must reintroduce clinical supervision as a priority within the Healthcare Team to support staff with the sustained pressures from staffing issues.

ANNEX B

SUMMARY OF GOOD PRACTICE

Good practice 1: Prisoners who did not own a mobile phone and were going on home leave were issued with a prison mobile to allow them to keep in touch with the prison in an emergency.

Good practice 2: Prisoners were offered use of the staff office phone to let their family know they had arrived, pending access to the hall phone and a mobile.

Good practice 3: Familiarisation visits took place before new prisoners arrived.

Good practice 4: Prisoners having responsibility for completing their own induction.

Good practice 5: The Buddy system that involved peer mentors in the induction process.

Good practice 6: The Shack provided an excellent facility for a multi-faith centre. The Memorial Garden, with the opportunity for families to plant a memorial plaque and hold a service to remember their loved one after a death in custody, is an excellent initiative worthy of replication in the closed estate.

Good practice 7: The facilities available to support outdoor family-focussed visits at HMP Castle Huntly were exceptionally good, while the availability of the Barista supported relaxed informal indoor visits.

Good practice 8: Attention to aligning pre-release case conferences with preparation of parole dossiers contributed to continuity of information and planning.

Good practice 9: Early initiation of HDC applications, maximising the prisoner's potential time on HDC in the community.

Good practice 10: Enhanced regime in admissions wing to assess and stabilise substance use in preparation for community access.

Good practice 11: Personal officers had a significant and meaningful role in supporting prisoners with planning for re-integration.

Good practice 12: Key processes in sentence management were explained to prisoners at the earliest opportunity.

Good practice 13: The Occupational Therapy Team conduct familiarisation visits and liberation planning.

Good practice 14: Caseworkers, the nursing teams and occupational therapy work focussed on supporting individuals to reintegrate into the community by establishing links with community services and engagement in groups or meaningful activity.

Good practice 15: Prompts on Vision system alerted staff that reviews were due for patients with long-term health conditions.

Good practice 16: NHS Tayside/HSCP developed a liberation referral form to advise the community drug and alcohol service of the patient's requirements to ensure continuity of care on liberation.

Good practice 17: Liaison with a patient's preferred community pharmacy takes place, where required, to ensure a seamless supply of medication on liberation.

Good practice 18: Healthcare staff complete a daily exception report as well as a night report. This was shared with senior nurses and SPS and included details of any concerns regarding prisoners and also documents of any staffing issues. This mode of communication provided continuity of care for prisoners in the out of hours' period.

Good practice 19: Healthcare staff politely challenge staff and prisoners entering the Health Centre without wearing masks.

Good practice 20: Complaints forms were available for patients and a feedback box for staff to make anonymous suggestions. Any suggestions were discussed at staff meetings.

ANNEX C

SUMMARY OF RATINGS

Standard/QI	Standard rating/QI rating
Standard 1 – Lawful and Transparent Custody	Satisfactory
QI 1.1	Satisfactory
QI 1.2	Good
QI 1.3	Satisfactory
QI 1.4	Satisfactory
QI 1.5	Satisfactory
QI 1.6	N/A
QI 1.7	Satisfactory
QI 1.8	Good
QI 1.9	Satisfactory
Standard 2 – Decency	Satisfactory
QI 2.1	Satisfactory
QI 2.2	Satisfactory
QI 2.3	Satisfactory
QI 2.4	Satisfactory
QI 2.5	Satisfactory
QI 2.6	Generally acceptable
Standard 3 – Personal Safety	Satisfactory
QI 3.1	Satisfactory
QI 3.2	Satisfactory
QI 3.3	Satisfactory
QI 3.4	Satisfactory
QI 3.5	Satisfactory
QI 3.6	Generally acceptable
QI 3.7	Satisfactory
Standard 4 – Effective, Courteous and Humane Exercise of Authority	Satisfactory
QI 4.1	Generally acceptable
QI 4.2	Satisfactory
QI 4.3	Satisfactory
QI 4.4	N/A
QI 4.5	Satisfactory
QI 4.6	Satisfactory
QI 4.7	Satisfactory
QI 4.8	Satisfactory
QI 4.9	Satisfactory
QI 4.10	Satisfactory

Standard 5 – Respect, Autonomy and Protection Against Mistreatment	Satisfactory
QI 5.1	Satisfactory
QI 5.2	Satisfactory
QI 5.3	Satisfactory
QI 5.4	Satisfactory
QI 5.5	Generally acceptable
QI 5.6	Satisfactory
QI 5.7	Satisfactory
QI 5.8	Generally acceptable
Standard 6 – Purposeful Activity	Satisfactory
QI 6.1	Satisfactory
QI 6.2	Satisfactory
QI 6.3	Generally acceptable
QI 6.4	Good
QI 6.5	Satisfactory
QI 6.6	Good
QI 6.7	Good
QI 6.8	Satisfactory
QI 6.9	Satisfactory
QI 6.10	Good
QI 6.11	Satisfactory
QI 6.12	Satisfactory
QI 6.13	Satisfactory
QI 6.14	Satisfactory
QI 6.15	Satisfactory
Standard 7 – Transitions from Custody into the Community	Satisfactory
QI 7.1	Satisfactory
QI 7.2	Satisfactory
QI 7.3	Satisfactory
QI 7.4	Satisfactory
QI 7.5	Satisfactory
Standard 8 – Organisational Effectiveness	Satisfactory
QI 8.1	Generally acceptable
QI 8.2	Satisfactory
QI 8.3	Satisfactory
QI 8.4	Generally acceptable
QI 8.5	Satisfactory
QI 8.6	Satisfactory
QI 8.7	Good
QI 8.8	Satisfactory

Standard 9 – Health and Wellbeing**Satisfactory**

QI 9.1	Satisfactory
QI 9.2	Satisfactory
QI 9.3	Satisfactory
QI 9.4	Good
QI 9.5	Generally acceptable
QI 9.6	Generally acceptable
QI 9.7	Good
QI 9.8	Satisfactory
QI 9.9	Generally acceptable
QI 9.10	N/A
QI 9.11	Generally acceptable
QI 9.12	Satisfactory
QI 9.13	Satisfactory
QI 9.14	Satisfactory
QI 9.15	Satisfactory
QI 9.16	Generally acceptable
QI 9.17	Satisfactory

ANNEX D

PRISON POPULATION PROFILE ON 31 MAY 2022

Status	Number of prisoners	%
Untried Male Adults	0	0
Untried Female Adults	0	0
Untried Male Young Offenders	0	0
Untried Female Young Offenders	0	0
Sentenced Male Adults	95	82.61%
Sentenced Female Adults	0	0
Sentenced Male Young Offenders	0	0
Sentence Female Young Offenders	0	0
Recalled Life Prisoners	9	7.83%
Convicted Prisoners Awaiting Sentencing	0	0
Prisoners Awaiting Deportation	0	0
Under 16s	0	0
Civil Prisoners	0	0
Home Detention Curfew (HDC)	10	8.70%
Sentence	Number of prisoners	%
3 – 4 months	0	0
4 – 5 months	0	0
5 – 6 months	0	0
6 months to less than 12 months	0	0
12 months to less than 2 years	0	0
2 years to less than 4 years	9	8.65%
4 years to less than 10 years	51	49.04%
10 years and over (not life)	12	11.54%
Life	28	26.92%
Order for Lifelong Restriction (OLR)	4	3.85%
Age	Number of prisoners	%
Minimum age:	21	n/a
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	12	11.54%
30 years to 39 years	29	27.88%
40 years to 49 years	27	25.96%
50 years to 59 years	26	25.00%
60 years to 69 years	9	8.65%
70 years plus	1	0.96%
Maximum age:	n/a	0

ANNEX E

INSPECTION TEAM

Wendy Sinclair-Gieben, HMIPS

Stephen Sandham, HMIPS

Calum McCarthy, HMIPS

Kerry Love, HMIPS

Graeme Neill, HMIPS

Sam Gluckstein, HMIPS

Martyn Mackenzie, SPS

John Bowditch, Education Scotland

Mike Hendry, Care Inspectorate

Lindsay Macphee, HIS

Jamie Thomson, HIS

Sophie Moss, HIS

ANNEX F

ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT

ACP	Advanced Care Planning
BBV	Blood Borne Virus
BICS	British Institute of Cleaning Science
CCU	Community Custody Unit
C&R	Control and Restraint
COVID19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CPT	European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
CSRA	Cell Sharing Risk Assessment
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
E&D	Equality and Diversity
FCO	Family Contact Officer
FLM	First Line Manager
GMA	Governor, Manager Action
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
H&S	Health and Safety
HIS	Healthcare Improvement Scotland
HMCIPS	Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland
HMIPS	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland
HMP	Her Majesty's Prison
HSCP	Health and Social Care Partnership
ICM	Integrated Case Management
IMU	Intelligence Management Unit
IPC	Infection Prevention and Control
IPM	Independent Prison Monitor
ICP	Industrial Cleaning Party
ICT	Information Computer Technology
MAPPA	Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements
MDMHT	MultiDisciplinary Mental Health Team
MDT	Mandatory Drug Testing
NMP	Non-medical Prescriber
NSPMG	National Suicide Prevention Management Group
ORT	Opiate Replacement Therapy
PER	Personal Escort Record
PIAC	Prisoner Information Action Committee
PPC	Prisoner Personal Cash

POA	Prison Officers Association
PRL	Prison Resource Library
RMT	Risk Management Team
RRA	Reception Risk Assessment
SICPS	Standard Infection Control Precautions
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SPSO	Scottish Public Services Ombudsmen
SRU	Separation and Reintegration Unit
SSOW	Safe Systems of Work
SUT	Substance Use Team
TT	SPS Anti-bullying Strategy Think Twice
TTCG	Tactical Tasking and Coordination Group
TTM	SPS Suicide Prevention Strategy – Talk to Me
UoF	Use of Force
VDT	Voluntary Drug Testing

EVIDENCE REPORT

STANDARD 1 - LAWFUL AND TRANSPARENT CUSTODY

Quality Indicators

1.1 Upon arrival all prisoners are assessed regarding their ability to understand and engage with the admission process.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

HMP Castle Huntly only received prisoners from other prison establishments, not directly from court. Therefore, the opportunity to observe the admissions process was greatly reduced. Reception staff were able to talk knowledgeably about the process and inspectors observed one new admission during the inspection. There was an SOP covering the admissions process and an Admissions Process Guide available for staff. Inspectors observed staff followed the instructions within them.

If more than one prisoner arrived at the same time, the first one was brought off the escort van and processed at the staff desk. Once initial checks and searching was completed, the prisoner was taken into a private room with the door closed to assess their ability to understand and allow them an opportunity to engage in the admissions process via the RRA form. Once in the private room the next prisoner was brought off the van to be processed, offering privacy to both. All prisoners covered by the RRA were seen by a nurse in the Health Centre.

The admission that was observed met the required standard and the person was processed quickly. Staff estimated that the maximum time to process someone was an hour, and that this was dependent upon the amount of property the prisoner had and availability of a nurse. Reception staff could not recall receiving a prisoner who did not speak English, but there was a folder held with instructions on how to use translation services if required. Prisoners arriving over meal time were provided with food from the canteen.

The staff in HMP Castle Huntly often worked across different areas of the prison and those that worked in reception were knowledgeable about their role. They were friendly, polite and professional when interacting with prisoners. All had received the training required to carry out their role and the Scottish prison service records system (PR2) was updated appropriately.

Inspectors spoke to prisoners who had recently been admitted and they were positive about the experience and the staff working in reception. According to the HMIPS pre-inspection survey, 73% of prisoners said they were treated quite or very well in reception.

Inspectors took the opportunity to observe prisoners going out and returning from home leave to gather more evidence of the reception process working in practice. It was a very smooth and efficient process. The process of issuing those who did not own a personal mobile phone with a prison issued phone to allow them to keep in touch with the prison whilst on home leave was good practice.

Good practice 1: Prisoners who did not own a mobile phone and were going on home leave were issued with a prison mobile to allow them to keep in touch with the prison in an emergency.

1.2 On admission, all prisoners are provided with information about the prison regime, routine, rules and entitlements in a form that enables the prisoner to understand.

Rating: Good performance

HMP Castle Huntly is the only open prison in Scotland and as such runs differently from any other Scottish prison.

Prisoners were provided with plentiful amounts of information about the prison rules and routine during the admissions process. As part of this they were provided with an induction passport and timetable, an equality and diversity statement specific to HMP Castle Huntly that they were asked to read and sign, a compact containing expected standards of behaviour and conditions of being at Castle Huntly, as well as information about property, money and prisoners personal cash (PPC).

Lots of helpful information was displayed in the reception area, and in the holding cell there was a TV with an information channel about HMP Castle Huntly.

On arrival at their allocated room, prisoners were provided with a local induction booklet that contained plenty of information on how the prison ran, including the regime, family contact, entitlements, information on the complaints process, Independent Prison Monitors (IPMs) and Prisoner Information Action Committees (PIAC). There was also separate guidance on how to access the hall phones and a canteen sheet. Inspectors were pleased to hear that prisoners were offered use of the staff office phone to let family know they had arrived, pending access to the hall phone and a mobile. Peer supporters met with every new prisoner on the day they arrived to give them an orientation tour and explain the basics of the prison. The induction booklet was available in other languages.

Prisoners spoken to were content that they had been provided with lots of helpful information during the admissions process to give them an understanding of how the prison ran.

Good practice 2: Prisoners were offered use of the staff office phone to let them family know they had arrived, pending access to the hall phone and a mobile.

1.3 Statutory procedures for identification and registration of prisoners are fully complied with.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The admissions process SOP referred to in QI 1.1 covered the identification and registration of prisoners, and reception staff were observed to complete this process as instructed. This included checking the Prisoner Escort Record (PER) and

querying any issues/concerns with the escorting staff, completing the seven-point warrant check and confirming the prisoner's identity using the warrant for reference.

The PER should identify any special needs, including risk factors and the RRA provided a further opportunity for this.

Reception staff at HMP Castle Huntly were not required to take account of changes of circumstances for prisoners returning through reception e.g. changes to release dates due to receiving a further custodial sentence, as they do not arrive there straight from court, and would not be considered for admission to HMP Castle Huntly if there were charges pending.

PR2 was updated as appropriate and the warrant was passed to the Parole Unit. See QI 1.7 for more about this process.

1.4 All prisoners are classified and this is recorded on the prisoner's electronic record.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

As reported previously, HMP Castle Huntly did not receive prisoners straight from court. They were transferred in from another establishment following a Risk Management Meeting (RMT), which meant that the prison knew in advance who was arriving into their establishment and on what date.

The request paperwork was sent from the home establishment to the Integrated Case Management (ICM) Team at HMP Castle Huntly. The Head of Casework and the Casework Manager managed the transfer process and liaised with establishments to complete the required checks to allow progression to HMP Castle Huntly. The Progression Information Checklist was completed and secondary assured, and this highlighted any language or communication barriers. All new admissions to the prison had already been classified as low supervision. A spreadsheet was used to track progress.

All new transfers arrived on a Tuesday. The paperwork was concluded the Friday before and a weekly email was sent to interested parties at the weekend for all new arrivals the following week. This information was also available on SharePoint and PR2 was updated as appropriate.

Inspectors were pleased to hear that, where possible, familiarisation visits were completed before new prisoners arrived.

Good practice 3: Familiarisation visits took place before new prisoners arrived.

1.5 All prisoners are allocated to a prison or to a location within a prison dependent on their classification, gender, vulnerability, security risk or personal medical condition.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

As reported in QI 1.4, HMP Castle Huntly were aware of prisoners due to arrive with them in advance. Although not ideal this could happen with little notice, but the prison was able to be flexible and accommodate people at short notice. The Casework Manager used a spreadsheet to manage this process and arranged for the necessary checks to be completed.

All mainstream prisoners were initially allocated to a room in Murray House, C wing. They stayed there until a decision was taken at RMT that they were ready to move to another area within the prison. Inspectors were told that on average prisoners spent three weeks there. They were given a choice of room and wing, depending on what was available. This facility was not available to offence protection prisoners, who were allocated straight to Bruce House.

If a prisoner with accessibility needs was on the list to transfer in, they would not be taken unless there was an accessible room available for them. The Casework Manager could not recall this ever having been an issue, but they were aware that it may become an issue due to the ageing prison population. Occupational health had been involved in previous familiarisation visits to ensure prisoner's needs were taken account of, and inspectors saw evidence of this having taken place for a prisoner who was registered blind and had mobility issues.

Prisoners who had previously been on protection had this removed prior to transferring to HMP Castle Huntly to allow access to all parts of the prison.

Prisoners had the facility to communicate any needs or concerns during the familiarisation visits in advance of them arriving, and again during the RRA process and early discussions with their personal office.

1.6 A cell sharing risk assessment is carried out prior to a prisoner's allocation to cellular accommodation.

Rating: N/A

Due to the low population numbers at HMP Castle Huntly at the time of the inspection, all prisoners had their own cell with no requirement to share.

There was a process should the need arise, and a Cell Sharing Risk Assessment (CSRA) Audit Flowchart and CSRA Desktop Instructions for gathering intelligence from and updating PR2 were available. A suitable assurance process was also in place.

1.7 Release and conditional release eligibility dates are calculated correctly and communicated to the prisoner without delay.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The staff in the Parole Unit within HMP Castle Huntly were responsible for the calculation of release dates, therefore all warrants were passed to them by hand from reception staff and signed for. Reception completed the seven-point warrant check and it was secondary assured by the Parole Administrators.

