



**HMIPS**

HM Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland  
INSPECTING AND MONITORING

**Inspection of the Court Custody Provision,  
Hamilton Sheriff Court.**

**3 September 2018**

## Contents

---

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Introduction and background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Overview by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Standards, commentary and quality indicators</b>	<b>6</b>
Standard 1: Lawful and transparent use of custody	
Standard 2: Decency, dignity, respect and equality	
Standard 3: Personal safety	
Standard 4: Health, wellbeing and medical treatment	
Standard 5: Effective, courteous and humane exercise of authority	
Standard 6: Respect, autonomy and protection against mistreatment	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Good practice</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Annex A    Inspection Team</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Annex B    Acronyms</b>	<b>22</b>

## 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 several 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.prisonssinspectoratescotland.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 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 Standard inspected.

## Overview by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland

Hamilton Sheriff Court's Custody Unit (CCU) was inspected on a busy Monday morning, with 42 people in custody. Twenty-five had arrived from Police Scotland custody cells and 17 from Scottish Prison Service (SPS) establishments.

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. The staff discharged their duties courteously and in a respectful manner, whilst maintaining an acceptable level of authority. It was evident that they worked as a team, and each member was confident and competent in their given role. The individual team members supported each other, and were operating with a clear vision of what they wanted to achieve. Inspectors observed good interaction between prisoners and the CCU staff. On arrival of all prisoners, CCU staff adapted their style and approach where necessary. At all times they were friendly and open, and demonstrated calm authority and control.

The admission process observed was sound; those in custody were identified using the appropriate information. Personal Escort Record's (PER) were well documented and contained the appropriate information to allow CCU staff to identify risks and offer additional support where necessary. Where CCU staff were unsure about any additional support required, they contacted the appropriate agencies. Although the CCU did not have a safer cell, staff utilised the cell closest to their desk and our observations indicated it was used appropriately.

Although CCU staff were constantly on hand to assist and care for those in the CCU, the fabric of the holding cells did little to encourage interaction between staff and prisoners. The doors of the holding cells were solid and had a hatch that remained in the closed position unless opened by staff to communicate. This would benefit from some modernisation to encourage observation and communication.

It was also noted that some cells had blind spots where staff could not fully view the activities of prisoners.

The holding cells were clean with some areas in need of some painting, and there was some graffiti on the walls and ceilings. CCU staff reported that the court responded to issues around health and safety in a timely manner.

The movement of prisoners from the CCU to some off the courtrooms required the prisoner to walk through public areas. This is not conducive to ensuring the separation of prisoners and members of the public, and as such may impact upon the security and safety of CCU staff, prisoners and the public. CCU staff conducted dynamic risk assessments prior to entering these areas, with a Police Scotland presence minimising the risk.

Toilet facilities were in the main clean and positioned out with the holding cells, with easy access to hand towels and toilet paper. However, for those with reduced mobility there were no disabled toilet. The only available disabled toilet was located in the court reception area, posing an unnecessary risk.

Refreshments were readily available for all those in custody as well as meals catering to all dietary needs. Hot food was available to those likely to be held in custody after 16:00.

On reviewing access and egress to the CCU from the drop off and pick up area, it was found that it was not fit for purpose for those with reduced mobility as there were three stairs leading up to the entrance with no ramp. Those in wheel chairs were required to enter and exit through the public areas, posing an unnecessary risk.

There was Close Circuit Television (CCTV) throughout the CCU, however only one cell had CCTV fitted. This cell was used mainly for female prisoners. It was well positioned to be seen by staff, however it did not record and therefore had no playback provision. The inspectors noted that it was not actively monitored. This could be a useful resource for vulnerable people if utilised.

