



HMIPS

**HM Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland
INSPECTING AND MONITORING**



**Inspection of Court Custody Provision
Glasgow Sheriff Court**

Monday, 24 February 2020

Contents

	Page
Introduction and background	3
Overview by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland	4
Standards, commentary and quality indicators	6
Standard 1: Lawful and transparent use of custody	6
Standard 2: Decency, dignity, respect and equality	9
Standard 3: Personal safety	13
Standard 4: Health, wellbeing and medical treatment	16
Standard 5: Effective, courteous and humane exercise of authority	20
Standard 6: Respect, autonomy and protection against mistreatment	22
<u>Annexes</u>	
Annex A Summary of good practice	24
Annex B Summary of recommendations	25
Annex C Inspection Team	26
Annex D Acronyms	27

Introduction and Background

This report is part of the programme of inspections of Court Custody Units (CCUs) carried out by HM 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.

The inspections of CCUs are informed by a set of Standards as set out in our document 'Standards for Inspecting Court Custody Provision in Scotland', published March 2017 which can be found at

<https://www.prisonsinspectoratescotland.gov.uk/news/standards-inspecting-court-custody-provision-scotland>

These Standards contribute positively to the effective scrutiny of court custody provision in Scotland, and will encourage continuous improvement in the quality of care and custody of people held in court cells.

The Standards 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. This report is set out to reflect the performance against these Standards.

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

- obtaining information and documents from the Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service (SCTS) and the court inspected;
- shadowing and observing staff as they perform their duties within the CCU;
- interviewing prisoners and staff on a one-to-one basis;
- inspecting a wide range of facilities impacting on both prisoners and staff; and
- reviewing policies, procedures and performance reports

The information gathered facilitates the compilation of a complete analysis of the CCU against the Standards used. A written record of the evidence gathered is produced by those undertaking the inspection. This consists of a detailed narrative against each of the Standards inspected.

Overview by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland

Glasgow Sheriff Court and Justice of the Peace Court is located at 1 Carlton Place, Glasgow, on the banks of the River Clyde. It is a three-storey building of large cut stone construction and was formally opened on 29 July 1986. The building houses 23 courts.

Glasgow Sherriff Court and Justice of the Peace Courts were busy on the day of the inspection with over 94 people in custody, 72 having arrived from Police Scotland custody cells and 22 from Scottish Prison Service (SPS) establishments. Two custodies were aged under 21, one of whom was 18, and there were 13 women accommodated in the Unit.

Inspectors found the CCU to be a well-run facility, with staff that were clearly well motivated, well led and working well as a team. It was evident that individual team members supported each other, and were operating with a clear vision of what they wanted to achieve.

The CCU had 63 cells of varying sizes and construction, with women being held in a discrete area separate from men. The CCU was clean and ordered, and the good state of the Unit was only let down by the extensive graffiti, some of which Inspectors found offensive.

Staffing at the court was provided by GEOAmey and consisted of a regional manager, three supervisors and 44 core staff of both male and female officers. On the day of the inspection four members of staff were on sick leave.

Despite the Unit being busy and noisy, it was clear that staff maintained good levels of supervision and were highly visible and approachable. Staff were observed undertaking appropriate levels of supervision whilst taking account of the varied needs of those for whom they were responsible. Whilst it was clear that CCU staff took their responsibilities seriously, local management should review the consistency of the staff approach to identifying risk. On occasion, some staff did not allocate insufficient time to properly assess risk, whereas other staff were very thorough in their approach.

The management and control of Personal Escort Records (PERs) was undertaken with great diligence and care, and the details contained within them were regularly updated.

The Inspectorate welcomed the use of translation services and the evidence that every member of staff could access this for speakers of languages other than English.

A number of areas of good practice emerged during the Inspection and GEOAmey are to be commended for their secure approach to entry to the CCU, the relationships between the Scottish Legal Aid Board office and Scot Nurse. Having a Scot Nurse on site

and the presence of the Scottish Legal Aid Board office, whilst a practical arrangement for one of the busiest courts in Europe, is nonetheless considered good practice and should be replicated in other busy courts.

Wendy Sinclair-Gieben

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland

May 2020

STANDARDS, COMMENTARY AND QUALITY INDICATORS

Standard 1: Lawful and transparent use of custody

The custody service provider (“the provider”) complies with administrative and procedural requirements of the law and takes appropriate action in response to the findings and recommendations of official bodies that exercise supervisory jurisdiction over it.

Commentary

The provider ensures that all prisoners are lawfully detained. Each prisoner’s time in custody is accurately calculated; they are properly classified and allocated to cells appropriately. The provider co-operates fully with agencies which have powers to investigate matters in the custody areas.