Because HMP Castle Huntly did not receive prisoners directly from court, they did not provide those arriving with release dates as they would already know them. However, the Parole Unit did recheck the calculation to be confident that the dates were correct for those in their care, and it is recorded in the Audit and Assurance Warrant Log Book held within the Parole Office.

The situation would not arise where a prisoner attended court whilst in custody and the outcome affected their release date, because prisoners would not be transferred to HMP Castle Huntly with outstanding charges.

There were three members of staff working on the Parole Unit. All were competent in warrant identification and calculation and they covered for each other during leave periods.

The processes were efficient and there was a suitable assurance process in place. All paperwork was stored and destroyed appropriately.

1.8 All prisoners attend an induction session as soon as practicable, but no later than one week after arrival, which provides a thorough explanation of how the prison operates and what the prisoners can expect, including their rights and obligations.

Rating: Good performance

HMP Castle Huntly had a very good process in place for prisoner induction. As reported in QI 1.2, HMP Castle Huntly is the only open prison in Scotland and as such runs differently from any other prison. Therefore, it is important for prisoners to understand how it runs.

Prisoners were provided with plentiful amounts of information about the prison rules, regime and routine during the admission process and via a local induction booklet on arrival at their room of allocation. The booklet included information on how prisoners could influence decisions via PIACs and the complaints process. There was also an information channel on the TV. At this point they were provided with an induction passport and timetable and prisoners were responsible for following the timetable and arriving at each session timeously. The timetable clearly stated what sessions they should attend, where and when, and the passport required the provider to sign off each session as the prisoner attended them.

The induction was compulsory and took place over a week, running from the Tuesday the prisoner was admitted. It included sessions with Peer Mentors, the Senior Management Team (SMT), Education, PT, an employment case conference, benefits advice, family contact, addictions, progression, chaplaincy and the personal officer role.

The Links Centre Officer oversaw the induction process and ensured that prisoners were on track with it. If sessions were delayed or missed, he arranged for them to take place at a later date. The process was reviewed by the Links Centre Officer and Manager.

HMP Castle Huntly had a 'Buddy' system in place to enhance the induction process, undertaken by six volunteer Peer Mentors. They supported new prisoners to acclimatise to an open regime, helping them to become aware of their surroundings, the layout of the estate and points of interest. They met with every new prisoner on the evening they arrived to give them an orientation tour and explain the basics of the prison. They then meet with them the following morning to answer any immediate questions then again at the end of the induction week to review how they found it.

Prisoners spoken to were content that they had received lots of information about how the prison operated. According to the HMIPS pre-inspection survey, 90% of prisoners said they received induction in a way they could understand.

Good practice 4: Prisoners having responsibility for completing their own induction.

Good practice 5: The Buddy system that involved peer mentors in the induction process.

1.9 The procedures for the release of prisoners are implemented effectively with provision for assistance and basic practical arrangements in place.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Staff within the Parole Unit and Reception were able to clearly explain the liberation processes, and there was an SOP and a Liberation Process Guide available to guide them through it. Personal officers were responsible for explaining the liberation process to prisoners.

The Parole Unit prepared and collated all paperwork required for a liberation and a secondary assurance was completed by another colleague. They also notified liberations internally and to relevant external agencies. All liberations were entered in a Liberations Book and checked by nominated members of the SMT. The Cashier ensured that all documentation and monies were in place including PPC, discharge grants and travel warrants. Inspectors noted that discharge grant amounts were different dependent on the age of the prisoner (GMA 028/A/14). Those aged 25 and over received £72.64 whereas those aged 18-25 received £58.03. Since the inspection took place, the same amount of discharge grant is provided to prisoners regardless of their age.

Reception staff collected the completed documentation and money from the Parole Unit and Cashier in advance of the liberation taking place, and stored it in a safe in the reception area. They also retrieved any property from the storeroom within reception.

Inspectors observed one liberation during the inspection. Staff checked their ID, their prison mobile was returned to store and he was provided with his personal mobile. He was asked to confirm everything was in order in relation to his property and then signed the property card to confirm this. The reception First Line Manager (FLM) then took the prisoner through the paperwork. This was done very thoroughly with the paperwork being read out verbatim, and his understanding was continually checked to ensure the prisoner was fully aware of the conditions of his release. The prisoner was then permitted to leave the establishment and the relevant wing was notified that he had been liberated. The prisoner was treated very well by reception staff. The timing of liberations coincided with onward travel timetables and appointments in the community. This particular prisoner was only notified of his release the previous evening and the prison reacted quickly to ensure he met his onward travel arrangements, which had been made more difficult due to an ongoing rail strike.

Prisoners within HMP Castle Huntly wore their own clothing and had their own bags because they go out on home leave. If either was required there was a process in place to provide it.

PR2 was updated as required.

STANDARD 2 - DECENCY

Quality Indicators

2.1 The prison buildings, accommodation and facilities are fit-for-purpose and maintained to an appropriate standard.

Rating: Satisfactory

The accommodation provided by the establishment was mixed. Murray House provided prisoners with an in cell toilet and washing facilities and was intended for double occupancy, however due to low prisoner numbers at the time of the inspection they were all single occupancy. Bruce and Wallace wing cells were single occupancy but prisoners shared showers and toilets, these shared facilities were found to be in good condition and clean. Prisoners commented that arriving from closed conditions where they had their own in cell washing and toileting facilities to then having to share was not desirable and inspectors agreed with this.

Inspectors found no evidence of graffiti or walls requiring significant painting or repair, the paintwork throughout the prison was relatively fresh in appearance and well maintained. It was noted that a contract had been signed with a painting company to paint the cells of Wallace Wing and Murray House over the weeks following inspection. There may be opportunities in future to use prisoners as painters and link this to securing a VT qualification.

The extensive grounds, gym facilities and common areas were clean and very well maintained, with the welcome provision of external seating and quiet spaces for use by prisoners and staff.

Inspectors examined the one accessible cell within the prison and sought the views of the occupant. The cell was found to be spacious, clean and in a good state of repair with adequate toileting and showering facilities that contained all of the necessary equipment and access handles for prisoners with mobility issues to comfortably use. The occupant confirmed to inspectors that the cell facilities met his requirements and that generally staff were attentive to his needs.

The HMIPS "Who Cares Report" follow up review published in February 2021 highlighted the pressures of trying to find suitable accommodation for the growing number of older prisoners with mobility issues. HMIPS were concerned that the regime did not take account of the specific additional needs of older prisoners.

The report recommended that the development of a new national strategy for the housing, care, and support of older prisoners should be prioritised by the SPS, which takes account of the growth in numbers and the shift in attitudes amongst this cohort of the prison population.

With this in mind, concern was raised by inspectors that there was only one accessible cell for the entire prison, and that this may have had a detrimental impact on prisoners with mobility issues progressing to the prison from closed conditions.

Inspectors were assured that this had not been a factor in any decision making but prison management did accept that this may change in the future.

All cells were fitted with intercom call points that were found to be in good working order. TVs and kettles were provided in every cell, however inspectors were advised that a number of kettles had gone on fire over the past couple of years, often when the cells were not occupied and the kettle not in use. One prisoner advised he was on his eighth kettle for this reason and that the local instruction was that all kettles should be unplugged when not in use. Enquiries with the management team established that this was an issue that they and SPS HQ were aware of, but it would appear that the same defective kettles were being used to replace the ones that go on fire. As an organisation to do this knowingly is very concerning. There is more about this in QI 3.7.

Bruce and Wallace wings were built in the 1970s and some parts were found to be tired and almost no longer fit for purpose, with dampness in places caused by condensation from deteriorating wall insulation. The heating system consisted of large radiators built into the ceilings and walls that could not be individually temperature controlled in each cell. The heating system was also found to be old and porous, regularly requiring repair work. Eleven major repairs had been carried out on the radiators and pipework over the previous 18 months.

An Independent Living Unit (ILU) was located within Bruce Wing but at the time of the inspection was closed as it had been used for COVID-19 isolation during the pandemic and there were no plans to reopen it. HMIPS strongly recommends that this is opened again and the prison should consider whether the ILU concepts could be expanded to the whole prison.

The maintenance process worked well within the prison. Prisoners were aware that they report a fault to staff who then create a job request to the maintenance team via the "Agility" system. The job was given a priority rating and progressed. Prisoners reported to inspectors that they received a good service and repairs were carried out in good time. Prisoners and staff were clear on how to report maintenance issues and were very complimentary about the effectiveness of the Estates Team.

The maintenance programme was viewed at the time of inspection and it was found that the maintenance team had received 753 reactive job requests from staff and prisoners and 668 routine planned jobs since 1 January 22. Out of this large number only three jobs were outstanding and they were delayed for good reason, such as awaiting parts or specialist involvement.

The prison maintenance team had five large projects running at the time of the inspection, the replacement of the cast iron downpipes of the 15th century castle, tarmac repairs to the road to the front of the Links Centre, strengthening repairs to a long established brick wall to the front of the castle and a fire stopping survey of the entire estate.

Inspectors were informed that the existing maintenance team would be taking responsibility for the new woman's Community Custody Unit in Dundee from their workshops at HMP Castle Huntly. One new member of staff would be provided to

facilitate this additional work; it was unclear if this would have a detrimental effect on the existing satisfactory service provision at Castle Huntly.

Recommendation 1: SPS need to create more accessible cells in the establishment to accommodate the potential for an increase in prisoners progressing who have mobility issues.

Recommendation 2: SPS should upgrade HMP Castle Huntly with modern accommodation facilities, with single accommodation for all prisoners, including in-cell shower and toilet facilities, in-cell technology and telephony to enhance its role as Scotland's only Open Estate and key progression objective.

Recommendation 3: HMIPS strongly recommends that the ILU is reopened and the prison should actively consider whether the ILU concepts could be expanded to the whole prison.

2.2 Good levels of cleanliness and hygiene are observed throughout the prison and procedures for the prevention and control of infection are followed. Cleaning materials and adequate time are available to all prisoners to maintain their personal living area to a clean and hygienic standard.

Rating: Satisfactory practice

The prison was found to have good levels of cleanliness throughout and cleaning schedules in general and residential areas were in place. ICT were responsible for cleaning most areas of the prison. The team consisted of four pass men for the common areas, five pass men for Murray House, two pass men for Wallace Wing and four pass men for Bruce Wing. Prisoners spoken to confirmed that they had received relevant training and were confident in their work. Prisoners were encouraged to keep their cells tidy and those that were unable to were assisted by pass men. There were sufficient cleaning materials held throughout the establishment.

Training records were examined and it was found that all members of the ICT had completed basic induction training. It was noted that none held a British Institute of Cleaning Sciences (BICS) qualification. Inspectors were informed that there were staff qualified to deliver and award BICS training, but due to staff shortages this had not been delivered for many months.

It was found that only one member of the ICT was bio-hazard trained which for the size of the establishment was insufficient and offered no flexibility. Inspectors requested to view the cleaning process and found that the contents of the bio-hazard kits were adequate and easily accessible.

It was a positive reflection on the staff and management that the establishment was kept in a good, clean and operational state despite the challenges of ageing and deteriorating buildings.

Recommendation 4: HMP Castle Huntly should increase the training of those working in ICT in bio-hazard trained to provide flexible cover for the entire establishment.

Recommendation 5: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that the ICT should be provided with BICS training and qualification as an essential part of their role.

2.3 All prisoners have a bed, mattress and pillow which are in good condition, as well as sufficient bedding issued by the prison or supplied by the prisoner. The bedding is also in good condition, clean and laundered frequently.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The majority of prisoners beds were found to be of heavy steel frame construction, and whilst structurally sound were poor in appearance due to worn paintwork. Many prisoners complained of the mattresses being too thin but they were found to be in good condition and the majority of prisoners had more than one to lie on.

Bedding, including pillows and duvets were in good condition and plentiful throughout the establishment. Each residential area had a good stock with some made into “grab bags” of complete bedding for use if required at short notice. It was noted that the vast majority of prisoners used prison bedding rather than their own.

Towels were again found to be plentiful and in good condition, with prisoners reporting that they could obtain them almost immediately if required.

The prison laundry system worked well and appeared very efficient. Laundry services operated weekdays with uplifts in the residential areas arranged by pass men at 0815 and returned by late afternoon. The laundry bags were tagged with an individual number placed against the prisoner’s name, each residential area with its own coloured tag and it was very rare that laundry went missing. Bedding, work wear and personal items were able to be cleaned at any time. Medical markers were also available for laundry bags to advise staff and ensure an individual wash cycle, for conditions such as scabies, ringworm and other infectious diseases.

The laundry itself was found to be clean and well equipped. Staff informed inspectors that the washing and drying machines had been replaced relatively recently and that three prisoners were currently employed in the laundry, but due to placements they were not often all working at the same time. In the past when the prison was at higher capacity the laundry employed up to eight prisoners. HMIPS recommends that the establishment consider moving to self-care for laundry to provide a more normalised environment and prepare prisoners for living in the community.

Training records of the three prisoners working in the laundry were requested but only two could be produced. Of the two, it was seen that the eight required modules had been completed including chemical use and soiled item handling. The training record of the third prisoner, who was not working during the inspection, was not made available to inspectors as it appeared to have been misplaced.

2.4 A range of toiletries and personal hygiene materials are available to all prisoners to allow them to maintain their sense of personal identity and self-respect. All prisoners also have access to washing and toileting facilities that are either freely available to them or readily available on request.

Rating: Satisfactory

Prisoners had access to essential toiletries held within each of the residential areas. Inspectors found adequate toiletries to be in stock and in addition the prison canteen offered a good range of toiletries to suit all budgets.

There was no PIAC held specifically for the canteen but staff and prisoners did comment that communication was good between prisoners, the pass men and staff and most requests for specific items were usually provided. The canteen operated as a shop with a serving hatch with one hour opening times in the afternoons and evenings.

A sundry service was available for fresh items however, inspectors were advised by prisoners that some weeks this did not happen as a minimum order of £20 was required and with such low numbers in the prison this figure was sometimes not met.

The cells in Murray House had sinks and toilets therefore prisoners were free to use them whenever they pleased, but they were required to share showers. A, B and C wing on Murray House had six showers on each and they were in a good state of repair and clean. Prisoners on Bruce and Wallace wings had sinks in their cells but were required to share toilets and showers. Again, these were found to be in a good state of repair and clean but generated waiting times for prisoners to use them during busy periods. Many prisoners spoken to by inspectors felt that the accommodation was poor and a backwards step from their time in closed conditions where they had their own toileting and showering facilities. See recommendation (X) in 2.1 on need to upgrade accommodation.

2.5 All prisoners have supplied to them or are able to obtain for themselves a range of clothing suitable for the activities they undertake. The clothes available to them are in good condition and allow them to maintain a sense of personal identity and self-respect. Clothing can be regularly laundered.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Prisoners at HMP Castle Huntly wore their own clothing rather than prison issued clothing, other than some pass men operating as part of the ICP when working in the common areas.

Jackets provided for working outdoors were of high visibility and good quality, and prisoners reported they were fit for purpose. There were adequate jackets in stock and available if required.

Prisoners who could not afford their own clothing were issued with a clothing grant to purchase some, prisoners were permitted to bring clothing back into the prison from home leave. See QI 2.3 regarding laundry.

2.6 The meals served to prisoners are nutritionally sufficient, well balanced, varied, served at the appropriate temperature and well presented. Meals also conform to their dietary needs, cultural or religious norms.

Rating: Generally Acceptable performance

The pre-inspection survey found that 58% of prisoners found the food at HMP Castle Huntly to be quite good with 20% finding it to be quite bad. Generally, these figures reflected what inspectors found when conversing with prisoners and staff during the inspection.

The catering building comprised of a fit for purpose kitchen including sufficient storage, preparation and servery space with two separate dining halls that could accommodate a total of 285 prisoners. All foodstuffs used in the preparation of prisoner's meals were stored in proper conditions and at the correct temperature, packed lunches for prisoners leaving the establishment for work were also prepared by the kitchen.

It was noted that there was no dedicated catering manager for the kitchen. It was a dual role for the Offender Outcomes Manager who had no training or background in the catering business. His position was to merely sign off purchases and orders generated by staff and did not offer any advice or support when and if required. It was clear that this lack of knowledge was felt by staff in the kitchen.

Inspectors observed food being served to prisoners through an open servery by two prisoner employees. Neither were wearing masks, whilst staff and other prisoners were. This was brought to the attention of managers at the time who addressed this issue.

The menu ran on a three weekly rotation and was displayed on the notice boards in each of the residential areas. They were available in other languages if required, however it was noted that one such display was out of date. This was quickly amended by staff when highlighted.

Food focus groups had been re-introduced in early 2022 to seek prisoner feedback on menu choice. The most recent had identified a desire for an increase in salad options for the summer. It was good to see that this had been acted upon by the establishment with a salad option being offered every day on the menu.

There was no clear indication for prisoners of nutritional values or allergen information in respect of the food provided to them by the kitchen, or what guidance is followed by the kitchen in respect of ensuring the nutritional value of the food provided meets desired standards. Fruit and vegetables were available every day.

The canteen was quite well stocked with an effort being made to sell healthier items such as green tea, low fat UHT milk and protein drinks. Vitamins were also sold but rarely purchased as the quality was not good for the price.

At the time of the inspection there was a total of nine prisoners working in the kitchen. This was the lowest number the kitchen has ever had and reflected the low

number of prisoners resident at the time. It was found that some of the prisoners employed to work in the kitchen were essential to the prisons food provision and were therefore required to work there every day to maintain this service. As such some were not being offered the same opportunities as other prisoners in respect of reintegration into the community. This in turn adversely affected their parole decisions and their progression.