Wendy Sinclair-Gieben  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland

9 January 2019

## STANDARDS, COMMENTARY AND QUALITY INDICATORS

### 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 cooperates fully with agencies which have powers to investigate matters in the custody areas.**

#### Quality indicators

- 1.1 Statutory procedures for identification of prisoners are fully complied with.
- 1.2 All prisoners are classified and this is recorded on the Personal Escort Record (PER) form.
- 1.3 All prisoners are allocated to a custody location dependent on their classification, gender, vulnerability, security risk, state of mental health or personal medical condition.
- 1.4 A cell sharing risk assessment is carried out prior to each individual prisoner’s allocation to a cell.

## Inspection findings

On arrival at the CCU, prisoners were asked to stand in front of an officer at the reception desk to establish their identity, by confirming their name and date of birth. This was then checked against the PER and the information held on the G4S database, which was used to record all relevant prisoner information. Their photograph was also taken and saved onto the database.

In addition to the information contained on the PER, staff also asked prisoners a series of set questions, including their views on equality and diversity matters. This information was utilised to help identify any risk factors that may be relevant and to mitigate any risks of interpersonal conflict, prior to making a final decision on which holding area to locate them within. This initial identification and risk evaluation process was undertaken appropriately, and with sufficient privacy to encourage open and honest responses. The cell sharing risk assessment process was thorough and undertaken with care and consideration.

Inspectors observed good interaction between prisoners and the CCU staff. The staff shared information in a clear and concise way, disseminating any issues identified by prisoners to fellow colleagues. First Line Managers (FLMs) were visible and appeared to always be in control. CCU staff were clear in identifying new prisoners, and relaying any information on negative attitudes and behaviours observed during travel to and from the court. **The inspection team saw this as good practice.**

Inspectors witnessed the arrival of all prisoners, and CCU staff adapted their style and approach where necessary. They were friendly and open, but when required to do so they demonstrated calm authority and control.

It was noted that CCU staff searched prisoners thoroughly each time they were moved between cells, moved for court appearances, visits to their legal representatives and toilet use. This practice may be specific to Hamilton CCU but it was carried out in a methodical and well-established manner. FLM's reported that using this process had enabled them to recover a number of items, including controlled drugs, which had previously been concealed on a regular basis. These finds were subsequently reported to Police Scotland.

During the inspection, staff were observed using restraint and searching techniques in a professional manner to recover illicit items from a prisoner who was seen to act suspiciously in his cell.

## 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.
- 2.2 Good levels of cleanliness and hygiene are observed throughout the custody areas ensuring procedures for the prevention and control of infection is followed.
- 2.3 All prisoners have access to toileting facilities on request.
- 2.4 The meals provided to prisoners are nutritious, varied, served at the appropriate temperature and well presented.
- 2.5 Where an individual remains in custody beyond 17:30 they should be provided with a nutritious evening meal.
- 2.6 The meals provided to each prisoner conform to any specific dietary or medical requirements and their cultural or religious needs.



## Inspection findings

Inspectors found the CCU to have some graffiti on the walls and ceilings of the holding cells, which appeared to have been there for quite some time. In addition the search area clearly required redecoration.

Staff were unaware if there was a maintenance programme in place. However, they did comment that a deep clean and repaint was requested, but to date had not been carried out.

**Recommendation: SCTS should review their maintenance programme to ensure that the CCU is maintained appropriately, and put in place a process to ensure that once identified, graffiti is removed as quickly as possible.**

CCU staff reported that the sheriff clerk's office was efficient at responding to requests for repairs to anything that may affect health and safety within the CCU.

Whilst there was no natural light within the facility, the lighting was adequate in most areas.

The movement of prisoners from the CCU to some off the court rooms involved the prisoner walking through public areas. Inspectors accompanied a prisoner on this journey and noted that they passed a number of people in different parts of the building. This is not conducive to ensuring the separation of prisoners and members of the public, and as such may impact upon the security and safety of CCU staff, prisoners and the public. The inspectors discussed this with the CCU staff who clearly demonstrated a good risk assessment process, and were seen to handle this particularly difficult situation professionally and efficiently. In addition, Police Scotland officers were highly visible within the public access areas.