Quality indicators

1.1 Procedures for identifying those in custody are fully complied with, and staff are proactive in assessing their understanding, needs and whether they require further support in order to understand basic information.

Inspectors observed that all custodies were brought through a secure door from the drop-off area by GEOAmey custody vehicle staff into the CCU reception. The custodies were then formally identified by one of the three CCU desk officers.

At this point, the custodies were released from handcuffs and searched. The desk officer was observed asking the custodies to confirm their name and date of birth, for comparison against their Personal Escort Record (PER) and computer record. They were also asked if they had or wished a solicitor to be informed of their attendance.

Once their identification had been confirmed, a photograph was taken and added to the computer system before they were placed in a cell.

Glasgow CCU had a dedicated Scottish Legal Aid Board office within the cell area, with two members of staff. This is the only CCU in Scotland to provide this service instigated because of the volume of custodies, and has been there for over 20 years. It is the responsibility of the Scottish Legal Aid Board staff to speak with every custody to ensure they have legal representation, and if a custody does not have their own solicitor they will secure a duty solicitor for them. In addition, they may make essential telephone calls on behalf of custodies to assist them upon their release. The Scottish Legal Aid Board staff confirmed that they had a good working relationship with GEOAmey, and exchanged information to assist custodies when and if required. This is seen as good practice.

1.2 Personal Escort Record (PER) forms are accurately populated and all relevant sections are completed.

A selection of PER forms belonging to adult male, adult female and custodies under 21 were examined by Inspectors. All were found to have been completed correctly and accurately, documenting the custodies classification, vulnerabilities, medical issues, dependencies, if an interpreter was required and the cell sharing risk

assessment (CSRA). Handcuff risk assessments (HRAs) were also recorded on the PER forms and the time of arrival at the CCU.

It was noted that all further information pertaining to the custody, generated whilst within the CCU, was recorded by staff on the PER forms located outside the cell belonging to that particular custody. This is in contrast to other CCUs, where this information is stored electronically on the GEOAmey IT system rather than the PER. This was considered pragmatic given the high volume of custodies experienced at Glasgow CCU.

1.3 A CSRA is carried out on arrival, taking account of individual characteristic (including gender, vulnerability, security risk, state of mental health or personal medical condition) and individuals are then allocated to an appropriate cell.

On arrival at the CCU, Inspectors followed a selection of custodies and staff on their short journey from the Court Custody Vehicle (CCV) to the CCU reception desk.

Staff were observed to be friendly and encouraged dialogue with the custodies, by asking them questions to assess their welfare and about how they were feeling generally. This was carried out in a relaxed, calm and controlled manner, allowing the staff to update the desk officer of any potential issues.

It was observed by Inspectors that on arrival at the CCU the series of set questions to determine any medical, mental health issues, dependencies or diversity and equality views were asked in different ways, some more effectively than others. For example, some staff asked the questions in a clear and concise manner whilst walking with the custody, thereby obtaining a good understanding of the answers and any associated risks. Others were seen to wait until reaching the door and quickly asking the questions, whilst pointing at the list of risks on a piece of paper attached to the rear of the door. Some asked custodies to read this list and inform them if any applied to them, which is a clear issue if a custody cannot read or understand what is being asked of them.

It is essential that this information is accurately documented as together with intelligence on index offences, risk, known enemies, gender, and age and PER markers it allows for the better management of risk within the CCU.

It was established that cell allocations had already been identified prior to arrival, based on the information provided by the GEOAmey IT system and information received from both Police Scotland and the Scottish Prison Service (SPS). Staff confirmed that if an issue was identified with a custody in respect of the series of set questions, the desk officer would immediately be informed to allow a review of the CSRA.

Any new information or incidents occurring whilst within the CCU were added to the GEOAmey computer system and the PER itself, for onward information to the receiving prison.

CCU staff informed Inspectors that they telephoned the prison before the prisoner departed if there were serious issues, that is threat to life, self-harm or possible suicide. However, this could not be verified by Inspectors as it was not observed in practice.

A young person arrived at the CCU from Police custody who was under 18 years old. Inspectors found that after the CSRA had been carried out he was placed in a cell with three adults. When questioned about this, the desk staff informed Inspectors that it was an established protocol within Glasgow CCU for under 18 year olds to be placed with mainstream adult custodies until they were convicted. Only then would they be placed in a cell separate from other custodies.

Inspectors brought this to the attention of the GEOAmeY staff and a member of the SPS monitoring team who was in attendance informed them that this was unacceptable. The Monitor escalated this to GEOAmeY and the young person was placed in his own cell awaiting their court appearance.