Weekday breakfasts were served from 07:15, lunches from 11:30 and dinner from 16:30, weekend brunch was at 10.00 and dinner at 15:45. Prisoners were provided with a pack of biscuits every Friday and Saturday due to the longer period of time between meal times. Prisoners attended the servery on a rotational basis from each residential area, with the vast majority seen to be returning to their cells to eat rather than remain in the communal dining area. Inspectors were informed that this practice had grown from the restrictions placed on the establishment during the COVID-19 pandemic, and was now the preferred option by prisoners rather than sitting in the communal dining areas. One of the main reasons provided to inspectors was that food could be eaten or reheated in microwaves in the residential areas later in the day and closer to recognised meal times, for example an evening meal could be eaten at 19:00 rather than 16:30. Inspectors were informed that the establishment intended to reintroduce communal dining a few months after the inspection period. It may be worth considering providing alternative dining options for prisoners as part of this reintroduction to include eating meals in cells. In addition, inspectors found on examining the weekend regime that there may have been scope for the evening meal to be served up to 17:45 rather than 15:45 thereby reducing the long waiting time between meals.

Training records were found to document that all staff working in the kitchen had received induction training covering basic hygiene and kitchen orientation. Others had specialist training in the use of specific items such as hotplates, slicing machines and microwaves.

Kitchen staff catered for prisoners with specific dietary requirements, cultural or religious needs. At the time of inspection there were a number of vegetarian options provided on the menu and three prisoners required a halal diet. Inspectors were informed that all the chicken and burgers purchased by the prison were halal compliant and any other halal meats were purchased in smaller number when required. At the time of the inspection there was no requirement for kosher meals but if required they were purchased pre-made from an outside source. Inspectors were informed that special events were also catered for with a menu being made available to celebrate Christmas and Eid.

Recommendation 6: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that the menu offered to prisoners displays the nutritional values and allergen information.

Recommendation 7: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that prisoners who are employed in the kitchen are not restricted in accessing the same rights as others in respect of reintegration and progression because they cannot be spared from their role due to prisoner shortages.

Recommendation 8: HMP Castle Huntly should consider changing the weekend regime to allow the evening meal to be served up to 5.45 pm rather than 3.45 pm thereby reducing the long waiting time for prisoners between meals.

Recommendation 9: HMP Castle Huntly should employ a dedicated, qualified catering manager for the kitchen, who would provide much needed advice and support for kitchen staff and ensure managerial oversight of the budget to ensure the provision of varied quality food to prisoners.

STANDARD 3 - PERSONAL SAFETY

Quality Indicators

3.1 The prison implements thorough and compassionate practices to identify and care for those at risk of suicide or self-harm.

Rating: Satisfactory

To protect those that may be at risk from self-harm or suicide all prisoners were managed under TTM. The TTM policy instructs staff to carry out an RRA for those on admission, transfer or return. HMP Castle Huntly only accepted prisoners on transfer from another prison so an RRA was completed on receipt of a transfer.

There was derogation in place, agreed by the National Suicide Prevention Management Group (NSPMG) in 2018 with regards to when RRAs are also required. For those returning from a hospital appointment, a funeral or court appearance, or having attended a tribunal/parole hearing including video conferencing in the prison as well as returning from home leave, an RRA must be completed. Consideration should also be made for those returning from unplanned day releases. An RRA was not required when a person returned from a routine day release i.e. work placements. However, it was observed that staff sought out confirmation with those returning if they had any concerns.

Although prisoners on TTM would not transfer to HMP Castle Huntly, this did not prevent those transferring with a previous history of TTM. Samples of RRAs were checked and found to have been completed correctly (see standard 1). A TTM audit that included RRAs was completed by the duty managers weekly.

TTM cases were uncommon at HMP Castle Huntly, with the last being recorded in November 2020. The prison was not designed to look after those in crisis, so where it was decided that a prisoner required to be monitored under TTM they were placed in one of two holding cells. Although these cells were deemed less risky than those in the residential wings, they cannot not be defined as 'safer cells'. With that in mind HMP Castle Huntly made every effort to transfer individuals out of the holding cells at the earliest opportunity, normally to HMP Perth. A joint plan was agreed in the management of the person, and when they are deemed 'no apparent risk' a joint RMT between prisons would decide if the prisoner could return.

There were no prisoners in the prison who were currently or had previously been on TTM to discuss their experiences. Most TTM files were transferred with the individual who was at risk therefore sampling TTM closed files proved challenging, with only two files from 2019 available. Both were of a good standard and followed the policy guidelines. Electronic concern forms were available in the gate house, and if required staff completed the form and passed it to the residential FLM to take action. The last concern raised was in November 2020. Staff training during the inspection was at 99%, with planned training to ensure high compliance throughout the rest of the year. This was backed up by staff knowledge of the TTM process. To support TTM, there were four active listeners who attended the quarterly TTM

meetings chaired by the Suicide Prevention Co-ordinator. Minutes were available, with the last meeting taking place on 29 March 2022.

3.2 The prison takes particular care of prisoners whose appearance, behaviour, background or circumstances leave them at a heightened risk of harm or abuse from others.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Prior to transfer to HMP Castle Huntly, an assessment was carried out to ensure any indicators that the person may be at risk were addressed, which included a familiarisation visit to the prison. These visits were particularly useful in identifying any additional support required, particularly mobility issues. It also allowed prisoners to get used to the differences in the open estate, such as no perimeter fences and free movement.

Most prisoners spent the first 16 days in Murray house C-Wing as part of their induction. This area should only be accessed by prisoners who have authorisation, which allowed them to get into their own routine without influence from the rest of the population.

An admission interview was carried out where information was gathered with regards to risk. The interview encouraged discussion and could highlight issues around mental health, family contact, physical and mental health wellbeing. Where issues were identified, support could be signposted where necessary. One example was where a prisoner was suffering from a debilitating disease, which was under control, but long-term support was discussed. Substance use was also discussed and sign posted to relevant agencies.

The quarterly equality and diversity (E&D) meeting supported those most vulnerable, with standing agenda items on E&D complaints, TT issues and learning needs. There were also a number of local events such as anti-bullying week and human rights day to support the most vulnerable.

3.3 Potential risk factors are analysed, understood and acted upon to minimise situations that are known to increase the risk of subversive, aggressive or violent behaviour. Additionally, staff are proactive in lowering such risks through their behaviours, attitudes and actions.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Risk was an important focus for HMP Castle Huntly. There were a number of ways this could be reported, challenged and support put in place. As an open prison there was no secure physical separation of prisoner groups at HMP Castle Huntly. All prisoners must agree to live with others regardless of their history or connections, and if they can't they will not be at the prison. To support the safety of all, the Intelligence Management Unit (IMU) was responsible for collecting and analysing information that may create an imbalance to the regime. This analysis was shared at the monthly Tactical Tasking and Coordination Group (TTCG), unless there was an

immediate need to escalate an issue to the Head of Operations or the Governor. Actions identified at TTCG for the IMU to take forward were managed well. Significant incidents were reported through an adverse circumstance report and forwarded to the daily RMT. A discussion took place to decide if there were any recommendations to be made. It might be that the decision was to return the individual to closed conditions, however if it was the first time and not too severe the prisoner would likely stay at the prison with a plan in place that was reviewed when appropriate.

Although there was no longer a police liaison officer on site, HMP Castle Huntly reported that they had a good working relationship with Police Scotland. This allowed an excellent flow of information between both parties and supported the good running of the prison and protecting the community.

Good relationships observed between staff and prisoners was also productive in increasing everyone's safety.

3.4 Any allegation or incident of bullying, intimidation or harassment is taken seriously and investigated. Any person found to be responsible for an incident of bullying, intimidation or harassment is appropriately reprimanded and supported in changing their behaviour.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Official reports of incidents of bullying were low but this did not reflect the pre-inspection survey where 22% of the respondents had said they have been abused, threatened, bullied or assaulted by another prisoner. Although official reporting was low, there were mechanisms in place to support those accused of bullying, with staff following the TT Strategy. Inspectors were content that staff and prisoners were confident that most cases were dealt with at the lowest level, where staff will challenge the person exhibiting bullying tendencies. Staff reported that in most cases having spoken to the individual it was a lack of self-awareness. A particular example inspectors explored confirmed this, where the person exhibiting bullying behaviours had been spoken to and once challenged there were no further instances reported by the victims.

As previously reported, there was no secure physical separation of prisoner groups in the prison. All prisoners were free to move throughout the prison so staff vigilance was imperative to highlight any harassment or bullying towards more vulnerable groups. There were periods when staff were not in a position to monitor the behaviours of those in the prison, but it was reassuring that staff were able to articulate the different processes in place to support the most vulnerable. Currently 85% of staff have undergone TT training. There was information available in the form of a TT booklet, explaining the process to report being or observing bullying and posters displayed throughout the prison promoting anti-bullying. There was also a confidential phone number on prisoner's mobiles and the hall phones where a message could be left if they needed to speak to someone

3.5 The victims of bullying or harassment are offered support and assistance.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

When questioned whether they had been abused, threatened, bullied or assaulted by another prisoner while at HMP Castle Huntly, 21% responded that they had and if they would report it to staff, only 19% confirmed they would. Even that low a number prepared to report it was not reflected by the official statistics from HMP Castle Huntly, where only one suspect bullying report (SBR) had been submitted since January 2021. A reason for this low number maybe that prisoners said that in most cases where they felt bullied they would speak to a member of staff unofficially or to other prisoners such as peer supporters to seek the best way to challenge this behaviour. If it continued to be an issue they would officially report it. There were some good examples where victims and perpetrators had been supported in the past. There was no-one in the prison who was currently on the TT strategy to talk to about their experiences.

3.6 Systems are in place throughout the prison to ensure that a proportionate and rapid response can be made to any emergency threat to safety or life. This includes emergency means of communication and alarms, which are regularly tested, and a set of plans for managing emergencies and unpredictable events. Staff are adequately trained in the roles they must adopt according to these plans and protocols.

Rating: Generally acceptable

HMP Castle Huntly felt like a settled prison and staff and prisoners reported that it was generally a safe place to live and work. The HMIPS pre-inspection survey confirmed that 92% of prisoners that responded always or often felt safe. Response to emergency threats to safety of life was covered in a catalogue of SOPs that were available in SharePoint. A good example of a robust SOP was the response to a fire. The prison operated a self-evacuation protocol and there were good instructions for prisoners to adhere to. Although there were planned fire drills, the system had recently been tested in real time with a successful outcome.

There was a link in SharePoint to all contingency plans. The prison rarely experienced level 2 and 3 incidents. However, it is important that complacency does not set in so testing of contingencies are important.

Testing to ensure operational readiness was not as regular as expected, such as setting up the command room. HMP Castle Huntly were also experiencing issues with fulfilling some of their ICT roles. This was similar to other recent inspections, where face to face training had not taken place due to COVID-19 guidelines on social distancing. As social distancing is phased out, both these issues should be addressed as priority.

Staff do not carry personal alarms as they were incorporated into the radio system. They can also activate alarm buttons on the walls which were situated throughout the prison. These were checked on a regular basis by the estates team for

compliance. There were no formal instructions for staff to attend a staff alarm on commencing shift, with the response based on who was available. Generally, it will be a staff member from each area.

Recommendation 10: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that testing of the command room is carried out regularly and that they have sufficient staff trained in ICT roles.

3.7 The requirements of Health and Safety legislation are observed throughout the prison.

Rating: Satisfactory

Inspectors met with the H&S coordinator to discuss how legislation was observed within the prison and its grounds. There were H&S committee meetings held on a regular basis, attended by the SMT, estates and the POA. The meeting had a comprehensive agenda with a live action log. Any actions were reviewed at the next meeting.

There was a comprehensive set of SOPs and Safe Systems of Work (SSOW) available in SharePoint and in relevant areas. A local H&S policy had been developed to meet the needs of the prison. Risk assessments of all areas were carried out on a regular basis, with actions distributed to those in charge of the area. Work place inspection reports were submitted monthly from all areas, including the Health Centre. The Governor also carried out a monthly H&S inspection of the prison.

The Scottish Fire and Rescue Service attended annually to carry out a risk assessment, with the last visit giving a clean bill of health.

Accidents were low, with six being reported in the last 12 months. Three involved prisoners and three with staff. All incidents were investigated thoroughly.

H&S training statistics revealed that in some areas more than 50% of staff were deemed not competent, i.e. H&S for managers. Although it was a consequence of COVID-19 guidelines, the online training needed to improve. As restrictions reduce, HMIPS would expect training to be delivered to meet the short falls.

Prisoners expressed an ongoing concern that the cell kettles were not fit for purpose at the prison. The kettles were used in the whole SPS estate and there was a current national campaign called 'in-cell kettle near miss campaign' where it should be reported if there is a fault in a kettle. Governors, Managers and Actions (GMA) notice 072A/18 suggested that there were issues around kettles in 2018, when a revised action notice from 2016 was circulated. In the GMA it instructs the user that they should not leave the kettle unattended even though there was an automatic off switch, which would suggest kettles were not turning off when designed to do so. Twenty-eight kettles had been replaced since January due to various faults from continually turning itself on, not switching off at the correct temperature or the kettle has melted. The H&S manager felt that this might be under reported. Although there is a view that some of the faults could be due to misuse, the large number

would suggest that this is not always the case. Reports suggest that kettles were switching on when no one was in the vicinity, had been found to had switched on and become damaged even in unoccupied rooms.

Recommendation 11: As restrictions ease HMP Castle Huntly must make efforts to increase the competency of staff with regards to H&S.

Recommendation 12: SPS HQ should conduct a review into the high number of faults occurring with kettles and consider whether a change in model is needed

STANDARD 4 - EFFECTIVE, COURTEOUS AND HUMANE EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY

Quality Indicators

4.1 Force or physical restraints are only used when necessary and strictly in accordance with the law.

Rating: Generally acceptable performance

Force or physical restraint, known as Use of Force (UoF) must be undertaken in accordance with Rule 91 of the Prisons and Young Offenders Institutions (Scotland) Rules 2011.

UOF was rarely used at HMP Castle Huntly, which was not unexpected, given the nature of the population. All UOF forms were sent to the IMU to check for compliance and analysis. All forms were then signed off by the Head of Operations. Any useful analysis was reported during the TTCG meeting for ongoing action.

Since January 2021, nine instances of UOF had been undertaken. In eight of the cases 'come along holds' were used (the minimum use of force) to minimise the risk of a prisoner absconding while being escorted to the holding cells, as there was no perimeter fencing. One UOF involved thumb and wrist locks. The UOF forms were completed to a good standard with good narratives from team members explaining their role. One incident indicated that UOF was carried out with less than the minimum requirement of three staff. The form also indicated that there had not been a medical assessment carried out immediately following the removal but at a later time, the mitigation being lack of staff available at that time. None of the UOF had been planned and therefore no video recording was required, but a camera was readily available if required. A UOF and an SOP on Video Recording of Planned Removals were available for reference on SharePoint.

Under SPS Prison Resource Library (PRL) 2.3.4.2: Control & Restraint (C&R), only prison staff assessed as competent should undertake a removal. A concern raised during recent inspections was the level of staff competence in C&R. HMP Castle Huntly only had 44% of staff competent in C&R, whilst those competent to supervise a removal was 73%, competence in PPT was also below target. Although this was due to restrictions during COVID-19 where social distancing was being adhered to therefore C&R training had not taken place, it was the view of HMIPS that HMP Castle Huntly, as a priority, must address staff competency in C&R as soon as possible.

Recommendation 13: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure all staff required to carry out C&R are competent as a priority.

4.2 Powers to confine prisoners to their cell, to segregate them or limit their opportunities to associate with others are exercised appropriately, and their management is effected, with humanity and in accordance with the law. The focus is on reintegration as well as the continuing need for access to regime and social contact.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

There was no Separation and Reintegration Unit (SRU) at HMP Castle Huntly. There were two holding cells that could be used for a short period of time to isolate some-one from the rest of the population, until a decision was made to either send them back to closed conditions or return them to their cell. It was pleasing to note that the two cells had recently been refurbished following recommendations made by HMIPS during a COVID-19 liaison visit in 2021.

Those held in these cells for more than 24 hours did have access to fresh air. If the prisoner did not have access to their mobile, they could use the hall phone closest to the holding cells. However, this could be difficult when trying to keep prisoners separate, so in most occasions the First Line Manager (FLM) office was used. There was no access to showering facilities within the holding cell area so prisoners were taken to the gym, normally during a lock up period so that there were no other prisoners around, which was not ideal and inhibited gym access periods.

In the past 12 months, 87 prisoners had been held in these holding cells. The maximum stay being just under 72 hours and therefore only rule 95(1) had been applied. A sample of rule 95(1) forms were scrutinised and found to be lawfully complete. No one was held in these cells during the inspection, but prisoners were spoken to that had previously been placed there and stated they had no complaints about their treatment.

One thing to note however was that when a person had become unlawfully at large from HMP Castle Huntly, when they were apprehended by the police and returned to the closed estate, they often had to be recorded on PR2 as being located in HMP Castle Huntly's holding cells first, before immediately being 'departed' on the system to their current establishment. This could be confusing as it appeared that a person had been in a holding cell with no accompanying lawful paperwork when they had not actually been there. HMP Castle Huntly should consider an alternative arrangement for recording their absence that avoids this potential confusion.

4.3 The prison disciplinary system is used appropriately and in accordance with the law.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The discipline hearings, known as an orderly room, were not common at HMP Castle Huntly. There were no hearings during the inspection to observe and so the process was not tested to establish if it was a person-centred approach. The orderly room process could only be checked by sampling paperwork and talking with those who had been subject to a disciplinary report.