The service provider had biohazard processes in place to reduce the spread of infection, particularly where they had to deal with a body fluid spillage. All equipment required to deal with such situations was available and utilised when required. Cleaning staff from the court were called upon to clean any area that had been subjected to a biohazard, and CCU staff were aware of the process to isolate a contaminated area.

The holding cells did not have internal toilet facilities. During the inspection, it was clear that prisoners wishing to use the toilet would ask a member of CCU staff, who would escort them to a toilet situated outside the holding cells. One toilet tended to be allocated for males and another one for females. The facilities were clean with toilet paper and hand towels provided for use. It is necessary to be able to view prisoners whilst using the toilet and the construction of the doors were found to be adequate to allow this, whilst also providing privacy for the prisoner.

Meals for the prisoners are supplied by the canteen situated in the Sheriff Court building. The canteen caters for a variety of dietary needs. Hot food was available to those likely to be held in custody after 16:00. The staff also provided those in custody with access to drinking water on a regular basis.

### 3. PERSONAL SAFETY

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

**Commentary: 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.**

#### 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.
- 3.2 The requirements of Health and Safety legislation are observed throughout the custody areas.
- 3.3 All activities take place according to recorded safe systems of work which are based on appropriately completed risk assessments.
- 3.4 The attitude, behaviour and approach of staff contribute to the lowering of the risks of aggression and violence.
- 3.5 All reasonable steps are taken to minimise situations that are known to increase the risk of aggressive or violent behaviour. Where such situations are unavoidable, appropriate levels of supervision are maintained.
- 3.6 Particular care is taken of prisoners whose appearance, behaviour, background or circumstances leave them at heightened risk of harm or abuse from others.
- 3.7 The management and supervision of prisoners, held in custody, takes into account the nature of any identified risks.
- 3.8 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.
- 3.9 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.

## Inspection findings

### Self-harm and Suicide

CCU staff were aware of the SPS Talk To Me Strategy<sup>1</sup>, for those considered at risk of self-harm or suicide, and dealt with those arriving from prison establishments in the appropriate way. Prisoners arriving from Police Scotland who were documented as a risk of self-harm were also dealt with appropriately. If the CCU staff had concerns about a prisoner, they would contact Police Scotland or the appropriate prison for clarification, before making any decisions on that prisoner's welfare. It was noted that documentation used by staff referred to the previous system of "Act 2 Care" rather than "Talk to Me".

**Recommendation: Reference to 'Act' should be amended to the Talk to Me Strategy on the New Admissions Prisoner Risk Assessment.**

Hamilton CCU does not have a safer cell, but utilised a single holding cell close to the staff desk when vulnerable prisoners were identified. Those who identified as vulnerable were closely monitored, and whilst the cell was not ideal, it was the most appropriate available to the staff to provide a safe environment for those in need of additional supervision and care. The cell had a solid door with a hatch, and a member of staff remained outside it whilst it was occupied. Inspectors welcomed this initiative.

### Health and Safety

Inspectors observations were that health and safety appeared to be well managed. The area was well controlled with a two members of staff per door policy, with only one prisoner being let out of a holding cell at any one time.

Inspectors were shown the appropriate processes and records that were deployed, to ensure the necessary health and safety legislation was adhered to, and that any issues or risks arising were addressed appropriately. It was noted that the last date on the training register was in 2012. It was explained to inspectors that the process had changed and that it may be recorded elsewhere.

**Recommendation: The Health and Safety Register should be updated or changed to reflect the current procedures in respect of documenting checks.**

### Diversity and Equality

Secure access and egress to the court for those with restricted mobility or wheel chair bound was limited to using the main public entrance of the building. Prisoners arriving at the CCU entered through the secure holding area where they have to climb three steps, which hinders those who have restricted mobility or are wheel chair bound. Given that the front entrance is a busy area used by court staff and the public, it offered a significant safety and security risk.