QUALITY INDICATOR	GOOD PRACTICE	RELEVANT AGENCY
1.1	The presence of a dedicated Scottish Legal Aid Board office provides an excellent service in respect of a custody's representation in court.	SCTS GEOAmeY Scottish Legal Aid

QUALITY INDICATOR	RECOMMENDATIONS	RELEVANT AGENCY
1.3	The manner in which the series of set questions to identify risk are asked by staff on the way into the CCU must be consistent, robust and clear to understand.	GEOAmeY
1.3	Those under 21 years of age must be kept separate from adults. Those under 18 must be kept separate from all other custodies.	GEOAmeY

Standard 2: Decency, Dignity, Respect and Equality

The custody areas should meet the basic requirements of decency and all prisoners within custody areas are treated with dignity and respect, irrespective of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex and sexual orientation.

Commentary

All custody areas should be of adequate size for the number of persons they are used to detain, well maintained, clean and hygienic and have adequate lighting. Each prisoner should have access to toilets, be provided with necessary toiletries, and offered a nutritious meal. These needs should be met in ways that promote each prisoner's sense of personal and cultural identity and self-respect.

Quality indicators

2.1 The custody areas should be appropriately equipped and constructed for their intended use and be maintained to an appropriate standard.

The CCU at Glasgow Sheriff Court was a relatively modern facility, built in July 1986. It was built to meet the needs of all those attending court, regardless of their age, gender or mobility. The CCU and the cells were well lit by artificial lighting and maintained to a good working order.

There was good access to the court rooms using stairs, and a lift was available if required. The corridors were wide enough to facilitate wheelchairs and were free from obstruction.

All cell doors operated adequately, opening outwards, and all locks and viewing hatches found to be in good working order. None of the cells were fitted with emergency call buttons.

There were 12 closed cells that were largely used to house custodies arriving from a prison establishment. The walls, ceilings, floors and doors on the closed cells were seen to be badly vandalised with graffiti, some of which was mildly offensive. The walls in almost all of the remaining cells were badly vandalised, and the paint was stained and peeling off in places.

There were no dedicated observation cells. If an observation cell was required a choice of open fronted cells were available. They varied in size and as such a larger number of custodies who required to be observed could be accommodated in one cell, providing a reduction on staff demand. If a closed cell was required to be used as an observation cell a hatch would be left open with a dedicated member of staff outside.

On the day of inspection, Inspectors found a separate area leading from the main CCU cell area with four large open fronted cells covered by CCTV. One of these cells was being used as a constant observation cell with a member of staff positioned outside. There were six custodies being observed in this cell.

Inspectors observed that it was routine for custodies to be placed four in a cell but the size of the cells made it a cramped experience. The majority of the cells had a bench on each side just long enough for a custody to lie on. It was observed that when a custody was lying on each of the benches the other two custodies had to sit on the floor. It was clear that this encouraged a pecking order, with the more dominant custodies utilising the benches. This situation could have been avoided by either staff challenging the custodies or using additional cell spaces. At the time of the inspection there were a number of cells that were not being used that could have reduced the numbers in each of the cells.

2.2 Good levels of cleanliness and hygiene are observed throughout the custody areas ensuring procedures for the prevention and control of infection are followed.

For the volume of custodies and general size of the CCU, it was of a good standard of cleanliness throughout. Inspectors were informed that SCTS cleaning staff attended the CCU every evening and provided a power wash of the drains and floors every weekend. However, there was not a record of cleaning or maintenance kept and held within the CCU.

There was evidence of good processes in place to deal with body fluid spillages and other biohazard incidents. The CCU manager reported that in the event of such incidents, CCU staff were aware that in the first instance the cleaning team from the SCTS would be contacted to deal with any such spillages. A contract was in place if there was a requirement to deploy specialist cleaning, for example where a dirty campaign had taken place. There were clear instructions to staff on how to isolate the area and who to contact for assistance. In urgent cases CCU staff could expect specialist cleaning staff to attend within 15 minutes which is excellent.

Cells were checked on a daily basis and conditions recorded. Custodies were not seen to be informed by staff on arrival of the required standard to be met in each cell, and that where damage or graffiti was caused during the custody's stay the police would be contacted.

After discussing the level of graffiti in the CCU with the CCU manager, it was agreed that it was currently almost impossible to identify new damage to a cell and therefore challenging to report a custody for causing damage. Staff, however, confirmed that should a custody be identified as causing damage, they would be offered the choice of cleaning the graffiti or involving the police. If any damage was caused by a custody from the SPS, a report was prepared by the CCU manager to accompany that custody back to prison for consideration of a disciplinary report.