Since January 2022, 23 discipline hearings had taken place. Ten cases were sampled with all paperwork being completed to an acceptable standard. There did not appear to be a tariff system for punishment following the hearing. Punishments appeared to be agreed on a case by case basis. From the sample, only three were given loss of earnings or access to their personal cash. The other seven were issued a caution or a suspension, including those that had been caught using illicit substances. All those appearing at a discipline hearing attended an RMT to decide their risk. It was noted that in most cases prisoners were not returned to closed conditions and that a plan was put in place to get them back on track.

Guidance in running discipline hearings was available in the orderly room. Appeal forms were available in case a prisoner wished to challenge the outcome. There was no evidence of challenges to orderly room outcomes therefore the appeal process was not tested.

An interesting observation was the motivational signage in the order room. Quotes such as 'Do not give up, the beginning is always the hardest' and 'Correction does much but encouragement does more' emphasising the ethos of HMP Castle Huntly.

4.4 Powers to impose enhanced security measures on a prisoner are exercised appropriately and in accordance with the law.

Rating: N/A

This QI is not applicable as HMP Castle Huntly do not hold any person under enhanced security measures.

4.5 The law concerning the searching of prisoners and their property is implemented thoroughly.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

HMP Castle Huntly had a number of derogations in place to exempt them from some normal searching rules due to it being an open prison. All prisoners transferring there were searched on admission as well as those returning from home leave. Searching took place in the reception cubicles out of sight of others. Searching was observed to have been carried out within the rules. All prisoners were searched at least once every quarter. The search list was issued by the IMU to the residential FLMS. This ensured the prison met its compliance obligations and gave assurances to the SMT that they had been met. The IMU also sent out tasking where intelligence suggested a search was appropriate. During the inspection, some prisoners reported that they felt they had been over-searched but there was no evidence found either in the records of cell searching or on PR2 to confirm this. It was noted that 10% of those returning from routine day release were subjected to a search, and because of the low numbers going out on a daily basis, prisoners may be searched more regularly. There was no traditional daily route movement of prisoners as they could move freely from their cells to their work etc. therefore prisoners were not subjected to a search as they might be in closed conditions.

The pre-inspection survey indicated that just over 20% of prisoners said there was not always a reasonable explanation for being searched. Searches were observed and although staff did not quote the prison rule, they did inform the person why they were being searched, however it was a small sample. HMP Castle Huntly staff should ensure that prisoners are informed on every occasion why they are being searched.

Property received by the prison from external sources was manually searched and x-rayed prior to being distributed to the prisoner. Where property was suspected of having illicit items, the prisoner was informed and the property was held until such times as it was picked up by Police Scotland. At the time of the inspection COVID-19 guidelines were in place where families and friends could not hand in property and had to send it in. The cost for this could be significant for those who maybe could not afford it, but as restrictions reduced HMP Castle Huntly should return to giving family and friends an opportunity to hand items in and remove others during a visit.

Recommendation 14: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that all prisoners have a clear understanding of the authority the prison has by quoting The Prisons and Young Offenders Institutions (Scotland) Rules 2011, rule 92- Searching of prisoners, as to why they are being searched.

4.6 Prisoners' personal property and cash are recorded and, where appropriate, stored. The systems for regulating prisoners' access to their own money and property allow for the exercise of personal choice.

Rating:

Rating: Satisfactory performance

HMP Castle Huntly only received prisoners transferring in from another prison, therefore property and personal cash was already recorded on PR2.

On receipt of property from the escort provider the seals were checked against the PER. All property was then listed on the property card in front of the prisoner and signed by both the prisoner and the member of staff. There was no limit on clothing allowed in use, however but it must fit into one sealed property box as HMP Castle Huntly operated a volumetric control policy. Both prisoners and staff were aware of what could be kept in possession. Prisoners were advised of this in reception face to face and it was detailed in the local induction booklet. There was a further explanation given about money as prisoners were permitted to carry cash in the prison.

The store room for additional property not in use was barely adequate for the population, measuring around 5m x 4m, and there was no reserve area available. Because of this, prisoners were encouraged to take property away gradually when going on home leave to keep stocks down. This will become a bigger issue if and when the population rises, and SPS HQ should work alongside HMP Castle Huntly to provide adequate storage space for the population.

Prisoner's friends and family could deposit money electronically via an SPS bank account, and the money arrived in prisoner's accounts within 2-3 days. Fifty pounds was the maximum limit that prisoners could have in possession. If they returned from home leave with more than this, it was held in the safe in reception and collected by the cashier who added it to their PPC. There were cash boxes held in the wings for cash that arrived via the mail. Prisoners were given a receipt and it was recorded and signed for by two members of staff. It was tallied up at the end of the day and kept in the safe in the residential manager's office overnight and the Cashier collected it in the morning and added it to their PPC. Prisoners could fill out a request sheet to get money out of their PPC and it could also be transferred to another bank account.

Prisoners were able to access their property at any time by turning up at Reception, which was good but may need to be revisited if the population increases. If prisoners wished to bring additional property in whilst out on home leave, they must complete a proforma and hand it into reception the day before they leave and it was attached to their property card. They were limited to five items per month.

Valuable property was recorded on the prisoner's property card which an officer and the prisoner signed during the admissions process. It was stored in a bag with a seal and placed in a lockable cabinet within the reception storage area.

In the event of mishandling of property or loss, prisoners would go through the SPS complaints process.

The reception area would very much benefit from having an x-ray machine to assist with the searching process as any items requiring to be x-rayed is carried out elsewhere which causes delays in prisoners getting their property.

Recommendation 15: SPS HQ and HMP Castle Huntly should work together to provide adequate storage within the reception area for the population.

Recommendation 16: HMP Castle Huntly Reception should be provided with an x-ray machine to reduce delays in processing property and to aid the searching process.

4.7 The risk assessment procedure for any prisoner leaving the prison under escort is thorough and implemented appropriately. Any restraint imposed upon the prisoner is the minimum required for the risk presented.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

HMP Castle Huntly holds low supervision prisoners in open conditions, many of whom carryout unsupervised placements.

It is mainly contracted escorts that take place, rather than being undertaken by SPS staff. In this situation the prison carried out their own risk assessment but the contracted escort also did the same. There was an SOP available for emergency escorts.

The residential FLM completed the personal escort approval certificate/risk assessment using PR2 and reports from RMT. The use of handcuffs was made on a case by case basis following a risk assessment taking place, but they were rarely needed. The Reception staff could not recall the last time someone was sent out on escort wearing handcuffs.

4.8 The law concerning the testing of prisoners for alcohol and controlled drugs is implemented thoroughly.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

By transferring to HMP Castle Huntly, prisoners agreed to take part in the Voluntary Drug Testing (VDT) Scheme. On arrival they were asked to sign a proforma giving their permission to be listed for regular testing as part of the prison's local drug strategy. There was information in the local induction booklet that explained more about the process to prisoners. The VDT Scheme did not replace Mandatory Drug Testing (MDT) and prisoners were still subject to testing under risk assessment at RMT and suspicion.

Prisoners were selected for VDT based on their last test date and a list was retained on SharePoint. The prison aimed to test all prisoners every five to six weeks, and started with new admissions one week after they arrived. Testing was carried out every day with the exception of a Wednesday when prisoners went out on home leave. This was due to the process taking up to five hours and the prison did not want this to prevent someone going out on home leave. Instead they were tested on their return. Those on work placements were tested at weekends.

With the exception of positive results that NHS partners confirmed could be attributed to prescribed medication, relating to specific drugs, namely, Methadone, Tramadol, Pregabalin, Gabapentin and Buprenorphine (ie Subutex), all positive VDT and MDT tests were subject to confirmation testing and there was an SOP available to support this process. The SPS staff requested information from NHS staff on the medication the prisoner was taking, with their consent, and this went to the lab with the positive test result, ensuring they had the most accurate information to report on when undertaking the screening.

There was also an SOP available for alco meter tests, for those suspected of consuming alcohol or their sentence management plan included regular testing for alcohol.

All positive test results were recorded in an Adverse Circumstance Report then discussed at the daily RMT. Test results were analysed and discussed at the addictions meeting that was attended by the Governor, the MDT Co-ordinator and the Substance Abused Team. During 2021/22 there were 714 tests completed with just over 3% positive tests, which was in line with results over the last five years.

Inspectors were talked through the process and were content that the paperwork was filled out correctly, the process met the necessary standards and it followed the guidance within the SOPs. The testing area was fit for purpose and provided privacy

to the person being tested. The results were recorded on PR2 and the paperwork was retained for five years before being destroyed.

There were three staff carrying out drug testing and all had received the necessary training. Inspectors spoke to a prisoner who had recently been tested and he was satisfied that he had been treated fairly.

4.9 The systems and procedures for monitoring, supervising and tracking the movements and activities of prisoners inside the prison are implemented effectively and thoroughly.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

HMP Castle Huntly is unlike closed condition prisons and have a number of derogations from policy, a relaxing of prisons rules and procedures including PRLs. Prisoners were not escorted around HMP Castle Huntly, there was no traditional route movement and prisoners were expected to exercise personal responsibility in attending appointments within the estate by themselves.

Any monitoring took place in the gate house, with a suite of cameras covering the prison estate. Although camera coverage could be improved, it is suitable for what is required.

4.10 The procedures for monitoring the prison perimeter, activity through the vehicle gate and for searching of buildings and grounds are effective.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

A number of derogations were also in place for this QI which were accepted by HMIPS. HMP Castle Huntly does not have a perimeter fence but operations staff carry out a sweep of the area at least once per day and continuously throughout the night shift, as per local protocols. A number of hot spots for illicit items being left were checked regularly both by staff and the cameras. An SOP was available to ensure the recovery of illicit items was carried out correctly. These perimeter checks were recorded and stored for assurance purposes. A prison watch scheme was in place to allow members of the public to report suspicious activity.

HMP Castle Huntly did not have a traditional vehicle lock and therefore vehicles were not searched on arrival or when leaving. Access was by way of a security barrier controlled by a member of staff in the gatehouse. When a vehicle arrived, the gate officer checked the identity of the driver and when content allowed the vehicle in. The officer then notifies the area where the vehicle was going. On arrival the staff checked the person's ID and the vehicle.

Buildings were regularly searched by staff and recorded.

STANDARD 5 - RESPECT, AUTONOMY AND PROTECTION AGAINST MISTREATMENT

Quality Indicators

5.1 The prison reliably passes critical information between prisoners and their families.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Prisoners had unhindered access to hall phones during unlock periods and in addition to this could be allocated an SPS mobile phone. Prisoners were also given access to a personal mobile phone when out on home leave. A new emergency phone top up process had been introduced that allowed prisoners to add additional funds to their phone account twice weekly, up to and including their weekly wage.

Processes existed for sharing critical information regarding family members. For example, an SOP for Death (Or serious Illness) of a relative. The information handling process appeared robust and provided a secure and sensitive approach. Evidence from staff suggested that any response was carried out in a sensitive manner and in confidence, however this could not be measured as there were no recent cases. The SOP had a review date of 08/05/21 therefore this required attention.

At the time of inspection, both Family Contact Officers (FCO) were unavailable, one was absent due to illness and the other had been redeployed due to staff shortages. However, the role was being partly filled by one of the officers in the Links Centre. Prisoner's families had direct contact with the FCOs by phone for advice and assistance. Additionally, FCOs offered induction to prisoners and their family members covering a number of matters including home leave process, visit sessions and the Integrated Case Conference Management (ICM) process etc.

ICM prisoners were actively encouraged to invite their families to attend. If families were expected to attend, the prisoner was sent an information sheet to share with them prior to the visit. From November 2021 to April 2022, few families took the opportunity to attend with only six families attending from 61 Case Conferences, 10%.

Recommendation 17: HMP Castle Huntly should review the SOP for Death (Or serious Illness) of a relative as it was now past its review date.

5.2 Relationships between staff and prisoners are respectful. Staff challenge prisoners' unacceptable behaviour or attitudes and disrespectful language or behaviour is not tolerated.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Throughout the prison, staff and prisoner relationships appeared positive and the atmosphere very relaxed. There was mutual respect and understanding for each other with both groups on first name terms. Prisoners routinely went about their

business around the establishment where they were observed engaging with others with appropriate humour and a relaxed rapport.

All prisoners spoken to knew who their personal officer was and saw them regularly. Prisoners spoke well of their relationship with their personal officers and there were many encouraging stories of how they had engaged and supported individuals during their sentence. All prisoners interviewed said they felt safe in HMP Castle Huntly and described the atmosphere as relaxed and therapeutic.

There was a strong sense of empowering prisoners to exercise personal responsibility. For example, prisoners taking ownership of their own induction and attendance at the various appointments in the induction programme. Prisoners who were spoken to felt this allowed them to exercise some personal responsibility and would better prepare them for release, where they would be expected to make these choices for themselves.

There was no evidence of unacceptable behaviour or attitudes. Whilst the open conditions provide a relaxed atmosphere and more freedom of movement, prisoners still respected boundaries and this was evident in conversations and behaviour.

5.3 Prisoners' rights to confidentiality and privacy are respected by staff in their interactions.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Discussions and interviews with staff suggested they had the necessary awareness of the importance of confidentiality, privacy and protecting information. Staff had access to rooms to conduct confidential interviews with prisoners.

Data breaches were reviewed and two Information Security Incident reports had been submitted in 2022. In both cases, the Information Security Unit concluded that both matters were handled correctly and no further action was required. Prisoners affected by the breach did not raise a complaint.

Confidential mail and recorded deliveries were dealt with in line with national guidance. Staff were able to describe in detail the SOP for handling mail. Mail was recorded and assured accurately.

To protect confidential information each prisoner has a safe in their cell. The safe was of an adequate size to store small items such as medication or letters, however, not large enough to store A4 size paper. There was the possibility that those sharing a cell with another occupant could have access to information when the other was absent.

Recommendation 18: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure that cellular accommodation; particularly those where there is double occupancy, have a safe of appropriate size for each prisoner to store their confidential information.

5.4 The environment in the prison is orderly and predictable with staff exercising authority in a legitimate manner.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

During interviews with various prisoners it was evident they understood the daily regime, and all regime plans were published for each prisoner group to view in residential areas. The prison environment seemed positive with its primary focus on providing care and opportunities for prisoners, but in equal measure maintaining a sense of order and calm. This was maintained in part by the positive staff / prisoner relationships.

The pre-inspection survey revealed that less than half of participants felt they were always treated with respect by prison staff. The inspection team saw no evidence of staff exercising their authority inappropriately. Any interactions with prisoners were satisfactory, and the manner and tone of these engagements were both respectful and professional.

HMP Castle Huntly is an open prison, with all prisoners enjoying the freedom of movement and exercising personal responsibility for matters such as completing their own induction. Prisoners reported that whilst it took time to adjust to this new concept it allowed them to take responsibility for themselves, which they found fulfilling.

5.5 Prisoners are consulted and kept well informed about the range of recreational activities and the range of products in the prison canteen as well as the prison procedures, services they may access and events taking place. The systems for accessing such activities are equitable and allow for an element of personal choice.

Rating: Generally acceptable performance

PIACs took place monthly and every quarter a prisoner forum group meeting took place which had multi-disciplinary representation. They were described as two distinct meetings however, in reality, the quarterly prisoner's forum group meetings were PIAC meetings with a greater representation from SMT discussing the previous months PIAC minutes and new proposals.

The PIAC representatives spoken to were well organised and demonstrated a genuine interest in improving conditions for all prisoners. There was representation from all three residential areas. The minutes of PIAC meetings were shared with prisoners and copies were available in the Links Centre and posted outside the canteen.

The induction booklet informed all prisoners that the minutes of the aforementioned meetings were published on notice boards around the establishment, but this was not the case. Staff could access PIAC minutes and identified actions on SharePoint but the staff spoken to not all were familiar with this process.

There was a prisoner suggestion box for individuals to submit their thoughts and/or ideas for consideration at the quarterly forum group meeting. The suggestion box was not considered during the meeting attended by the inspection team.

HMP Castle Huntly had established an information TV channel for all prisoners. This initiative was introduced during the pandemic and had been developed into an opportunity for a small group, supported by Fife College. The group was able to develop digital skills whilst providing vital information for the residents of the establishment.

Upon arrival at HMP Castle Huntly, prisoners were provided with an informative induction booklet and assistance from peer mentors who supported the induction process.

Recommendation 19: HMP Castle Huntly should provide a copy of PIAC minutes in all residential areas in addition to the Links Centre and Canteen, and make sure staff are aware when PIAC minutes are available

5.6 Prisoners have access to information necessary to safeguard themselves against mistreatment. This includes unimpeded access to statutory bodies, legal advice, the courts, state representatives and members of national or international parliaments.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

When requested by inspectors, the prison rules were held in all residential areas and available for prisoners to access. It was also noted that the prison rules were available in the Library, which also provided access to a number of documents to help prisoners safeguard themselves against mistreatment, including relevant legislation.

SPSO information was advertised on noticeboards in all residential areas.

Access to agent's visits was available through a booking system, and agents may request visits to clients Monday to Friday at various times during the day.

5.7 The prison complaints system works well.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Information on the complaints procedure, including the appeals process, was on display throughout the establishment including every residential area. Every residential area had complaint forms stored neatly in wall mounted document holders. These were well organised and had the full range of forms. The induction booklet includes details of the SPS complaints system. Prisoners spoken to across the prison were fully aware of the process, although none had made use of the SPS complaints process.

The establishment submitted its last PRL self-assessment in January 2020 assessing itself as 100% compliant with the PRL standards. The last audit

conducted by Audit and Assurance Unit in September 2019 was of the opinion that with no items of non-compliance and no recommendations, a rating of substantial assurance was appropriate.