---

<sup>1</sup> [The Scottish Prison Service Talk to Me Strategy](#)

**Recommendation: This situation is far from ideal and should be reviewed to ensure that access and egress for those with restricted mobility are provided with appropriate secure arrangements away from public gaze.**

On reviewing Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans, it was established that the main exit door from the CCU during an emergency was through the main door leading, down the three steps to the external secure holding area. Again, it was observed as unsuitable for evacuation for those in a wheel chair or with restricted mobility

A review should be carried out urgently with consideration being given to creating a permanent or deployable ramp, to negate the need for prisoners in wheelchairs having to use the main public entrance to access/exit the CCU.

### **Training and Development**

CCU staff at Hamilton Sherriff court were found to be adequately trained for their job role. All training records are kept centrally by the service provider. As found in other CCUs, G4S had a comprehensive list of Operating Instructions (OPIs), and appropriate safe systems of work. However, the online OPIs were not in an accessible or user-friendly format, and it was difficult to find specific instructions or directions within one large document. In addition to the OPIs, local management had access to a range of contingency plans, and worked closely with the Scottish Courts and Tribunal Service to ensure they were developed collaboratively, and jointly tested at appropriate intervals.

**Recommendation: The format of the OPIs document should be reviewed to ensure that it is user friendly and accessible.**

### **Governance**

Staff were observed to have a good relationship with those in custody. They used their interpersonal skills well to reduce the risk of aggression and violence. Where risks were identified, staff reacted quickly to resolve any issues. If staff assessed that where prisoners had been located may increase aggression and/or violence, they were moved to more suitable surroundings where they could be cared for more appropriately. When checking PERs there was clear and accurate recording of observations of all prisoners by CCU staff.

CCU staff had a clear process for dealing with any complaints or allegations made by those held in custody. In addition, all such complaints were reviewed by the SPS contracts team to ensure fairness of treatment, and that appropriate remedies were identified and implemented when required. The manager within the CCU informed inspectors that when an allegation was made relating to a potential crime, it was referred immediately to Police Scotland.

#### 4. HEALTH, WELLBEING AND MEDICAL TREATMENT

**All reasonable steps are taken to ensure the health and wellbeing of prisoners while in the custody areas and that appropriate and timeous medical treatment is available when required.**

**Commentary: Where it is necessary to do so, prisoners should receive treatment which takes account of all relevant NHS standards, guidelines and evidence-based treatments.**

##### Quality indicators

- 4.1 Any treatment provided in custody must be undertaken by an appropriately qualified professional and meet accepted standards.
- 4.2 There should be at least one court custody staff trained in emergency first aid on shift at any given time.

## Inspection findings

### Training and Development

It was reassuring to find that all staff on duty within the CCU were fully trained in first aid and in competency.

Training records were held centrally, and individuals were notified when they were due for refresher training. Any CCU staff out of competency are removed from working with prisoners until such times as they successfully complete refresher training.

### Healthcare

CCU staff could access medical services through a recognised provider, Scot Nurse. The contract provides for an appropriate response within one hour. Inspectors were told that a response was generally achieved within the one-hour requirement. However, on occasion, it could be over one hour. The inspectors were present when a Scot Nurse attended to examine a prisoner who was insulin dependent. The nurse arrived within the response time and administered medication. The circumstances surrounding the requirement for the prisoner to be seen by Scot Nurse was reviewed by the inspectors, and the PER form originating from Police Scotland was found to be accurate and contained relevant information in respect of the prisoners health.

### Diversity and Equality

Inspectors found that there was only one disabled toilet in Hamilton Sheriff Court building, situated at the front public entrance, for use by both members of the public and prisoners. Any prisoner who used a wheelchair or had restricted mobility required to be taken from the CCU to the public entrance to use the toilet. This would be in full view of the public and court staff, and would have both security and dignity issues.

**Recommendation: This situation should be reviewed immediately. A disabled toilet should be provided for use by prisoners within the CCU, away from the public area.**

It was established that CCU managers do not undergo any specific health and safety training. However, it was helpful to find that a full check of the CCU was carried out at the start and the end of each working day, and any faults or issues were immediately reported to the Sheriff Clerk.