2.3 All custodies have access to suitable toileting facilities on request.

It was good to see that no cells within the CCU were fitted with urinals and that all custodies had access to toileting facilities situated out with the cells. The CCU had one large male toilet that was also utilised as a disabled toilet. This consisted of a large room with eight toilet cubicles along one wall, but no doors fitted for privacy. The sinks were positioned opposite the cubicles, further reducing privacy for toilet users. This was deemed by the Inspectors as unacceptable.

Toilet rolls were available and instead of soap a hand sanitiser was offered. Two electric hand dryers were situated within the toilet and were readily available, although only one was operational. All facilities were of a good standard and clearly cleaned on a daily basis.

It was found that there was no dedicated disabled toilet. It was observed however that the toilet situated at cell 53 could easily be converted to a dedicated disabled toilet by fitting handrails.

Female custodies had their own cell area away from the main male cell area. The toilet within this area was found to be of a good standard and clearly cleaned on a daily basis. Inspectors enquired as to the process for female custodies requesting sanitary products, and were advised that they were provided without delay on request. In addition, there was a poster on the wall of the toilet informing of the sanitary products available. A sanitary bin was located within the toilet.

Further toileting facilities were available if required in nearby courts.

2.4 All meals provided to custodies are well presented, nutritious, varied, conform to dietary, religious, cultural or medical requirements and are served at the appropriate temperature.

Lunches were observed being served on the day of the inspection. They were prepared in the canteen in the main court building and consisted of a sandwich in a sealed package, a packet of crisps, a biscuit and a drink. Staff did not handle or prepare any foodstuffs directly. There was a choice of four sandwich fillings.

Coffee and tea were not seen to be offered to custodies at any point during the day. When asked, no custody reported to Inspectors that they had received a tea or a coffee, although due to the volume of custodies this may not be practicable.

Hot food was made available for custodies who were likely to be in transit during the afternoon and considered likely to return to prison after 17:00. Inspectors observed varied types of microwave meals and dry noodles to be stored within the CCU for this purpose.

Dietary and medical requirements were catered for on request and water was seen to be provided to custodies during the inspection.

When questioned, the staff responsible for handling food informed Inspectors that they had not received any training or awareness on current environmental health legislation and associated food preparation, handling and hygiene regulations.

QUALITY INDICATOR	RECOMMENDATIONS	RELEVANT AGENCY
2.1	Graffiti on the floors, doors, walls and ceilings of the majority of cells was excessive and should be addressed. The current position made it almost impossible for CCU staff to monitor damage and take action against any custody causing damage.	SCTS

2.1	Use of every cell should be utilised to reduce the number of custodies in each cell.	GEOAmey
2.3	As a matter of urgency, doors should be fitted to the toilet cubicles to provide a degree of privacy.	SCTS
2.3	Due to a lack of a disabled toilet, cell 53 should be converted to a disabled toilet.	SCTS
2.3	The hand dryer in the male toilets should be repaired.	SCTS
2.4	All staff handling food should be trained in accordance with current Environmental Heath Legislation.	GEOAmey

Standard 3: Personal safety

All reasonable steps are taken to ensure the safety of custodies while in the custody areas.

Commentary

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

Quality indicators

3.1 The provider has in place thorough and compassionate practices to identify and care for those at risk of suicide or self-harm.

When interviewed by Inspectors, the CCU supervisor was aware of the SPS Talk to Me Strategy and was clear on what was required of staff in respect of custodies identified as being at risk of self-harm. Around three-quarters of CCU staff interviewed were aware of the SPS Talk to Me Strategy.

During the inspection, CCU staff were observed enquiring as to custodies wellbeing periodically throughout their stay, ensuring a continual awareness of risk and any changes required to levels of care and welfare.

As with previous inspections, Inspectors discovered that if staff at the CCU identify a risk or concern regarding the welfare of a custody in their care who was not returning to SPS or Police Scotland, they had no clear process with what agency they should share these concerns with before the custody was released.

3.2 The requirements of Health and Safety legislation are observed throughout the custody areas.

A full check of all aspects of health and safety and cleanliness was carried out prior to custodies arriving, and were repeated again after the last custody leaves the CCU. They were known as “Alpha” checks. Any issues that required repair or attention were reported to the SCTS for action. Inspectors viewed an accurate daily record of Alpha checks.

3.3 All activities take place according to recorded safe systems of work which are based on appropriately completed risk assessments.

The CCU staff had a comprehensive online list of operating instructions and appropriate safe systems of work. Staff had access to a range of contingency plans and informed Inspectors that they worked closely with the SCTS to develop and maintain them. The CCU held a file of Health and Safety information and checks that were regularly reviewed and updated, along with details of local induction training given to staff.