It was suggested that prisoners did not complain for fear of being transferred/returned to closed conditions. This appeared to be a myth in the absence of any real evidence. It was also implied at the pre-inspection focus groups that prisoners were worried that making complaints could affect their release.

FLMs evidenced good awareness of the process and were able to describe their role. The majority of complaints were dealt with at FLM level and few were escalated to the Internal Complaints Committee.

Recommendation 20: HMP Castle Huntly should take action to dispel the myth that prisoners may be downgraded or their release affected for using the complaint system.

5.8 The system for allowing prisoners to see an Independent Prison Monitor works well.

Rating: Generally Acceptable performance

At the time of inspection there were five IPMs assigned to HMP Castle Huntly. Ideally, that number would be eight. They appeared to be well known to both staff and prisoners and there was a reasonable understanding of their role. The IPM service was advertised throughout the establishment and there was no evidence of any restriction of access to the IPMs. Of the prisoners spoken to none had used the service. The IPM telephone number was now available on prisoner mobile phones and the induction booklet needs updating to reflect this.

Recommendation 21: HMIPS should aim to increase the number to IPMs to eight.

Recommendation 22: HMP Castle Huntly to update their induction booklet to highlight access to the IPM telephone number via prisoner mobile phones.

STANDARD 6 - PURPOSEFUL ACTIVITY

Quality Indicators

6.1 There is an appropriate and sufficient range of good quality employment and training opportunities available to prisoners. Prisoners are consulted in the planning of activities offered and their engagement is encouraged.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The prison offered an appropriate range of employment opportunities for prisoners which were based on the operational requirements of the prison. These key service work parties included: catering; gardens and ground maintenance; industrial cleaning; laundry; and waste management. In addition, individual daily work placements in the community were available for a number of prisoners as preparation for release. Community projects were available for offence protection prisoners who were supported on these visits by an officer.

Almost all prisoners participated in a work party or placement, with only a few unable to participate due to age or capability. Prisoners were actively involved in negotiating with officers a work party or placement appropriate to their needs and interests.

The prison had around 130 work placements available with a wide range of local employers and community partners. Prisoners valued these placements and the opportunity to update and improve employability skills prior to release or parole.

However, at the time of inspection only around a third of prisoners were able to take advantage of these placements due to the number of prisoners required to remain on site for essential key service work parties. This was due primarily to the low prison population, with the prison operating below 50% capacity.

Recommendation 23: SPS HQ should, as a matter of urgency, identify the barriers preventing prisoner progression to the open estate to increase the numbers progressing, with an aim of increasing the numbers able to participate in community-based work placements to prepare them better for release.

6.2 Prisoners participate in the system by which paid work is applied for and allocated. The system reflects the individual needs of the prisoner and matches the systems used in the employment market, where possible.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

As part of the induction process, prisoners completed a placement application form which was then considered by the Employability Board as part of an individual employment case conference.

Prisoners had the opportunity to discuss work parties and potential work placements and were allocated a work party which commenced following their induction period.

Work placements were allocated at a future meeting of the Employability Board after the prisoner had completed a period within a work party.

The process worked well and considered fully the needs and aspirations of prisoners, as well as taking account of the labour requirements to allow the prison to function operationally.

6.3 There is an appropriate and sufficient range of good quality educational activities available to the prisoners. Prisoners are consulted in the planning of activities offered and their engagement is encouraged.

Rating: Generally Acceptable performance

The Learning Centre, located in the Links Centre and operated by Fife College, provided a welcoming and relaxed environment for prisoners to engage in learning activities. Classes ran during week days, with evening classes available on a Thursday to allow prisoners who were on community-based work placements to attend. Attendance was generally low with daily attendances averaging 17 for the week prior to the inspection.

Relationships between Learning Centre staff and prisoners were positive and respectful, and this encouraged prisoners to participate meaningfully in learning activities. Prisoners attending classes valued the interaction and support provided by centre staff.

The quality of provision was good, with most of the learning delivered on an individual basis. Prisoners were able to participate in classes in numeracy, creative writing, ICT and art. Two prisoners had recently completed degrees with the Open University. However, overall the curriculum was limited and provided insufficient breadth or depth. A small training kitchen within the Learning Centre which had previously been used to support prisoners to develop practical life skills in preparation for release was unused due to staffing issues. However, a new member of staff was undertaking the necessary training to make use of the facility again.

More generally, prisoners were not given the opportunity to develop the necessary digital skills to prepare them for release due to not being allowed access to the internet and online facilities. This placed them at a disadvantage on release to cope with and manage many routine tasks such as: email; online applications for benefits and employment; banking; and managing household utilities. Prisoners who were completing long-term sentences had limited or no exposure to these online processes prior to being imprisoned. Current SPS policy prevents the use of the internet by prisoners for security reasons. However, technological solutions exist to monitor online activity, limit websites that can be visited and material that can be viewed, and provide assurance that online activities are being used appropriately.

Recommendation 24: SPS HQ should work with senior managers in HMP Castle Huntly and Fife College to find a workable solution to allow prisoners to access online activities to enable them to gain the necessary digital skills to prepare them for release.

6.4 There is an appropriate and sufficient range of physical and health educational activities available to the prisoners and they are afforded access to participate in sporting or fitness activities relevant to a wide range of interests, needs and abilities. Prisoners are consulted in the planning of activities offered and their engagement is encouraged.

Rating: Good performance

All prisoners were able to access good quality indoor and outdoor sporting and fitness facilities. Prisoners had the opportunity to attend the gym daily. The gym contained a well-equipped exercise room with a suitable range of exercise and training equipment and a separate weights room. The gym facilities were available to prisoners during the day, in the evening and at weekends. All prisoners completed an induction prior to accessing the fitness equipment to ensure safe use.

Prisoners made good use of an indoor games hall for activities such as badminton, indoor bowls and circuit training. An outdoor all-weather football pitch and a separate grass pitch was also available for prisoner use. Prisoners were also able to use the prison grounds and garden for walking and supervised cycle rides in the local area were organised regularly.

The team of PTIs had good positive relationships with prisoners and this contributed strongly to the relaxed atmosphere, which encouraged prisoner participation in health and well-being activities. Prisoners were consulted regularly on what type of activities they preferred to engage with.

There were productive partnerships with external organisations. For example, Street Soccer ran regular 10-week programmes which promoted healthy lifestyle through football coaching, and offered work placements for prisoners. Prisoners participated in 10K and half marathon runs and acted as race marshals with a local running club.

6.5 Prisoners are afforded access to a library which is well-stocked with materials that take account of the cultural and religious backgrounds of the prisoner population.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Prisoners were able to access a well-stocked library located in the Links Centre, which provided a welcoming atmosphere to browse and read material. The library stock was appropriate and included a good balance of reading material with fiction, autobiographies and non-fiction texts. There was a large collection of DVDs which most prisoners borrowed for viewing in their cells and communal living areas. However, there were no legal texts which prisoners could request and read on the library premises or daily newspapers.

The library provision was managed through an arrangement with Culture Perth and Kinross, the local authority provider. This provided a good rotation of the stock, ready access to local library materials and inter-library loans. This ensured that prisoners could order audio books, large print or foreign language texts when

required. Prison managers had committed funding to update the library computer system to allow direct access to the Perth and Kinross library catalogue.

A visiting librarian from the local authority spent time in the library every two weeks, to oversee the stock and support the library passman who worked daily in the library and managed loans and returns to prisoners.

6.6 Prisoners have access to a variety of cultural, recreational, self-help or peer support activities that are relevant to a wide range of interests and abilities. Prisoners are consulted on the range of activities and their participation is encouraged.

Rating: Good performance

Prisoners participated in a good range of cultural activities and events which made a positive contribution to prison life and supported preparation for release. Strong and effective partnership working between prison staff and a number of national and local organisations resulted in a varied array of activities and events in which prisoners could engage.

Prisoners used a well-equipped music room in the Shack and a weekly creative writing and music workshop, delivered in partnership with Vox Liminis was always well attended. A longstanding partnership with the Taymara Project provided a number of prisoners with qualifications in marine first aid, marine radio operators licence and Powerboat 2 licence.

A number of prisoners also entered art items for the annual national Koestler Trust awards, in addition to displaying their completed work around the prison.

Prisoners had created and maintained two bespoke gardens within the prison grounds. The Recovery Garden was an allotment-style garden where prisoners could work and grow plants and vegetables, and the Memorial Garden provided a quiet contemplative area with a memorial for those who had died in military service.

There was an organised group of peer-mentors in the prison who provided support to new prisoners, particularly during the induction period, and assisted with a range of other activities. The peer-mentors had successfully completed a peer-mentor training programme which supported them well in this role.

6.7 All prisoners have the opportunity to take exercise for at least one hour in the open air every day. All reasonable steps are taken to ensure provision is made during inclement weather.

Rating: Good performance

With HMP Castle Huntly being an open prison there were no restrictions on access to fresh air for all prisoners throughout the day. Prisoners who chose not to go on outside placements, work parties within the prison or attend education could go outside for fresh air whenever they wanted, and those who did attend these activities still had opportunities before lock up in the evening. The only restrictions were when

a prisoner was isolating due to COVID-19, and the prison had rarely had to impose any such restrictions. Moreover, at the time of our inspection prisoners were able to eat their meals outside if they so wished. Prisoners wore their own clothing at HMP Castle Huntly including their own coats for wet weather conditions. If they did not possess adequate outdoor clothing, they would be helped to purchase some via a clothing allowance, with coats and jackets ordered and arriving quickly.

6.8 Prisoners are assisted in their religious observances.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The Chaplaincy Team consisted of a Church of Scotland Minister, a Roman Catholic priest and an Imam. Some prisoners were on outside placements and did not return to the prison until late afternoon. It was commendable therefore that the Chaplaincy Team chose to work a 'back shift', starting at midday so they could stay later (6:30 pm until 8:00 pm) to support the needs of those returning from outside placements. Mass was held on Thursday for Roman Catholics, with a Church of Scotland service held on a Sunday and prayers for Muslims taken by the Imam on a Tuesday. Additionally, a Christian bible study class was held every Friday afternoon. The Chaplaincy Team was confident they could seek assistance from the national chaplaincy team co-ordinator if anyone of Buddhist or Jewish faith needed support. Prisoners who sought rosary beads, the Koran or other things to support them in observing their religion were provided with it. There was a reasonable range of literature including packs offering a music CD and a cross to support those of Christian faith.

It would assist prisoners seeking to continue their spiritual journey on liberation if they had experience of attending faith services in the community. This had been facilitated previously by the prison, but had stopped when a few prisoners abused the system and understandably could not be reinstated through most of the pandemic. The easing of COVID-19 restrictions around attendance at places of worship means the prison could now reinstate the opportunity to attend places of worship in the community and we encourage that to happen. Any individuals abusing the arrangements can of course expect to forfeit the opportunity, but that should not impact on everyone wanting to deepen their journey of faith.

The Chaplaincy Team supported the Sycamore Tree project which was a one-day course offering prisoners the opportunity for self-reflection and an introduction to restorative justice philosophies. Armistice Day remembrance services were particularly poignant with prisoners and staff standing side by side in the Memorial Garden to remember those lost in action.

The Shack which housed the multi-faith centre was a bright, warm and welcoming environment, where prisoners were free to drop in at any time the Chaplaincy Team were there for a cup of coffee and a chat or simply have space to reflect and do a jigsaw. The Memorial Garden was well maintained by the prisoners and contained memorial plaques to prisoners who had sadly died in Castle Huntly. Their families were provided with the opportunity to plant a memorial plaque and hold a memorial service in the Garden for their loved one.

Good practice 6: The Shack provided an excellent facility for a multi-faith centre. The Memorial Garden, with the opportunity for families to plant a memorial plaque and hold a service to remember their loved one after a death in custody, is an excellent initiative worthy of replication in the closed estate.

Recommendation 25: HMP Castle Huntly should reinstate the opportunity to attend places of worship in the community as an aid to community reintegration and support for an individual's spiritual journey.

6.9 The prison maximises the opportunities for prisoners to meet and interact with their families and friends. Additionally, opportunities for prisoners to interact with family members in a variety of parental and other roles are provided. The prison facilitates a free flow of communication between prisoners and their families to sustain ties.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Face to face visits were available Monday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, with weekday visits available between 5.30 pm - 6.30 pm and 6.45 pm - 7.45 pm and weekend visits available 1.30 pm - 2.30 pm and 3.00 pm - 4.00 pm. Our pre-inspection survey confirmed high levels of confidence amongst most prisoners in their ability to see family on a weekly basis if they wished.

There was no formal family strategy in place at the time of our inspection, which was acknowledged by staff to be a potential gap, but communication between prisoners and their families was undoubtedly encouraged and supported. As with closed prisons every prisoner received an SPS mobile phone and 300 minutes of credit each month; the bone of contention for prisoners at HMP Castle Huntly being that they were allowed to use their personal mobile phones when on home leave but not when inside HMP Castle Huntly. However, this would be in line with the current SPS rules.

The facilities available for promoting contact between fathers and older children were excellent through crazy golf and outdoor tables for meeting outdoors in the grounds when the weather was favourable. Inspectors heard some frustrations about inconsistency in access to children's toys when families with young children arrived. Some members of staff had been allowing access to toys, perhaps unaware that this was not deemed to be compatible with official COVID-19 guidance, while other members of staff had been enforcing the restrictions. It is hoped that further easing of these restrictions will resolve the anomaly.

6.10 Arrangements for admitting family members and friends into the prison are welcoming and offer appropriate support. The atmosphere in the Visit Room is friendly, and while effective measures are adopted to maintain security, supervision is unobtrusive.

Rating: Good performance

Prison visits took place in the Links Centre, which was a bright open area. The Barista helped make the visit area more appealing, and the ability of prisoners to

greet their guests wearing normal clothing also promoted a relaxed visit. Visitors had access to a toilet in the Links Centre; prisoners were not allowed to use the same toilet as a security measure around the transmission of illegal items. In general, however, unless there was intelligence to the contrary, staff adopted a low key and informal supervisory approach to the oversight of visits in keeping with the ethos of an Open Estate.

Previously it was possible to book a hot meal for visitors arriving for the 5.30 pm - 6.30 pm visit, to assist those travelling from afar or making a visit after work, but this stopped during the pandemic. It would be good to see this offer reinstated.

When the weather was favourable prisoners could meet their visitors outside at picnic tables in an attractive garden area and make use of a small crazy golf course. These were excellent facilities for assisting with relaxed visits and family bonding and a credit to the staff and prisoners involved in their maintenance.

Due to the absence of a family waiting area, as would exist in closed prisons, and COVID-19 restrictions, visitors had to wait in their cars until called into the Links Centre by staff, which was understandable but not ideal. Moreover, and at the time of our inspection, visitors were not permitted to bring their own food to share with their loved one at the picnic tables. It is to be hoped these restrictions can be eased shortly to enhance the visit experience further.

The only real criticism that inspectors heard in relation to visits was that while the vast majority of staff were perceived by prisoners to provide a warm welcome to their visitors, and support relaxed family visits, a few staff were perceived to be unfriendly and unduly assertive in enforcing rules around the wearing of masks etc.

Good practice 7: The facilities available to support outdoor family focussed visits at HMP Castle Huntly were exceptionally good, while the availability of the Barista supported relaxed informal indoor visits

Recommendation 26: HMP Castle Huntly should consider reinstating the ability for visitors arriving for the early evening midweek visit slots to order a hot meal in advance.

6.11 Where it is not possible for families to use the normal arrangements for visits, the prison is proactive in taking alternative steps to assist prisoners in sustaining family relationships.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Video visits were readily available, with 80% of those responding to the pre-inspection survey indicating confidence in their ability to secure a video visit at least once a week. As this was a national facility with potentially long and arduous journeys to Castle Huntly for some families, the availability of the video visit facility to maintain regular family contact between home leave visits was particularly important and appreciated by prisoners. Encouragingly too the technology and arrangements for supporting video visits appeared to be working well.

There was the opportunity to book double visits and, following a period of qualification, the opportunity to apply for enhanced community access to allow prisoners to spend a lengthy period of the day with their family twice per month. This was particularly cherished by those able to spend extended time on days out with young children.

6.12 Any restrictions placed on the conditions under which prisoners may meet with their families or friends take account of the importance placed on the maintenance of good family and social relationships throughout their sentence.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

There was no indication of visits being withdrawn as a punishment or of restrictions being unnecessarily placed on visits. There had been a few occasions in the past when visitors had been temporarily suspended due to evidence of attempting to transfer inappropriate items during the visit or similar issues, but such incidents were extremely rare and suspensions were only temporary.

6.13 There is an appropriate and sufficient range of therapeutic treatment and cognitive development opportunities as well as an appropriate and sufficient range of social and relational skills training activities available to prisoners.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

There was a proactive commitment to the provision of therapeutic and development activities. Programme consolidation and substance treatment needs were identified early and case management and referral systems were in place to plan with the prisoner how and when these needs would be met.

Personal officers had a central role in case management, review and re-integration planning and were mostly establishing positive and effective relationships. Their role was understood by prisoners and by other agencies and their contribution was valued.

Personal officers contributed to case management conferences but were not consistently able to attend due to shift patterns. Processes were in place for them to provide written input to ICMs and to fulfil their contributions to parole processes. These were monitored by integrated case management and parole casework staff. Pending plans to enhance personal officers' training in their case management roles and trauma informed practice were reported by senior managers.

6.14 The prison operates an individualised approach to effective prisoner case management, which takes account of critical dates for progression and release on parole or licence. Prisoners participate in decision making and procedures provide for family involvement where appropriate.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Case management and parole casework systems were well established. They operated effectively and good collaborative working practices supported a coordinated approach to individualised sentence planning and attention to critical dates. ICM and parole casework staff had appropriate quality assurance and system monitoring measures in place.