**Recommendation: As a matter of some urgency, G4S should review the current lack of specific health and safety training for CCU managers and staff.**

## 5. EFFECTIVE, COURTEOUS AND HUMANE EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY

**The implementation of security and supervisory duties is balanced by courteous and humane treatment of prisoners.**

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

### Quality indicators

- 5.1 Court custody staff discharge all supervisory and security duties courteously and in doing so respect the individuals given circumstances.
- 5.2 The systems and procedures for the movement, transfer and release of prisoners are implemented effectively and courteously.
- 5.3 The systems and procedures for access and egress of all other people are implemented effectively and courteously.
- 5.4 The systems and procedures for monitoring and supervising movements and activities of prisoners inside the custody areas are implemented effectively.
- 5.5 The law concerning the searching of prisoners and their property in the custody areas is implemented thoroughly.
- 5.6 All security checks are carried out regularly and thoroughly.
- 5.7 Physical force is used only when necessary and strictly in accordance with 'the provider's' control and restraint training guidance and the law.
- 5.8 Physical restraints are only used when necessary in accordance with any associated risk information provided on the Personal Escort Record and, in any case, strictly in accordance with the law.
- 5.9 Prisoners' personal property and cash are recorded and, where appropriate, stored.

## Inspection findings

During the inspection, it was observed that CCU staff discharged their duties courteously and in a respectful manner, whilst maintaining an acceptable level of authority. It was evident that the CCU staff worked as a team, and each member was confident and competent in their given role.

Good communication and mutual understanding of the roles and responsibilities was observed, which helped to establish the sense of order and control, whilst maintaining a decent and humane environment.

### Prisoner Movement

The transfer from the escort provider's vehicles and the movement of prisoners within the CCU was carried out in a safe and controlled manner. The distance from the escort vehicles to the CCU was short and required the negotiation of a small flight of stairs. There was no public access to any of these areas.

CCU staff were observed carrying out continual dynamic risk assessments in order to manage those at risk, or likely to be detrimental to the good running of the Unit.

It was observed that there was a good relationship between the CCU staff and prisoners legal representatives. There were five interview rooms that were managed well, and there appeared to be an effective system in place to allow interviews to take place between the client and their representative.

There was CCTV throughout the CCU, however only cell six had CCTV fitted. This cell was used mainly for female prisoners. Whilst it was not actively monitored it was well positioned to be seen by staff, however it did not record and as such had no playback provision. It was also noted that some cells had blind spots where staff could not view fully the activities of prisoners.

**Recommendation: All areas, particularly cells, should have CCTV coverage and play back facility included in the system.**

### Searching

The searching observed by the inspectors was thorough and undertaken in a consistent and professional manner. 'Rub Down' searches were undertaken at the front desk on arrival, and appropriate facilities were available should a more detailed body search be required or assessed as necessary.

### Use of Force

The use of physical restraints to ensure the security and safety of staff, other people in custody and the public, appeared to be limited. There was no evidence that they were misused or applied without due cause. Although not observed, when physical force was used during the inspection it appeared, from listening to the incident and the post incident briefing, that the removal was carried out professionally and with minimal use of force. It was noted that staff used good interpersonal skills to calm the difficult situation and maintain a good atmosphere. When physical force was required, there was a process of review undertaken to ensure that techniques were



appropriately applied and de-escalated at the earliest opportunity. The inspectors welcomed this rigour.

### **Prisoner property**

Prisoner's personal belongings were held securely in lockers within the reception area and clearly recorded. All property bags were sealed with a unique reference number, and a process was in place should there be a requirement to open any bag.