Inspectors observed that the escorting of custodies to the toilet area and to the court rooms was carried out using the appropriate number of staff required based on risk, however Inspectors observed examples of up to five custodies in the toilet area together unsupervised. Although Inspectors recognise that the numbers requiring to use the facilities throughout the day is higher than other CCUs, both the number of people in the toilet and the lack of supervision was concerning.

3.4 The attitude, behaviour and approach of staff contributes to the lowering of risk of aggression and violence, and reasonable steps are taken to minimise situations that are known to increase such behaviour. Where such situations are unavoidable, appropriate levels of supervision are maintained.

Staff were found to be professional and friendly, and looked to develop good relationships with those brought into their custody. This created a good atmosphere that undoubtedly contributed to the safety of all within the Unit. Inspectors did not observe any aggressive or violent incidents during the inspection and considering the volume of custodies this approach is to be commended.

3.5 Particular care is taken of any custody whose appearance, behaviour, background or circumstances leave them at heightened risk of harm or abuse from others.

Linked to QI 1.3, where custodies had not been properly asked the series of set questions to determine any medical, mental health issues, dependencies, diversity and equality views, risk or known enemies. By not having this information accurately recorded, it could be argued that the risk to staff is increased as they are not fully aware of any risk associated with the custody in their care. This could have consequences when exposing custodies to each other when moving them to and from court, or prejudice shown towards staff themselves depending on their gender identity, race or religion.

3.6 All allegations or incidents of mistreatment, intimidation, hate, bullying, harassment or violence must be recorded and investigated by a person of sufficient independence with any findings being acted upon by management.

Inspectors did not observe any aggressive or violent incidents during the inspection. When interviewed, CCU staff were able to describe a clear process for dealing with any complaints or allegations made by those held in custody. These complaints were reviewed regularly by the SPS contracts team to ensure that the process had been followed correctly, and where actions were identified they were implemented. The CCU supervisor informed Inspectors that when an allegation relating to a potential crime was made it was referred immediately to Police Scotland.

There appeared to be a good working relationship between the CCU staff and Police Scotland which was enhanced by both being located in the same building.

3.7 There is an appropriate set of readily available contingency plans for managing emergencies and unpredictable events and staff are adequately trained in the roles they adopt in implementing the plans.

Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans showed that the main exit from the CCU during an emergency was via the entrance to the CCU, from the holding area for the

CCVs. This exit route was deemed as appropriate by the Inspectors. An additional exit was available via the front entrance to the court.

Fire drills were the responsibility of the SCTS and a full evacuation test was carried out annually. An evacuation chair was seen to be present on the stairwell.

All staff were fully trained on the evacuation process and all were fully qualified Fire Wardens. The evacuation routes were clearly displayed on the walls of the CCU.

The Fire Evacuation Plan was viewed and found to be in order.

QUALITY INDICATOR	RECOMMENDATIONS	RELEVANT AGENCY
3.1	All staff within the CCU should have knowledge of the SPS Talk to Me Strategy and how it links in with the CCU process and procedures.	GEOAmey
3.1	Where GEOAmey identify a concern for a prisoner who is about to be released from their care, there needs to be a clear process in place for staff to share their concerns with the appropriate agency prior to release.	GEOAmey

Standard 4: Effective, courteous and humane exercise of authority

The implementation of security and supervisory duties is balanced by courteous and humane treatment of custodies in the CCU.

Commentary

Procedures relating to perimeter, entry and exit security, and the personal safety, searching, supervision and escorting of custodies are implemented effectively. The level of security and supervision is proportionate to the risks presented at any given time.

Quality indicators

4.1 Court custody staff discharge supervisory and security duties courteously and in doing so respect the individuals given circumstances.

Inspectors observed the CCU staff to carry out their duties courteously and in a respectful manner, whilst maintaining an acceptable level of authority. Staff were seen to work well as a team and individually were clear in how to carry out their given roles and responsibilities.

4.2 The systems and procedures for the movement, transfer and release of custodies are implemented effectively and courteously.

When custodies were required to attend court or interviews with their legal representatives, or to go to the toilet, this was done in a controlled fashion. Any custody out of their cell was seen to be accompanied by a member of staff at all times, and the movement between areas was monitored to maintain safety. Due to the volume of custodies, it was not possible to allow only one custody out of their cell at a time.

Inspectors witnessed the release of a custody from the CCU. The custody was released within one hour of receiving their paperwork and the court decision was recorded on the PER and GEOAmey computer system. The release conditions were confirmed before the custody was released, initially by the desk officer and again by a supervisor. The custody was released adequately clothed and fit to travel, in possession of their property and with sufficient funds to travel if required.