Individuals' needs and risks were appropriately assessed at the earliest opportunity. This included an initial multi-agency review of information dossiers received from sending prisons, which informed decisions on any arising need for specific re-assessment to inform community access.

An admission assessment was initiated by personal officers for all new arrivals. These were undertaken jointly with the prisoner and used a comprehensive format which formed a basis for ongoing individualised planning.

Prisoners were actively encouraged to participate in their case management and contribute to planning. Meetings were focussed on the individual prisoner and participating agencies made skilled efforts to elicit the prisoner's views.

There were routine opportunities for the prisoner to invite family members to attend case conferences. Prison staff and prisoners noted that this was not always taken up because the community access focus of HMP Castle Huntly meant that a significant proportion of prisoners had contact with family during home leave and they were already well informed of the prisoners' plans. There was well-developed remote access to case conferences for family when it was required.

6.15 Systems and procedures used to identify prisoners for release or periods of leave are implemented fairly and effectively, observing the implementation of risk management measures such as Orders for Lifelong Restriction (OLR) and Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA).

Rating: Satisfactory

The prison was proactive in assessing and reviewing prisoner's risks and needs. There was appropriate oversight of case management, RMT and parole casework processes and procedures.

A strong focus on risk management processes to inform decisions on community access was well-aligned with the purposes of the open estate. There were well established and effective relationships with statutory partners and responsible authorities for the oversight and planning for MAPPA cases and those prisoners subject to Orders of Lifelong Restriction.

Prisoners were supported to participate in decisions made about their progress but they were not routinely encouraged to attend RMT meetings when their progress was being discussed. They were however consistently given timely feedback on the outcome of any decision and had the opportunity to discuss this with a personal officer on the same day and then with case work staff at routine RMT clinics the following day.

STANDARD 7 - TRANSITIONS FROM CUSTODY TO LIFE IN THE COMMUNITY

Quality Indicators

7.1 Government agencies, private and third sector services are facilitated to work together to prepare a jointly agreed release plan and ensure continuity of support to meet the community integration needs of each prisoner.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

An emphasis on re-integration planning and preparation for release was positively reflected in collaborative working across agencies. Routine scheduled attendance and contact with third sector and government agencies via the Link Centre ensured a suitable range of services were accessible. Agencies reported positively on their relationship with prison staff and there was consistent recognition that the work of these organisations was valued by prisoners and staff. There was an emphasis on the prisoner's role in contacting services involved in their transition to the community.

Personal officers had a central role in liaising with statutory and third sector services including community-based social work and accommodation providers. This ensured residential staff were well informed of release arrangements and encouraged their cooperative relationships with prisoners to support planning.

The prison's Substance Use Team (SUT) were accessible and proactively contributing to Link Centre activity, sentence management and release planning. There were well established processes for continuity of prescribing and for joined-up planning with community based substance use support services.

Collaborative working of prison-based social work and prison staff with community-based social work teams supported continuity of service. Positive relationships allowed for professional challenge, particularly in relation to risk management, and contributed to rigorous pre-release planning for prisoners' subject to statutory supervision on release.

7.2 Where there is a statutory duty on any agency to supervise a prisoner after release, all reasonable steps are taken to ensure this happens in accordance with relevant legislation and guidance.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The enhanced ICM process for long-term prisoners, and for short-term prisoners subject to supervision on release, was well coordinated. There was clarity of roles and responsibilities across ICM and parole case work. Prison-based social work and community-based social work were effectively contributing to case management.

The process was implemented flexibly, ensuring the attendance of partners who had statutory duties to supervise a prisoner on release.

Parole processes were well organised and there was timely provision of information for dossiers and early identification of information gaps. Delays in the contributions from any partner organisation were addressed in good time.

For those prisoners who may be subject to community supervision on a Home Detention Curfew (HDC), the application for HDC was started at the same time as the parole dossier was requested. This enabled a quicker decision for release on HDC as soon as the outcome of a parole hearing was received.

The case work procedure at HMP Castle Huntly ensured multi-agency attention to the dossiers of information received from sending prisons. This was ensuring that any information gaps were addressed and decisions were better informed.

Good practice 8: Attention to aligning pre-release case conferences with preparation of parole dossiers contributed to continuity of information and planning.

Good practice 9: Early initiation of HDC applications, maximising the prisoner's potential time on HDC in the community.

7.3 Where prisoners have been engaged in development or treatment programmes during their sentence, the prison takes appropriate action to enable them to continue or reinforce the programme on their return to the community.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

An enhanced regime on the admissions wing focussed on intensive support and assessment in relation to substance use. This focussed on stabilisation and treatment to ensure the risks and needs associated with substance use and successful community access were addressed.

The prison SUT had a comprehensive approach to harm reduction. Peer led SMART recovery sessions were run routinely and recovery cafés were available in the Link Centre. Good attention had been given to developing therapeutic and trauma informed spaces at Castle Huntly, including a well-used recovery lounge and a large accessible recovery garden.

In preparation for community access and release, the SUT coordinated treatment plans with community based services. There were specific interventions for prisoners in preparation for periods of home leave, which included training to use naloxone and the provision of naloxone kits.

Prison psychology services identified and delivered consolidation work with prisoners who had already completed programmes where it was assessed as being required. This reinforced learning and development to support prisoners in managing their own risks and needs ahead of community access. The Psychologists and Prison-based Social Work Team also delivered bespoke one-to-one interventions where specific needs were identified.

Prisoners reported positively on the Sycamore programme, based on restorative justice principles, which the chaplaincy ran.

Good practice 10: Enhanced regime in admissions wing to assess and stabilise substance use in preparation for community access.

7.4 All prisoners have the opportunity to contribute to a co-ordinated plan which prepares them for release and addresses their specific community integration needs and requirements.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

There was a pervasive positive and constructive focus on prisoners taking responsibility for their part in their own reintegration planning.

There were routine, well developed opportunities for prisoners to learn and ask questions about how key processes in their sentence management, parole, home leave and community access arrangements worked. These opportunities were first presented on induction and continued throughout sentence. This supported their understanding of how they would contribute and participate in arrangements and also what to expect and how to prepare.

Personal officers had a key role in engaging prisoners. In most instances personal officers were supporting prisoners with involvement in planning activities, preparation for community access or involvement in key processes such as case conferences or parole processes.

ICM conferences were focussed on the individual prisoner with their involvement and contribution being promoted. Participating agencies made consistent efforts to elicit the prisoner's views and to support their understanding of what was being discussed.

Prisoners described having been included in planning, understanding key processes and having opportunities to contribute or express their views on re-integration arrangements.

Good practice 11: Personal officers had a significant and meaningful role in supporting prisoners with planning for re-integration.

Good practice 12: Key processes in sentence management were explained to prisoners at the earliest opportunity.

7.5 Where the prison offers any services to prisoners after their release, those services are well planned and effectively supervised.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

For the duration of their time at HMP Castle Huntly, there was a multidisciplinary commitment to planned and coordinated support to help prisoners engage with services based in the community.

Link Centre staff and personal officers demonstrated their key role in ensuring prisoners were aware of community based support, including community supervision services and of the expectation on the prisoner to comply with them.

For periods of community access, placements and for home leave there were effective systems for monitoring and supervision of the prisoner's time in the community including the prison's communication with community-based social work, substance use services and reporting procedures from placement providers.

The ICM process and RMT made explicit reference to prisoners' responsibilities to engage with services on release and how they would be monitored. Prisoners described a competent understanding of their responsibility to engage with supports and comply with community supervision.

The roles of community-based social work, the parole board and electronic monitoring services in the supervision of prisoners on release was made clear at appropriate stages of sentence.

The prison does not directly deliver any service to the prisoner once liberated.

STANDARD 8 - ORGANISATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Quality Indicators

8.1 The prison's Equality and Diversity Strategy meets the legal requirements of all groups of prisoners, including those with protected characteristics. Staff understand and play an active role in implementing the Strategy.

Rating: Generally Acceptable performance

The prison had developed its own E&D Strategy and the E&D Committee had met four times over the previous 12 months with evidence through the minutes of issues being raised and actions taken forward. The GIC or Deputy Governor attended every meeting. Prisoner representation had recently been secured for the Committee which was a positive development; recruitment of another prisoner representative would help address the inevitable power imbalances. The E&D Manager was motivated and committed to the role, but had not received any special additional training for the role. Moreover, the national network of E&D Managers had not met for 12 months. It would be helpful if SPS HQ could consider the need for specialist training in this aspect and reconvene the network to provide a source of advice to all E&D Managers across the prison estate.

The prison had one fully accessible cell and a separate wet room had been developed which could be used flexibly to either support the needs of more than one prisoner or be left for the dedicated use of one prisoner. While these were positive developments, the business case submitted for the refurbishment of a vacant double cell and repurposing as a further accessible cell had not been approved by SPS HQ on the basis that there was no evidence of any application to progress to the Open Estate having to be rejected due to a lack of availability of an accessible cell. However, in light of the demographics of an ageing prison population we encourage the SPS to revisit the need for more accessible accommodation to ensure equality of access to the Open Estate going forward. It was reassuring, however, that although RMT and Parole Board hearings took place in the Castle admin block, which was not suitable for those with severe mobility issues, these meetings could take place in the Shack, which was fully accessible.

There were two areas where inspectors were concerned about potential inequalities:

- Offence protection prisoners had more limited opportunities to engage in outside placements. The challenges in securing external placements in the community for such prisoners is fully recognised. Their main opportunity for engagement in the local community came through the community projects work party, which made it all the more frustrating for offence protection prisoners when this was frequently the first work party to be cancelled when residential teams were short staffed and needed support. Moreover, some offence protection prisoners felt that opportunities to secure other external placements were not fully explored or an adequate explanation not provided on why suggestions were rejected. The prison should find alternative solutions to ensure that protection prisoners get

regular access to community project works and that every opportunity is explored to provide other outside placements, with clear explanations provided when suggestions cannot be facilitated.

- Conversely prisoners securing outside placements resented missing out on opportunities to take part in hill walking, bike riding and other such activities outside the prison grounds. These were run by PT staff and readily available midweek to prisoners on internal work parties but had finished by the time those on external placements had returned to the establishment. The prison currently only had one PT instructor working at the weekends, limiting the scope to offer access to the gym and external activities simultaneously at the weekend. The prison had offered to replace one or more of the gym sessions with outside exercise activities at the weekend, but it was difficult to secure a solution that worked for all prisoners as the gym sessions were popular with many prisoners. It is recognised that this had been raised before in PIACs, and there is no easy solution, but the prison should engage prisoners in further dialogue on a suitable compromise, perhaps trialling replacement of one gym session with outside exercise at the weekends.

Recommendation 27: SPS HQ should encourage reconvening of the national network of E&D Managers and work with the network to consider if further specialist training for E&D managers would be helpful.

Recommendation 28: SPS HQ and HMP Castle Huntly should jointly reconsider the case for further investment in accessible cell accommodation at the Open Estate to ensure with an ageing prison population this does not become a barrier to progression.

Recommendation 29: HMP Castle Huntly should ensure protection prisoners get regular access to community project work and that every opportunity is explored to provide other external placement opportunities, with clear explanations provided to prisoners when their suggestions cannot be facilitated

Recommendation 30: HMP Castle Huntly should review the scope to provide more opportunities for outside exercise activities such as bike riding and hillwalking for those who miss out on opportunities when away on outside placements midweek

8.2 Appropriate action has been taken in response to recommendations of oversight and scrutiny authorities that have reported on the performance of the prison.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The prison provided clear evidence of action taken to address issues raised in the last HMIPS inspection of HMP Castle Huntly and of engaging with Internal Assurance processes. There were regular business review meetings and a range of other meetings where issues were raised and implementation action tracked competently by the relevant committees.

8.3 The prison successfully implements plans to improve performance against these Standards, and the management team make regular and effective use of information to do so. Management give clear leadership and communicate the prison's priorities effectively.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

A Business Plan and Annual Delivery Plan had been developed and shared with staff. A PowerPoint presentation explaining about the delivery plan had been sent round the whole workforce. Key performance indicators and other core operational data were reviewed regularly in the Business Review and Performance Assurance Meeting and risk registers were kept under review. The GIC and the Deputy Governor were both perceived by staff to be visible in the prison and the GIC held informal monthly meetings with FLMs over coffee, providing the opportunity to discuss the key challenges facing the prison and individual teams and answer any questions FLMs or their staff might have about future plans for the establishment. During the inspection, staff indicated that communication from the senior management downwards was strong and an inclusive culture had been developed.

8.4 Staff are clear about the contribution they are expected to make to the priorities of the prison, and are trained to fulfil the requirements of their role. Succession and development training plans are in place.

Rating: Generally Acceptable performance

Staff throughout HMP Castle Huntly were motivated and committed to their roles, and positive about the value of the work undertaken at the Open Estate, although often feeling there was more that could be done and hopeful that would happen as the SPS came out of pandemic related restrictions. SPS staff were clear about their own roles and frequently had a good understanding of other SPS roles within the prison as some were often asked to cover other posts. The 'coffee cup' discussions between the GIC and FLMs provided opportunities to discuss priorities and other issues in the Delivery Plan that was circulated to all staff.

The prison monitored core to role training competencies so always knew how many staff were in compliance or out of compliance and had a plan for addressing the areas of non-compliance. The areas where the prison were significantly below 90% compliance levels related to C&R, PPT, H&S for Managers, Mentally Healthy Workplaces and E&D. The key priority was C&R, where the prison were inhibited from only having three C&R instructors, below the complement of six, and at the time of our visit were only at 47% compliance. The prison had secured the cooperation of instructors at SPS and had a plan to reach 90% compliance by September 2022, but that might require them to temporarily shut or limit some regime elements to release staff. The training variable was affected by the number of part-time staff.

In terms of succession and development, the management team were pleased that six staff who had applied for promotion to FLM had made it through to the interview stage. The prison was in the process of inviting people to join its new local Castle Huntly Development Programme for C-E staff, either as participants or mentors,

which would provide opportunities for mentoring, work shadowing and support around the application and interview processes.

Think Twice awareness raising training was delivered twice a year and an FLM was arranging substance abuse training for residential staff. Masterclass workshops to support those attending RMTs were also being planned.

Recommendation 31: HMP Castle Huntly must continue its efforts to bring all staff core competency levels into compliance as soon as possible.

8.5 Staff at all levels and in each functional staff group understand and respect the value of work undertaken by others.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

There was a strong feeling of mutual respect and understanding of different roles within the prison and of unity of purpose across the prison. Even when staff got pulled off their specialist roles to support residential staff or other work parties there was an acceptance of the need to do that, albeit with disappointment that prisoners in their own work party might then miss out on important opportunities.

The GIC and trade union representative had established a positive and inclusive working relationship which also helped support unity of purpose within the prison.

8.6 Good performance at work is recognised by the prison in ways that are valued by staff. Effective steps are taken to remedy inappropriate behaviour or poor performance.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

At the time of the inspection in June, the prison had an 85% completion rate for 2021-22 annual appraisals using the Personal Performance Management System, and the prison was following up with FLMs who had transferred to other establishments without all their appraisals being submitted on the system. While 100% completion rate had not been completed, this was better than we have seen in some prisons.

Reflective practice sessions were also being reinstated.

The prison had a good record on absence management with relatively few staff on long-term sick leave.

The prison had secured a 59% employee engagement score in its People Survey of staff which was encouraging, and the GIC was keen to both build on the strengths identified in the survey and address the concerns expressed about career progression opportunities.

The prison encouraged nominations recognising good performance, which were assessed in Employee Engagement Committee Meetings. From speaking to staff it

was clear that Governor and Chief Executive awards were made and appreciated by staff receiving them.

At the time of the inspection processes for managing poor performance were not having to be used but there was an appropriate awareness of the steps involved.

8.7 The prison is effective in fostering supportive working relationships with other parts of the prison service and the wider justice system, including organisations working in partnership to support prisoners and provide services during custody or on release.

Rating: Good

HMP Castle Huntly engaged with a very wide range of different partners including Fife College, Job Centre Plus, Social Work, and Alcoholics/ narcotics/cocaine anonymous and the Recovery Room, who both offered support around substance abuse. The Taymara Project Partnership offered 10-week courses leading to qualifications for marine first aid, powerboat licences and marine radio operators licence. Vox Liminis Partnership provided weekly sessions in the Shack for creative writing and music which were appreciated by prisoners. Street Soccer, Families Outside and Princes Trust were also active partners, while the Westbank project provided amongst other things forklift and tele-handler training. The Perth Six Circle Project delivered skills to enhance community integration and reduce social isolation. Taken alongside the work done on the PT side to support participation as runners and stewards in community running events, this represented an impressive range of partnership working.

HMP Castle Huntly also contributed to the Angus Community Justice Partnership and the Dundee Community Justice Partnership and other community initiatives. For example, prisoners supported the clearing of debris in the local community after Storm Arwen. These sort of partnership connections and initiatives also helped facilitate useful opportunities for the community projects team within Castle Huntly. Community justice partnership working had also secured access to a flat in Fife for Castle Huntly, could sometimes be made available for prisoners who would otherwise be homeless when liberated into that area.

HMP Castle Huntly also contributed to GIC meetings and other corporate SPS initiatives.