## 6. RESPECT, AUTONOMY AND PROTECTION AGAINST MISTREATMENT

**Staffs treat all prisoners in custody respectfully. Prisoners' rights to statutory protections and complaints processes are also respected.**

**Commentary: Staff engage with prisoners respectfully, positively and constructively. Prisoners are kept informed about the progress of their court case and are treated humanely and with understanding.**

### Quality indicators

- 6.1 Relationships between staff and prisoners are respectful. The use of disrespectful language or behaviour is not tolerated.
- 6.2 Staff respect prisoners' rights to confidentiality in their dealings with them.
- 6.3 International human rights as asserted in law are respected.

## Inspection findings

It was clear that there was a good relationship between CCU staff and prisoners. CCU staff clearly knew some prisoners from previous occasions and the dialogue between them reflected this.

However, the layout of the CCU did little to encourage interaction between staff and prisoners, when prisoners were secured in the holding cells. The doors of the holding cells were solid and had a hatch that remained in the closed position, unless opened by staff to communicate. The area was noisy, but CCU staff were always on hand to talk to deal with their needs and, when necessary, challenge prisoners.

**Recommendation: Cell doors should be modernised to encourage better communication.**

Inspectors enquired about communicating with prisoners who had little to no English. CCU staff have access to a series of questions, including equality and diversity questions, in five different languages; Arabic, Latvian, Polish, Romanian and Slovakian, which were obtained from an online service resource. When enquiries were made regarding the use of a language line, inspectors were advised that if it were required CCU staff would contact Police Scotland and ask for assistance. Generally, when foreign nationals are appearing at court their legal representative or Police Scotland arrange for a translator.

If a prisoner who cannot speak English arrives unplanned, the escort contractor should agree a joint protocol that clearly sets roles and responsibilities. This applies not only to foreign nationals but also to other vulnerable groups who may struggle with understanding and comprehension of the court system and therefore not have full access to their human rights.

**Recommendation: A protocol should be established between the partners, escort provider, Police Scotland and SCTS, to ensure that prisoners who potentially have little to no English or limited communication skills fully understand the court process to allow them to access their rights.**

## Recommendations

1. SCTS should review their maintenance programme to ensure that the CCU is maintained appropriately, and put in place a process to ensure that once identified, graffiti is removed as quickly as possible.
2. Reference to 'Act' should be amended to the Talk to Me Strategy on the New Admissions Prisoner Risk Assessment.
3. The Health and Safety Register should be updated or changed to reflect the current procedures in respect of documenting checks.
4. Access and egress for those with restricted mobility must be reviewed to ensure that they are provided with appropriate secure arrangements away from public gaze.
5. The format of the OPIs document should be reviewed to ensure that it is user friendly and accessible.
6. A disabled toilet should be provided for use by prisoners within the CCU, away from the public area.
7. As a matter of some urgency, G4S should review the current lack of specific Health and Safety training for CCU managers and staff.
8. All areas, particularly cells should have CCTV coverage and a playback facility included in the system.
9. Cell doors should be modernised to encourage better communication.
10. A protocol should be established between the partners, escort provider, Police Scotland and SCTS, to ensure that prisoners who potentially have little to no English or limited communication skills fully understand the court process to allow them to access their rights.

## Good practice

1. Inspectors observed good interaction between prisoners and the CCU staff. The staff shared information in a clear and concise way, disseminating any issues identified by prisoners to fellow colleagues. First Line Managers (FLMs) were visible and appeared to always be in control. CCU staff were clear in identifying new prisoners, and relaying any information on negative attitudes and behaviours observed during travel to and from the court.

**Inspection Team**

Calum McCarthy, HMIPS

Graeme Neil, HMIPS

**Acronyms**

CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CCU	Court Custody Unit
HMIPS	HM Inspectorate of Prisons for Scotland
OPI	Operating Instructions
PEEPS	Personal Emergency Evacuation Plans
PER	Prisoner Escort Record
SCTS	The Scottish Courts and Tribunal Service
SPS	The Scottish Prison Service



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

© Crown copyright 2019

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](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)**.

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

First published by HMIPS, 9 January 2019

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