All legal paperwork including PERs and warrants were seen to be checked by a manager, who informed Inspectors that contact was always made with the originating prison to confirm there were no outstanding warrants on the system prior to release.

Custodies were seen by Inspectors to be checked against the court list, PER form and photograph before confirming property. Property was signed for by the prisoner acknowledging receipt.

4.3 The systems and procedures for access and egress of visitors to the CCU are implemented effectively and courteously. There is adequate accommodation to facilitate such visitors.

To enter the CCU, visitors were required to identify themselves verbally at a locked gate to be then allowed entry to a secure sterile holding area in front of a CCU desk, where identification and the reason for the visit was determined. The visitor then waits within this sterile area until they are permitted entry to the CCU to engage in their business. This was a good structured systematic approach to security and worked well.

There were two agency interview rooms in the female area of the CCU. They consisted of a standard set up of fixed chairs facing each other over a fixed table. The rooms were very small with little room for manoeuvre. Inspectors felt, given the layout, that it could be unsafe for solicitors or agency workers speaking to a custody alone within the rooms.

There were seven agency interview rooms in the main cell area of the CCU. They were divided by glass partitions and were of good quality and fit-for-purpose. During the inspection almost all were in constant use. It was noted that there were a further four such interview rooms in the public corridor running adjacent to the CCU that were not being utilised.

Inspectors interviewed some solicitors operating within the court who reported that they had a good working relationship with CCU staff. They said they felt safe operating within the CCU but spent a lot of time waiting on an interview room to become free. The solicitors were aware that there were four more interview rooms not being used and it was suspected that this was due to the need for additional GEOAmev staff to facilitate the movement of custodies.

4.4 Systems and procedures for monitoring the movement and activities of individuals inside the CCU are implemented effectively, and accurately recorded on the appropriate system.

Within the CCU, there was CCTV coverage that recorded onto a hard drive held by SCTS. There were no CCTV cameras found in any of the cells, but there was good coverage in the cell passage area and the corridors leading to the CCU and to the courtrooms. Some of the larger open fronted cells that were used for constant custody observation had a CCTV camera to the front covering within the cell. A large bank of screens were located in the CCU office for staff to monitor. Inspectors found the cameras to be well positioned and did not impact on the privacy of any persons. CCTV was found to be subjected to daily checks and was in good working order.

4.5 The law concerning the searching of a custody and their property in the custody areas is implemented thoroughly.

As with all other inspections, custodies property was received at the CCU in sealed bags with a corresponding numbered tag. As per process, the number was checked against the PER document and stored.

Inspectors observed custodies arriving at the CCU being searched by CCU staff. The rub down searches were carried out adequately, with due regard to the individuals privacy and dignity and by staff of the same gender.

The CCU had a separate self-contained cell area for female custodies. This was an excellent facility that provided a safe sterile area for staff and custodies.

When a female custody arrived at the CCU, their identity was confirmed but they remained in handcuffs whilst the desk officer asked them to confirm their name and date of birth for comparison against their PER and computer record. The custody was then led to the female cell area to have the handcuffs removed and searched away from general gaze.

4.6 Physical force and restraints are only used when necessary, and strictly in accordance with the law and the service provider's' control and restraint guidance.

Handcuff risk assessments were documented appropriately on the PER forms. Custodies were seen only to be handcuffed when they left the CCU to go to court or to and from transport.

Inspectors did not observe the use of physical force or restraint by staff during the inspection, however they viewed the last two Control and Restraint reports. One of the forms was completed well with good quality statements, the pro-forma form was completed accurately and the Scot Nurse medical report was attached and well documented. The second report dated 20 February 2020 was of poor quality. Staff statements had not been completed before terminating duty, and they had still to be completed when viewed by Inspectors four days later. A badge number was missing for one of the key witnesses and the Scot Nurse medical report was not completed. The report had not been signed by a GEOAmev supervisor.

Inspectors discussed with staff the process to follow when carrying out the planned removal of a custody. Inspectors were informed that the camera and Personal Protective Equipment required to carry out this task was stored in the GEOAmev manager's office. On checking, there were three personal protective equipment packages, however, there should be four as Control and Restraint requirements can demand up to a four person team to execute a planned removal.

4.7 Any custody's personal property, valuables and cash are recorded, stored and released appropriately.

The main storage area for custodies property was located safely within the main CCU office, near to a supervisor and other permanently positioned staff. It consisted of large cabinets each containing a number of property bags. It was noted, however, that only half of the lockers had working locks.

There were small lockable cabinets positioned underneath the main desk for valuable items, with the keys being held by the desk officer.