8.8 The prison is effective in communicating its work to the public and in maintaining constructive relationships with local and national media.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The prison provided a bank of good news stories to the national SPS HQ communications team, who lead on media issues, and took other initiatives to engage with the local community and promote positive perceptions about the prison. The prison had given talks to the Longforgan Women's Guild and before COVID-19 had run Heritage Open Days, where visitors were able to visit the Castle and learn about its history, before visiting the ice house, Italian Gardens, and one of the largest

yew trees in Scotland, often with prisoners acting as tour guides. The prison intended to reinstate these Heritage Open Days, now COVID-19 restrictions were easing, along with Open Days for families of prisoners, which usually included face painting and a bouncy castle for the children and were always well received. It will indeed be good to see such things reinvigorated.

STANDARD 9 - HEALTH AND WELLBEING

Quality Indicators

9.1 An assessment of the individual's immediate health and wellbeing is undertaken as part of the admission process to inform care planning.

Rating: Satisfactory Performance

Staff told inspectors that prior to the patient's transfer to HMP Castle Huntly, information was requested from the transferring prison to ensure continuity of care. Health screening was provided to all transfers on arrival to the prison and the patient's dignity and confidentiality was maintained throughout the process. As there were no transfers into HMP Castle Huntly at the time of our inspection, inspectors could not oversee the process. All staff responsible for the provision of health screening had been trained to use a validated health screening tool. Health screening was undertaken through discussion between the patient and staff, with the informed consent of the patient. All information from the health screening process was documented into the patient record on Vision.

Inspectors saw evidence of documentation in place to demonstrate that the immediate health and wellbeing needs of patients were identified during the health screening process. This ensured that patients who were at risk of self-harm or suicide were identified through TTM. Systems and processes were in place to identify any patient unfit to be detained in the open estate. Appropriate actions were taken to maintain the safety of these patients. Inspectors were told that, where there is ongoing and escalating concerns about a patient's mental health and risk, they may require to be transferred back to a closed prison for a period of assessment prior to a medium secure mental health facility being identified if required.

Good systems and processes were in place to ensure all necessary information about the healthcare needs of patients were identified at the screening assessment. These were clearly documented in Vision and shared with the appropriate healthcare teams. All patients identified with healthcare needs were discussed at the next handover meeting ensuring they were promptly referred to the appropriate healthcare team to meet their healthcare needs.

9.2 The individual's healthcare needs are assessed and addressed throughout the individual's stay in prison.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

All prisoners transferred to HMP Castle Huntly were reviewed by a primary care nurse on arrival. Inspectors were told those undertaking the health assessment obtained a medical history from the patient, including identification of long-term medical conditions. Patients were involved in the planning of their care which was in line with national best practice and guidance. All prescriptions were reviewed and reconciled as part of the health assessment, ensuring appropriate medication was prescribed for the patient. Any changes to treatment or medication were discussed with the individual and documented in their healthcare record on Vision.

A confidential self-referral system was in place for all healthcare services. Patients had access to public phones in the halls to contact the Health Centre to self-refer and make appointments. Patients were informed of the waiting times for the relevant service and when they had been added to the waiting list.

All transfers received a Health Centre information booklet detailing the different professionals and services available. Arrangements for medication and preparing for home leave and liberation were also provided. Information on the available healthcare services was displayed in patient areas, the halls and Health Centre. Some information displayed was in easy read formats and was available on request in other languages. A variety of information on display showed how to access spiritual care and independent advocacy.

Patients were supported to attend the Health Centre for supervised medication by prison officers who were responsible for escorting them. Given the nature of the open estate, patients could attend independently for appointments at the Health Centre. Where patients did not attend appointments, healthcare professionals would follow this up with the patient, depending on the nature of the issue.

Systems and processes were in place for the onward electronic referral of patients to secondary care services. Patients due to attend secondary care appointments were escorted by GEOAme staff and in some instances by SPS. Inspectors were told as there were not many issues experienced using escorts, the appointments were rarely missed.

Robust systems and processes were in place for the identification and management of anyone who was unfit to remain in prison. Inspectors saw an easy to follow flow chart of the process.

Protocols were in place to ensure that patients requiring social care were involved in any assessment for this care. Social care needs were identified by nursing staff and patients were referred to occupational therapy for assessment. This assessment resulted in advice about the social care package required to support their rehabilitation and promote independence. NHS staff will liaise with SPS staff based on the recommendations made.

Staff were trained to respond to code red and blue calls for medical emergencies. All emergency equipment was found to be appropriate, in-date, intact and regularly checked. Staff training records showed that all healthcare staff had received the initial basic life support training. However, a number of staff were still waiting on an update refresher course. Systems and processes for the provision of urgent care for patients included the use of NHS 24 or the local out of hours' service. SPS staff would contact either HMP Perth for nursing advice, the Out of Hours GP support service or phone for an ambulance for patients who were unwell during out of hours.

9.3 Health improvement, health prevention and health promotion information and activities are available for everyone.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

All prisoners were offered screening for blood-borne virus (BBV) as part of the health screening process on transfer to the prison. Processes were in place to deliver all national and local age-appropriate immunisations and health screening. The Health Centre received letters for national screening programmes which were directed to patients to complete independently. All results received at the Health Centre were shared with the patients.

A variety of health education and health promotion information was available and displayed in patient areas, including the halls and Link Centre. Inspectors saw several patient information leaflets and posters available in a variety of formats, different languages and picture format, making them accessible to a wide range of people. The information displayed included how to make informed decisions about health, including sexual health information and risks associated with drug use.

All prisoners were offered naloxone to take home on leave and on liberation. However, inspectors found a low uptake of the injectable form and were told this was due to the stigma associated with needles. HMP Castle Huntly had plans to introduce nasal naloxone and at the time of the inspection, had a patient waiting list for this. This will be followed up at future inspections.

All transfers to HMP Castle Huntly were offered an induction session facilitated by caseworkers. It covered a focus on harm reduction and support available through the caseworkers, information on drug overdoses, naloxone and BBV. The prisoner information channel was also used to share health promotion notices.

Peer support was available through cocaine and alcoholics anonymous meetings. Details on how to attend these meetings were displayed in the halls and patients were signposted if engaged with the addictions team.

A health improvement practitioner visited the prison once a week to deliver a national smoking cessation programme. Inspectors saw leaflets on how to access support to stop smoking and nicotine replacement therapy.

All prisoners were given information about how to access sexual health services during their stay in prison and before their release. Patients can self-refer to the Health Centre for sexual health screening at any time. Information on accessing sexual health clinics in the community was discussed prior to home leave and liberation.

9.4 All stakeholders demonstrate commitment to addressing the health inequalities of prisoners.

Rating: Good performance

The healthcare staff inspectors spoke to could demonstrate an understanding of health inequalities and were knowledgeable about the potential barriers to accessing care. Staff demonstrated a respectful and professional approach to all patients whilst maintaining confidentiality. They were supportive and gave explanations of care to be given whilst gaining consent. For example, at medication rounds staff took opportunities to support patients raising other healthcare concerns.

Inspectors saw evidence that staff were directed to NHS Tayside's electronic learning platform where modules on equality and diversity were available. These form part of mandatory training requirements and inspectors were provided with the evidence of compliance of mandatory training. Staff they spoke to were aware of the Equality Act 2010 and could signpost them to where the up to date policies could be found on the staff intranet.

Planning for transfer to HMP Castle Huntly takes place in advance. Healthcare staff are therefore aware of any barriers or potential barriers for patients accessing care. A person-centred approach to planning was in place. This was supported by the Occupational Therapy Team who conduct familiarisation visits with complex prisoners to aid the transition in to open conditions. The team were also involved in liberation planning and through care as part of the multi-disciplinary team, this is good practice. The occupational therapy service was invaluable in HMP Castle Huntly. Planning also included identification of literacy and numeracy needs and any barriers in communication. The availability of the interpretation service was well signposted within the Health Centre and residential areas.

Good practice 13: The Occupational Therapy Team conduct familiarisation visits and liberation planning.

9.5 Everyone with a mental health condition has access to treatment equitable to that available in the community, and is supported with their wellbeing throughout their stay in prison, on transfer and on release.

Rating: Generally acceptable performance

A validated assessment tool was used to assess the mental health needs of people referred to or referring themselves to mental health services. This included an assessment of the patient's mental state, gathering their history, psychosocial factors, identification of risks, formulation of presenting problem and recommendation for care intervention. A risk assessment was included in the initial assessment.

Vision records showed that patients were fully involved in their assessment and had the opportunity to discuss the purpose and outcome of the assessment. The risks and benefits of any treatment or intervention offered were discussed with patients, to allow them to make informed choices about their care. The patient care plans

reviewed were comprehensive and had individual person-centred outcomes, jointly developed with the patient which reflected their goals. Patients on the mental health caseload had regular reviews where they were able to discuss and review their care. Patient reviews were recorded using an SBAR approach. Whilst the reviews recorded relevant updates to a patient's mental state and changes to treatment plans, the records of the reviews for patients at risk of self-harm or suicide were inconsistently documented. This is a concern.

The multi-disciplinary Mental Health Team (MDT) consisted of mental health nurses, psychologists and a consultant psychiatrist. A mental health nurse was available to attend HMP Castle Huntly once a week and the psychiatrist once a month. However, access to the MDT can be increased based on clinical need. This level of service delivery was deemed to be appropriate to the population and needs of patients at HMP Castle Huntly. The team had access to other specialists as required, to provide clinical input for patients with conditions such as, autistic spectrum disorder and cognitive impairment.

Inspectors were told that the fortnightly MDT meetings had been discontinued. They observed there was no attendance from the Mental Health Team at the daily healthcare team handovers, this was initially concerning. However, inspectors were assured that this decision was made based on the low number of patients on the mental health caseload. The clinical lead for the team (consultant forensic psychiatrist) and a mental health nurse were available, as and when required, to discuss patient allocation, assessments and reviews. Collaborative MDT working was evident through reviewing patient care records on vision.

A range of therapies and treatments, appropriate for the patient population, were provided within the prison. Written systems, protocols and procedures were in place to describe the joint working with substance misuse and primary care services for patients with co-morbidities.

At the time of the inspection, there was no waiting list for patients at HMP Castle Huntly to see a mental health nurse or psychiatrist. Once the referral has been triaged, patients would be seen in the next weekly clinic therefore, equitable with the community. Two patients were on the psychology waiting list and patients referred to psychology were waiting 35 weeks between assessments to treatment, this exceeds national waiting times, this is a concern. Patients were made aware of the wait and could receive support from the mental health nurses or caseworkers for low level psychological interventions if required, in the interim period. The psychologist delivered psychology provision across the two prisons in NHS Tayside and the waiting times were collated. Inspectors were told that considerations were being made to separate the waiting lists, which in turn, would likely reduce the wait for patients at HMP Castle Huntly.

Systems and processes were in place to ensure that any patient requiring inpatient mental health care was assessed and transferred promptly to hospital under the Mental Health Care and Treatment (Scotland) Act 2003. In the event that a patient's mental state deteriorates and requires hospital admission, the patient would be transferred to a closed environment in the first instance for a period of assessment and then transferred to an acute hospital if required.

Robust systems and processes were in place to ensure patients requiring community follow-up on release from prison were referred to Community Mental Health Teams. Discharge summaries were provided to community teams with details of the care received during an individual's stay in prison. Support was provided by the Occupational Therapy Team and caseworkers with reintegration into the community. This was through graded exposure work, planning home leave and setting up meaningful activity in the community for patients to engage with on liberation. As highlighted in QI 9.2 HMP Castle Huntly can face challenges assuring follow up care and having community prescriptions in place when patients are liberated. For patients with no fixed abode or GP identified, the system relied on patients contacting the Health Centre to provide their address. Inspectors were told this does not routinely happen which could create the potential for a gap in continuity of care. This was a risk that HMP Castle Huntly were aware of. Inspectors will review any process developments at future inspections.

Recommendation 32: NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that all patients have a regular review of risks of self-harm and suicide that is recorded within patient care record.

Recommendation 33: NHS Tayside/HSCP should review the psychology provision to ensure national waiting times are not exceeded.

Good practice 14: Caseworkers, the nursing teams and occupational therapy work focussed on supporting individuals to reintegrate into the community by establishing links with community services and engagement in groups or meaningful activity.

9.6 Everyone with a long-term health condition has access to treatment equitable to that available in the community, and is supported with their wellbeing throughout their stay in prison, on transfer and on release.

Rating: Generally acceptable performance

Systems and processes were in place to support early identification of long-term health condition needs during the transfer process. Staff had access to Vision to record both the initial assessment as well as referring patients to other specialities. Inspectors saw the process in place for this and reviewed the entries on the Vision computer system.

Nursing staff were responsible for referring on to other primary care specialities either in paper format or by email. Appointments were organised by the administration team and documented into the Vision system. Inspectors reviewed the long-term health conditions register. They were told that nursing staff were responsible for updating the register and organising the review of these patients.

Inspectors saw care plans described as enhanced care plans on Vision and were electronically available for completion and stored on the system. A SOP was in place identifying the remit for the completion of these plans. At the time of the inspection, HMP Castle Huntly had no patients with complex needs.

Inspectors saw that a function of Vision was being used to record specific long-term health conditions, including asthma, diabetes and epilepsy. These documents were well completed with detailed clinical data. However, inspectors saw that care planning was not person-centred or outcome focused. It was not clear from the Vision entries if patients were included in conversations about their care planning. Senior staff told inspectors that the current care plans in place were being reviewed. Inspectors will follow up the progress of this work at future inspections.

When accessing the patient's Vision care record, inspectors saw there were prompts available which alerted staff to the patient's planned reviews and vaccination appointments.

Secondary care appointments were managed by the administration team. The team sends copies of the appointment letters to patients and retain a copy to be uploaded onto Vision. Patients were facilitated to attend secondary care appointments by GEOAmeY. Healthcare staff did not report any challenges with this process and reported that in the case of any delays, SPS would transport patients.

Access to opticians and dentists was provided off site. Podiatry is provided by a visiting podiatrist in the health centre. Patients were supported to be responsible for their own healthcare needs and had access to a telephone to make appointments to the Health Centre. Staff reported that patients also visit the Health Centre to make appointments. This process was in line with community provision and encourages patients to be autonomous and prepare for liberation. During the inspection, inspectors saw that any patients who had missed appointments for the nurse clinics were followed up by healthcare staff and reappointed if required.

Recommendation 34: NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that patients with long-term health conditions have individualised, person-centred care plans. The care plans must evidence that patients have had an explanation regarding their condition and have had involvement in the planning of their care needs.

Good practice 15: Prompts on Vision system alerted staff that reviews were due for patients with long-term health conditions.

9.7 Everyone who is dependent on drugs and/or alcohol receives treatment equitable to that available in the community, and is supported with their wellbeing throughout their stay in prison, on transfer and on release.

Rating: Good performance

Patients requiring support with drug and or alcohol dependence were identified at health screening on transfer to the prison or as part of health assessment. This was done with the use of a validated screening tool and documented in the patient record. Inspectors were told for the majority of transfers to HMP Castle Huntly, the pre-transfer information was received. This detailed the patient's healthcare needs including if input from the SUT was required.

Systems and processes were in place to confirm prescriptions of those transferred to the prison. The patient's medication administration record (Kardex) would be brought

to HMP Castle Huntly from the transferring prison including prescriptions for opiate replacement therapy (ORT). In the event that patients were transferred without the Kardex, a copy of the medication could be viewed on the electronic document system Docman and a new prescription would be written by the nurse prescriber or GP.

Individual support needs for patients referred to SUT were identified through an assessment process. At the time of the inspection, there was no waiting list for patients referred to SUT. All patients on the addictions caseload would also be allocated a caseworker. The addictions nurses and caseworkers work together to provide patients with evidence-based pharmacological, harm reduction and psychological interventions. These interventions include one to one work and group sessions that focus on stabilisation maintenance, detoxification programmes and/or a range of alcohol and drug avoidance strategies. Patients have access to the Links Centre which is a well decorated therapeutic environment for engagement with the caseworkers and group work.

Vision records reviewed by inspectors' evidenced individual person centred outcome-focussed care plans reflecting the support needs required, were in place for all patients. There was evidence of patient involvement in the writing of their care plans which were regularly reviewed, and kept up to date. Patients were given the opportunity to be fully involved in their assessment, which included a discussion on the benefits and risks of interventions and treatments which were available to them.

Healthcare staff and the local drug and alcohol recovery service worked together to develop a liberation referral form. This made sure the community team were receiving all relevant patient information to ensure continuity of care, **this is good practice**. Inspectors reviewed patient care records which evidenced communication and referrals to teams in the community. As part of the discharge planning process, patients will be given their community appointment time before liberation. All prisoners preparing for liberation are offered a harm reduction session that covers areas such as safety planning, overdose prevention and use of injectable naloxone. A robust standardised discharge planning protocol was in place for all planned liberations that ensured community referrals were completed.

The SUT consisted of a range of multi-disciplinary professionals including a consultant psychiatrist, addictions nurses, case workers and a non-medical prescriber (NMP). The consultant psychiatrist was the clinical lead. The team worked closely with the Occupational Therapy Team which allowed for a range of treatments and therapies to be offered to patients. The primary care nurses administered ORT to patients. A daily multidisciplinary meeting takes place where patient care, concerns and new transfers were discussed. As referenced in QI 9.5 there was no routine meeting between SUT and mental health. However, inspectors were told this takes place informally on a needs basis.

Good practice 16: NHS Tayside/HSCP developed a liberation referral form to advise the community drug and alcohol service of the patient's requirements to ensure continuity of care on liberation.

9.8 There is a comprehensive medical and pharmacy service delivered by the service.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

All patients entering HMP Castle Huntly were transfers from other prisons and had written Kardexes in place. Medicine reconciliation took place before transfer. The GP rewrites the Kardex at the earliest opportunity to align with HMP Castle Huntly's documentation, this does not delay access to medicines.