Inspectors observed property being returned to custodies by staff on release. This was done in a methodical way and the property was signed for by the custody. Staff

were able to inform Inspectors of the process to follow should property be alleged to have gone missing or a complaint was made.

QUALITY INDICATOR	RECOMMENDATIONS	RELEVANT AGENCY
4.3	The additional agency interview rooms located in the corridor should be utilised when the CCU has a high volume of custodies to improve the service provided to custodies.	GEOAmey
4.6	There should be four Personal Protective Equipment packages within the CCU.	GEOAmey
4.6	Control and Restraint forms should be completed at the end of the removal before staff leave the area, managed and checked by a supervisor to ensure compliance.	GEOAmey
4.7	The storage cabinets for property belonging to custodies should be lockable at all times.	SCTS

QUALITY INDICATOR	GOOD PRACTICE	RELEVANT AGENCY
4.3	The process for visitors entering the CCU was a structured and systematic approach to security.	GEOAmey SCTS
4.5	A separate self-contained cell area for female custodies allowed for a safer discrete environment.	GEOAmey SCTS

Standard 5: Respect, autonomy and protection against mistreatment

Staff treat all custodies respectfully. A custody's right to statutory protections and the complaints processes are also respected.

Commentary

Staff engage with custodies respectfully, positively and constructively. Custodies are kept informed about the progress of their court case and are treated humanely and with understanding.

Quality indicators

5.1 Relationships between staff and custodies are respectful. The use of disrespectful language or behaviour is not tolerated from staff or those in custody.

CCU staff discharged all of their supervisory and security duties courteously and respectfully, and in a professional manner. Inspectors observed the CCU staff engaging with custodies in a supportive manner, taking into account individual circumstances. The CCU staff worked well as a team and supported each other when carrying out their duties. They were well aware of what was expected of them as custody officers.

5.2 Staff ensure all custodies rights to confidentiality are in place.

When required to speak to any custody regarding a private matter, CCU staff ensured this was carried out in a confidential manner. Custodies were able to speak to their legal and agency representatives within dedicated rooms.

There were notices at the admission desk covering the most common languages spoken by custodies, which explained protected characteristics and the risk of sharing cells. These posters were also present in the female cell area. Inspectors enquired as to how CCU staff communicated with custodies who had little or no English. Inspectors were informed that GEOAmey subscribe to a language line that every CCU now has full access to.

5.3 Staff ensure all custodies rights to statutory protection are in place.

Inspectors found no circumstances that required statutory protection or for the need for any of the custodies to be separated in the CCU or during transit.

5.4 Those in custody are kept well informed about the progress of their court case.

Inspectors observed CCU staff engaging well with custodies in a supportive manner, taking into account their personal circumstances. The majority of custodies that Inspectors spoke to stated that they were not aware of the progress of their court case, however staff were seen to answer any questions they had.

5.5 The complaints processes works well.

Inspectors did not observe the complaints process being used, but noted posters on the walls throughout the CCU explaining how to complain should a custody be required to do so, and complaint forms were available on request. In addition, staff were able to evidence the knowledge required to handle complaints.

QUALITY INDICATOR	RECOMMENDATIONS	RELEVANT AGENCY
5.4	The CCU staff should update all custodies on the progress of their court case at regular intervals.	GEOAmey

Standard 6: Health, wellbeing and medical treatment

All reasonable steps are taken to ensure the health and wellbeing of custodies while in the CCU, and appropriate and timeous medical treatment is available when required.

Commentary

Where it is necessary to do so, custodies should receive treatment that takes account of all relevant NHS standards, guidelines and evidence-based treatments.

Quality indicators

6.1 Any treatment provided in custody must be undertaken by an appropriately qualified professional and meet accepted standards and timescales.

The CCU staff can access medical services through a recognised service provider called Scot Nurse.

Due to the volume of custodies at Glasgow CCU, a member of Scot Nurse Staff was stationed in the CCU all day Monday and between the hours of 10:00 and 12:00 every other weekday. Out with these times, staff reported that a request for their attendance was almost always met within one hour.

If any control or restraint procedures needed to be carried out, staff informed Inspectors that they would notify Scot Nurse as a matter of course and document it appropriately.

Inspectors viewed a number of PER forms relating to custodies who requested medical attention. They were accurately updated with treatment times and type and it was noted that attendance was usually within minutes due to a Scot Nurse Staff member being on the premises.

6.2 There should be at least one staff member trained in emergency first aid on duty in the CCU at any given time.

All CCU staff were required to complete a three day first aid training course. This was managed centrally, and if any staff member fell out of competency they were removed from custody facing duties. The CCU manager confirmed to Inspectors that all staff on duty were qualified and within their competency dates. A good example was found regarding a member of staff who was deployed in a non-prisoner facing role, as on returning from sick leave she had a temporarily expired first aid refresher qualification. CCU staff were aware that there was a defibrillator located in the building and there was a notice on the office wall directing staff to it.

6.3 Prescribed medication is accurately documented on PER forms and staff are aware of procedures for dispensing.

Where custodies were on prescribed medication, they were provided with it by CCU staff or if necessary Scot Nurse staff. If there was any doubt regarding frequency, appropriate checks were made first with Police Scotland and the relevant prison.

Any newly prescribed medication by Scot Nurse was found to be accurately documented on the PER forms.

QUALITY INDICATOR	GOOD PRACTICE	RELEVANT AGENCY
6.1	The presence of a member of Scot Nurse on the premises on a Monday morning and at key times during the week provides an excellent standard.	GEOAmey
6.2	Signage on the walls giving direction to the nearest defibrillator should be found in every CCU.	GEOAmey SCTS

Summary of good practice:

QUALITY INDICATOR	GOOD PRACTICE	RELEVANT AGENCY
1.1	The presence of a dedicated Scottish Legal Aid Board office provides an excellent service in respect of a custody's representation in court.	SCTS GEOAmey Scottish Legal Aid
4.3	The process for visitors entering the CCU is a structured and systematic approach to security.	GEOAmey SCTS
4.5	A separate self-contained cell area for female custodies allows for a safer environment.	GEOAmey SCTS
6.1	The presence of a member of Scot Nurse on the premises on a Monday morning and key times during the week provides an excellent standard.	GEOAmey
6.2	Signage on the walls giving direction to the nearest defibrillator should be found in every CCU.	GEOAmey SCTS

Summary of recommendations:

QUALITY INDICATOR	RECOMMENDATION	RELEVANT AGENCY
1.3	The manner in which the series of set questions to identify risk asked by staff on the way in to the CCU must be more robust and clearer to understand.	GEOAmey
1.3	Those under 21 years of age must be kept separate from adults. Those under 18 must be kept separate from all other custodies.	GEOAmey
2.1	Graffiti on the floors, doors, walls and ceilings of the majority of cells is excessive and should be addressed. The current position makes it almost impossible for CCU staff to monitor damage and take action against any custody causing damage.	SCTS
2.1	Use of every cell should be utilised to reduce the number of custodies in each cell.	GEOAmey
2.3	As a matter of urgency, doors should be fitted to the toilet cubicles to provide a degree of privacy.	SCTS
2.3	Due to a lack of a disabled toilet, cell 53 should be converted to a disabled toilet.	SCTS
2.3	A hand dryer in the male toilets is defective.	SCTS
2.4	Staff should be able to evidence they are competent in food handling skills in accordance with current Environmental Heath Legislation.	GEOAmey
3.1	All staff within the CCU should have knowledge of the SPS Talk To Me Strategy and how it links in with the CCU process and procedures.	GEOAmey
3.1	Where GEOAmey identify a concern for a prisoner who is about to be released from their care, there needs to be a clear process in place for staff to share their concerns with the appropriate agency prior to release.	GEOAmey
4.3	The additional agency interview rooms located in the corridor should be utilised when the CCU has a high volume of custodies to improve the service provided to custodies.	GEOAmey
4.6	There should be four Personal Protective Equipment packages within the CCU.	GEOAmey

4.6	Control and Restraint forms should be completed without delay and be managed by a supervisor to ensure compliance.	GEOAmey
4.7	The storage cabinets for property belonging to custodies should be lockable at all times.	GEOAmey
5.4	The CCU staff should update all custodies on the progress of their court case at regular intervals.	GEOAmey

Inspection Team

Calum McCarthy, HMIPS
Graeme Neill, HMIPS

Acronyms

CCTV	Closed circuit television
CCU	Court Custody Unit
CCV	Court Custody Van
CSRA	Cell Sharing Risk Assessment
HMIPS	HM Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland
HRA	Handcuff Risk Assessment
NPM	National Preventive Mechanism
OPCAT	Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
PER	Prisoner Escort Record
SCTS	Scottish Courts and Tribunal Service
SPS	Scottish Prison Service



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

<http://www.nationalpreventivemechanism.org.uk/>

© Crown copyright 2020

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 <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: **psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk**.

This document is available on the HMIPS website
<https://www.prisonsinspectoratescotland.gov.uk/>

First published by HMIPS, May 2020

HM Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland
Room Y.1.4
Saughton House
Broomhouse Drive
Edinburgh
EH11 3XD
0131-244-8482