The Pharmacy Team described challenges with staffing shortages across the team. Pharmacy provision covers both prisons in NHS Tayside, HMP Perth and HMP Castle Huntly. The pharmacy assistance in HMP Castle Huntly was provided by a trained pharmacy assistant who was also a competent witness for the administration of controlled drugs. The role of competent witness was also extended to healthcare support workers. Inspectors saw evidence of the competency package in place but could not review the training records as these were stored at HMP Perth.

Access to clinical pharmacy support for both staff and patients was readily available by phone. Clinical pharmacy provision was provided by the Lloyds contract and the onsite clinical pharmacist. Both these roles were mainly being used in HMP Perth with a view to developing the Lloyds pharmacist role to support service delivery while staffing pressures continue. Previously, a polypharmacy clinic was available to patients but this was suspended due to COVID-19. Staff were keen to see this clinic reinstated when staffing allows.

Justice Healthcare hold a local multi-disciplinary Medicines Management Group bi-monthly meeting. The group is chaired by the specialist clinical pharmacist, with representation from management; NHS Tayside's controlled drugs team; pharmacy; GP; primary care; mental health; SUT teams and Lloyd's contracted pharmacy service provider. Local processes were reviewed and aligned with national guidance including that produced by the National Prisons Care Network and Prison Pharmacist Group.

Patients who are approved for home leave will receive a GP10 prescription for any medicines they require while on leave. This can be dispensed by a community pharmacy near their home leave address for use throughout their stay at home. This reduced the volume of medication in circulation at HMP Castle Huntly.

Planned liberations receive a Vision summary record, a copy of their Kardex, as well as their GP10 prescription. For unplanned liberations, the Pharmacy Team will support requests from community GPs for patients' prescribing on liberation. Liaison with a patient's preferred community pharmacy takes place, where required, to ensure a seamless supply of medication on liberation.

Inspectors participated in a medicine administration round for a small number of patients who received supervised medications. Safe systems were observed when checking stock of controlled drugs. Staff were diligent in completing the controlled drug register and entries were clear and legible. Staff were courteous during the medicines administration rounds and the appropriate safety checks were in place

before dispensing medications. All other medications were provided to patients in possession and safe storage was available in cells. A medicines contract was in place for patients, this was available for inspectors to review.

Good practice 17: Liaison with a patient's preferred community pharmacy takes place, where required, to ensure a seamless supply of medication on liberation.

9.9 Support and advice is provided to maintain and maximise individuals' oral health.

Rating: Generally acceptable performance

All dental care in HMP Castle Huntly was provided offsite at Kings Cross Health and Community Care Centre. Inspectors did not view the facility in place. Two sessions a week were ring-fenced for patients from HMP Castle Huntly. Patients requiring dental treatment were facilitated to attend appointments and transport was provided.

Out of hours' dental problems were managed by the GP out of hours' service and emergencies were managed in line with a community model. At the time of the inspection, the waiting time for a routine appointment was four weeks which was within the Scottish Government's recommended time of 10 weeks for access to routine dental treatment. Inspectors were told prior to the pandemic health promotion support was available for patients, led by the SPS. This was no longer in place and there was no obvious signposting to oral hygiene. Patients would benefit from the re-introduction of this support.

Recommendation 35: HMP Castle Huntly must reinstate the health promotion support available regarding oral health and hygiene.

9.10 All pregnant women, and those caring for babies and young children, receive care and support equitable to that available in the community, and are supported with their wellbeing throughout their stay in prison, on transfer and on release.

Rating: Not applicable

HMP Castle Huntly does not hold female prisoners.

9.11 Everyone with palliative care or end of life care needs can access treatment and support equitable to that in the community, and is supported throughout their stay in prison, on transfer and on release.

Rating: Generally acceptable performance

At the time of the inspection, no patients in the prison had been identified as having palliative or end-of-life care needs.

Inspectors were told any patients considered for transfer to HMP Castle Huntly would have had early identification of any enhanced or end of life needs and these would have been planned for. There was evidence of a positive team-working

relationship between the Prison Healthcare Team, NHS board palliative care service and community services. The Senior Nurse represented the Prisoner Healthcare Team at the NHS Tayside Palliative Care Group.

Inspectors reviewed the palliative care pathway in place. This outlined access to palliative care services and how to refer and signpost to urgent advice. Healthcare staff were familiar with this pathway. At the time of the inspection, HMP Castle Huntly had no requirement to have ACPs in place, however would benefit from developing this work in order to use them if required.

Recommendation 36: NHS Tayside/HSCP must ensure that anticipatory care plans are in place for patients with palliative and end-of-life care needs.

9.12 Everyone at risk of self-harm or suicide receives safe, effective and person-centred treatment, and support with their wellbeing throughout their stay in prison, on transfer and on release.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

On transfer into HMP Castle Huntly, every patients' risk of self-harm or suicide was assessed using a standardised health screening tool. Anyone identified as being at risk of self-harm or suicide, either on transfer or while in prison, was immediately commenced onto TTM. HMP Castle Huntly was deemed an unsuitable environment for anyone at risk of self-harm or suicide, therefore a process was in place for arrangements to be made to transfer back to closed conditions.

In the event patients were being managed on the TTM strategy, they would have their suicide and self-harm risk explored at every case conference, to inform their ongoing risk management and suitability of location at HMP Castle Huntly.

Inspectors saw evidence in Vision records of patients being fully involved in their assessment and an explanation of the purpose and outcome of their assessment. Vision records showed detailed personalised care plans reflecting individual's needs. Regular reviews took place and recorded in a SBAR format. As referenced in QI 9.5 recommendation, inspectors saw evidence of risks being recorded in the initial health screening. However regular reviews of patients on the mental health caseload risks of self-harm and suicide were not always clearly recorded at each review.

The TTM strategy could be initiated at any stage when there were concerns for an individual. All patient facing healthcare staff had undertaken SPS TTM core training.

NHS and SPS staff worked collaboratively to identify, support and review those at risk of self-harm or suicide. A weekly meeting took place with SPS discussing new transfers and reviewing their level of risk to be moved from the initial transfer wing of the prison. Inspectors were told there were positive relationships between SPS and NHS staff.

There was a process in place for patients in crisis and requiring urgent assessment. Patients could be managed on TTM until assessed to establish if it was safe for them to remain in HMP Castle Huntly.

There were no patients on TTM at HMP Castle Huntly at the time of the inspection. However, inspectors were informed that each stage of TTM process was updated on the patient record system Vision. This included the patient's identified risks and requirements to maintain their safety.

9.13 All feedback, comments and complaints are managed in line with the respective local NHS Board policy. All complaints are recorded and responded to in a timely manner.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Inspectors saw a clear and transparent process in place for patients to share feedback, comments and make formal complaints. Feedback, comments, concerns and complaint forms were available within the prison that could be posted anonymously. The post box was checked daily by the Healthcare Team. The forms were available in alternative formats and languages.

Systems and processes were in place to record all complaints received in the Health Centre along with the date of receipt to ensure they were processed and responded to within set timescales. All complaints were managed in line with general data protection regulation and confidentiality protocols. No complaints were seen to be recorded in patient records.

Complaints were managed by the healthcare service in line with NHS Tayside's Feedback and Complaints policy. The patient's relations administrator was responsible for logging all feedback on the Datix system and allocating stage 1 complaints to appropriate staff. Stage 2 complaints were managed by the complaints and feedback coordinator. Relevant training had been provided by the patient relations team. A learning log recorded all stage 2 complaints and that was shared and monitored through the Clinical and Professional Governance Group.

Information was provided at the end of each complaint response informing patients of their right to contact the SPSO if they were not satisfied with the outcome or response to their complaint. The contact details for the SPSO was available to all patients on free of charge on their phone list.

9.14 All NHS staff demonstrate an understanding of the ethical, safety and procedural responsibilities involved in delivering healthcare in a prison setting.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Staff demonstrated a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in reporting any situations which could result in physical or psychological harm to those in prison. Healthcare staff indicated that any issue requiring to be raised as a priority were recorded in the 5/5 system. Healthcare staff told inspectors that they had an open culture of communication and a good relationship with SPS colleagues.

Healthcare staff demonstrated how they would communicate with SPS staff, using a review template which was sent to the deputy governor. This among other issues

would identify patients who were causing concern. Issues were raised by the operations manager at twice weekly SPS meetings as well as at the monthly operational meeting which included SPS staff. Prisoners in HMP Castle Huntly were risk assessed for their suitability for open conditions. An RMT support was in place to review suitability of this process and the welfare of prisoners.

All nursing staff Inspectors spoke to were aware of their legal obligations for confidentiality and keeping accurate records, as part of maintaining their registration and commitment to the NMC code. All staff had their own personal access to Vision. Mandatory training requirements included adult support and protection modules.

Inspectors saw that healthcare staff completed a daily exception report which included details of any concerns regarding prisoners and documents of any staffing issues as well as a night report. This was shared with senior leadership and SPS and included details of any concerns regarding prisoners. This mode of communication was good practice and provided continuity of care for prisoners in the out of hours' period.

Good practice 18: Healthcare staff complete a daily exception report as well as a night report. This was shared with senior nurses and SPS and included details of any concerns regarding prisoners and also documents of any staffing issues. This mode of communication provided continuity of care for prisoners in the out of hours' period.

9.15 The prison implements national standards and guidance, and local NHS Board policies for infection prevention and control.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

The healthcare centre facility and clinical rooms within HMP Castle Huntly were of a good standard and were visibly fresh and clean. The fabric was intact and could be effectively decontaminated.

Inspectors saw evidence of daily cleaning schedules with senior nurse oversight and sign off. HMP Castle Huntly used an electronic system to upload audits including standard infection control audits. The Senior Nurse conducted a monthly assurance walk round. Results were added into a scorecard and were reviewed for compliance by senior staff. Results were shared through staff safety briefs. Any non-compliance would require action plans to be produced and completed. These were also shared at the HSCP IPC meetings represented by senior management.

Healthcare staff have a rolling audit programme in place which included other aspects of healthcare delivery and compliance as well as standard infection prevention and control. Trained pass men were responsible for cleaning the Health Centre areas and were visible throughout the inspection. The standard of cleanliness in HMP Castle Huntly was high. Inspectors saw evidence of the induction training pack for pass men which includes duties and responsibilities, this was signed off and stored.

The Health Centre was externally audited by NHS Tayside infection control staff using the recognised NHS Tayside environmental tool. Inspectors saw the most recent audit carried out in May 2022. This had identified a high compliance score.

Equipment was clean and ready for use and staff were knowledgeable about standard infection control precautions (SICPs). Inspectors saw good hand hygiene practice from staff. Healthcare staff could signpost inspectors to the National Infection Prevention and Control Manual through NHS Tayside's intranet platform. Inspectors saw that infection prevention control was part of staff mandatory training requirements.

PPE was readily available in clinical areas as well as signposting to hand washing. Healthcare staff were wearing masks. Inspectors were made aware that the guidance had changed for SPS officers and prisoners prior to the inspection that they no longer required to wear masks. However, guidance within healthcare settings still requires mask wearing compliance. Inspectors saw healthcare staff politely challenge staff and prisoners entering the Health Centre without wearing masks.

Good practice 19: Healthcare staff politely challenge staff and prisoners entering the Health Centre without wearing masks.

9.16 The prison healthcare leadership team is proactive in workforce planning and management. Staff feel supported to deliver safe, effective, and person-centred care.

Rating: Generally acceptable performance

Senior management told inspectors that primary care nurse staffing in HMP Castle Huntly was normally stable with two permanent primary care nurses on site. HMP Castle Huntly was experiencing short term staff shortages during the inspection and permanent staff were not available. Senior management described that HMP Castle Huntly and HMP Perth staff work closely together and staff from HMP Perth were present at the time of the inspection.

Inspectors were told that long term plans were to encourage all staff to be rotational between both prisons including the new Community Custody Unit (CCU) due to open in Dundee to support female offenders. The purpose of the CCU is to provide safe accommodation and to support the needs of women who will benefit from closer community contact and access to local services. This was to create and sustain independence in preparation for successful reintegration into the community.

Engagement was underway with staff to promote this and any future posts would be advertised as rotational. Mental health nurses, substance misuse nurses and occupational therapists provided cross cover over both sites, and attended HMP Castle Huntly when there were referrals for them. Inspectors saw evidence that waiting times were low and services were accessible. This was evidenced in very small numbers of complaints. HMP Castle Huntly mirrors a community model. Healthcare staffing was managed in line with demand for services, this can be variable and was accounted for in planning staffing rotas.

All staff described a good relationship between staff and a willingness to work across both sites. There were vacancies in all teams. Recruitment challenges are a national issue and was being experienced across the wider NHS and HSCP.

Overarching nursing and leadership support was provided by the Senior Team based in HMP Perth. Healthcare staff described their support as accessible and at the other end of the phone. Senior management support was provided from the HSCP and there was an active presence across both prisons. Inspectors participated in the daily huddle where all members of the multidisciplinary team could attend to discuss patients, staff shortages and cover required.

Healthcare staff described the staff shortages, saying they could be challenging and often last minute, making it difficult to provide cover. During the inspection, inspectors saw gaps in rotas and on one occasion there were no primary care nurses on site. Senior management told inspectors this was unusual, although HMP Castle Huntly was described as a stable population. Inspectors were concerned about the gap in nursing cover. They were told that SPS was alerted of this shortage as a priority. Communication pathways were in place between healthcare and SPS senior staff. This was evidenced in daily exception reporting as well as a night report including senior healthcare staff and SPS staff.

Inspectors were told that a contingency was in place to support patients. The process was to contact HMP Perth for medical or nursing advice, use the on call GP or call an ambulance. Inspectors raised a concern regarding the risk that this process was informal and person dependant. Inspectors were concerned that in the absence of a formalised process there was a risk of communication breakdown leaving both staff and prisoners vulnerable.

A programme was in place to ensure all training requirements, including induction and prison-related training was completed by all staff. Inspectors could not view staff training profiles as these were held at HMP Perth. However, electronically generated reports from the Learnpro platform showed a satisfactory rate of compliance considering the continued staff shortages. Senior nursing staff told us that regular informal 1:1 meetings took place with staff. There was no structured approach to this or clinical supervision at the time of inspection, due to lack of time and resource. Senior nursing staff were keen to reinstate this formal process and inspectors were shown evidence of a new training record proforma which will include details of 1:1s and clinical supervision dates.

HMP Castle Huntly was also supported by an operational manager who covered both HMP Castle Huntly and HMP Perth, with a base at both establishments. Inspectors saw evidence of minutes of regular meetings with SPS. This platform was used to discuss staffing shortages within the healthcare team. HMP Castle Huntly was also supported by administrative staff who manage appointments for patients.

Recommendation 37: NHS Tayside/HSCP and SPS must have a recognised robust agreed protocol in place for accessing healthcare support in the absence of trained staff.

Recommendation 38: NHS Tayside/HSCP must reintroduce clinical supervision as a priority within the Healthcare Team to support staff with the sustained pressures from staffing issues.

9.17 There is a commitment from the NHS Board to the delivery of safe, effective and person-centred care which ensures a culture of continuous improvement.

Rating: Satisfactory performance

Prisoner healthcare was hosted by Perth and Kinross HSCP. The Justice Healthcare Manager had overall responsibility for prisoner healthcare and was directly accountable to the HSCP. The Operational Leadership Team supported both HMP Perth and HMP Castle Huntly and was made up of senior nurses from mental health substance use and primary care. They provided clinical care, operational and managerial support across both sites.

The team at HMP Castle Huntly was supported by an operational manager and administrative support. Inspectors saw evidence of a range of communications between the Healthcare Team and the HSCP to discuss workforce, clinical demand and the allocation of resources. Staff reported that good supportive links were in place with the HSCP.

Healthcare staff within the prison were aware of the health and social care partnership leadership structure, their roles and responsibilities for the ongoing service delivery of healthcare within the prison. There were monthly operational meetings and weekly governance meetings attended by both SPS senior management and HMP Castle Huntly staff. Staff told inspectors there was a good working relationship between SPS and healthcare staff.

Senior managers from the health and social care partnership were visible in the Health Centre during the inspection to offer support to operational staff. The adverse events system used within the prison is the Datix incident reporting system. Reports from this were visible to managers within the health and social care partnership and were discussed at the clinical governance committee meetings.

There were staff meetings in place to support learning from adverse events, these were open forums for staff to discuss any concerns. Inspectors were told this was not common at HMP Castle Huntly. There was evidence of complaints forms available for patients and a feedback box for staff to make anonymous suggestions. Any suggestions were discussed at staff meetings.

Inspectors were shown scorecards in place within HMP Castle Huntly, this detailed information provided by team leaders. The scorecards were collated monthly including staffing audits and assurance. This information was stored electronically in the prisoner healthcare dashboard which was updated and discussed monthly. It was accessible to senior management for progress updates and exception reporting at the partnership clinical care and governance meeting. Operational team leaders met weekly across both sites to discuss patients and any areas of concern and were keen to focus these meetings around quality improvement. Inspectors will follow this up at future inspections. Inspectors saw evidence of a senior nurse conducting a monthly assurance walk round.

Good practice 20: Complaints forms were available for patients and a feedback box for staff to make anonymous suggestions. Any suggestions were discussed at staff meetings.



HM Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland is a member of the UK's National Preventive Mechanism, a group of organisations which independently monitor all places of detention to meet the requirements of international human rights law.

© Crown copyright 2022

You may re-use this information (excluding logos and images) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

First published by HMIPS, December 2022

ISBN: 978-1-80525-299-3

Produced for HMIPS by APS Group Scotland
PPDAS1199702 (12/22)