The Committee will meet at 2.15pm in Committee Room 1.

1. **Declaration of interests:** New members of the Committee will be invited to declare any relevant interests.

2. **Prison Estates Review (in private):** The Committee will consider lines of questioning for witnesses.

3. **Prison Estates Review:** The Committee will take oral evidence from—
   
   Clive Fairweather, HM Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland, Dr David McAllister, HM Assistant Chief Inspector of Prisons for Scotland, Malcolm McLennan, Inspector and Mike Crossan, Inspector,

   Stephen Nathan, Editor, ‘Prison Privatisation Report International’ and

   Dr Jacqueline Tombs, Honorary Director, the Scottish Consortium on Crime and Criminal Justice, Bernadette Monaghan, Director, APEX Scotland and Sue Matheson, Chief Executive, SACRO (Safeguarding Communities – Reducing Offending).

4. **Appointment of an adviser:** The Committee will consider a proposal for the appointment of an adviser for the forthcoming Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill.
5. **Prison Estates Review**: Committee members will give an oral report of the Committee’s visit to HMP Glenochil and the Audit Committee’s consideration of Scottish Prison Service accounts.

Alison Taylor
Acting Clerk to the Committee, Tel 85195

The following papers are attached for this meeting:

**Agenda items 2 and 3**
Note by SPICe and the Clerk (private paper) TO FOLLOW J1/02/19/1
Briefing note from the Scottish Consortium on Crime and Criminal Justice, APEX Scotland and SACRO J1/02/19/2
Background note on Stephen Nathan by SPICe J1/02/19/3
Final version of report of Justice 1 Committee’s visit to HM Prison Peterhead J1/02/19/4

**Agenda item 4**
Note by the Clerk J1/02/19/5
Justice 1 Committee

Prison Estates Review

Response to SPS Estates Review by the Scottish Consortium on Crime & Criminal Justice, APEX and SACRO

1. APEX and SACRO share with the Scottish Consortium on Crime & Criminal Justice (SCC&CJ) its aim to reduce the incidence and alleviate the impact of crime in society by whatever morally acceptable means shown to be most effective. Consortium members include the leading voluntary organisations concerned with crime and criminal justice – the Howard League for Penal reform in Scotland, APEX, NCH, SACRO, the Scottish Human Rights Centre and Victim Support Scotland. Associate members include other organisations and academics.

2. The Executive’s Proposals for the Future of the Prison Estate raise five areas of extremely serious concern, all of which have far-reaching consequences. The issues raised surround:
   - cost effectiveness
   - false assumptions made about the projected size of the prison population,
   - public protection
   - current conditions in the prison estate, and
   - how prisons should be financed and run.

While giving evidence to the Justice Committee on 14\textsuperscript{th} May 2002, we wish to focus on the first three issues.

Cost effectiveness

3. The proposal to build 3 new prisons, with an additional 900 prison places, will NOT SAVE £700M for health and other public services but WILL SPEND £619M NPV. Community sentences that can reduce re-offending are more cost effective and deliver more crime reduction and community safety for potential victims. They also allow less crowded prisons to be more effective in delivering rehabilitation.

The future prison population

4. Working from trends is dangerous, particularly when action is underway to change criminal justice responses. The future prison population projections take very limited account of planned changes. They are, therefore, based on a false premise. In short, the assumptions underlying the projections are fundamentally flawed for two main reasons.

5. First, there is a primary issue of principle. Our position on imprisonment is that it should be reduced to an ‘unavoidable minimum’. This position is fully evidenced in 

Rethinking Criminal Justice in Scotland, see www.sccj.org. In short, given the evidence that community sentences work best in reducing crime and promoting social inclusion, imprisonment, the most extreme and detrimental form of social exclusion, should be
avoided wherever possible and used only in those circumstances where it is necessary to protect the public.

6. The vast majority of sentences (82%) are for 6 months or less, for less serious offences and offenders. Most of these short-term prisoners, together with fine defaulters, women, most young offenders and many of those on remand, do not pose any serious threat to the community. Consider, for example, the prisoners and ex-prisoners APEX typically works with – aged 19, offending since age 14, 12 previous convictions, a history of school exclusion and truanting, no educational or vocational qualifications, poor literacy and numeracy skills and other problems such as substance misuse, homelessness, no supports, very low self-esteem and confidence. There is an urgent need to sentence such offenders in the community so that they can begin to acquire the skills found to reduce re-offending (for example, employment is the single most important factor in reducing re-offending).

7. Second, the projections are based on the assumption that *nothing will change* to reduce the numbers going into prison. But change is already underway and more is planned to reduce the projected prison population. The Scottish prison population is at its highest ever level but an assumption based on ‘trends’ is made that it will rise by a further 1000 and that prison expansion is required. There are two main points to be made here. First, trends neither go on for ever, and second, if we look back at the figures over the past 30 years, would projections taken at certain points in time have turned out as expected ten years later? The answer is NO. The Minister for Justice was himself well aware of this on October 4th, 2000, when he told the Scottish Parliament Justice and Home Affairs Committee that:

“*It is fair to say that it is notoriously difficult to predict prison populations, which are extrapolated from previous figures. When the comprehensive spending review that was announced in 1998 was being put together it was estimated that the prison population in 2000 would be 6,500. (In fact it turned out to be 5,869). It is an inexact science. We must strike a balance between the provision we make, bearing in mind the fact that it is impossible to predict the figure accurately and the alternatives to custody that are being developed….”*

8. Given that community sentences could be expanded rapidly throughout the country at considerably less cost, prison projections could be reduced dramatically. Full implementation of existing legislative provisions, together with provisions in, and minor additions to, the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Bill 2002, plus the speedy national roll out of pilots, would significantly reduce prison numbers. We therefore recommend:

- provisions to abolish imprisonment for fine default. Implementation of Section 235 of the Criminal Procedure (Scotland) Act 1995, together with a statutory requirement for sentencers to show that all fine enforcement measures have been tried and other community sentences actively considered before imprisonment – as in England & Wales – would help. The pilots planned in the Stipendiary Magistrates’ and a Sheriff Court should be brief prior to immediate national implementation of Section 235,

- expansion of bail services to all courts. Roll out is underway but adequate resources are required to reduce the average daily prison population of 1000 on remand to 500,
• provision of alternatives to remand e.g. through electronic tagging,

• reduction in use of short term sentences. This will require statutory limitations together with making the full range of community sentences nationally available to the courts,

• rapid nation wide introduction of all community sentences including DTTO’s, SAO’s, RLO’s, enhanced deferred sentences, and refreshing and adequately resourcing community service orders and probation,

• early release from sentences over 1 year for non dangerous prisoners on electronic tagging, as already exists in England,

• discount one third of sentence for a guilty plea. Again there is a statutory basis for this in England,

• increase the point at which automatic remission at half sentence is available but backed by tagging and strong conditions,

• set capacity limits on prisons – say 4,800 places – with earlier release of non-dangerous prisoners to make room if necessary for more dangerous prisoners newly sentenced by the courts (as opposed to expanding places). The addition of week-end and part-time imprisonment would help here, and

• work with sentencers to develop an effective policy of prison reduction. This has successfully occurred in Finland where the previously high rate of imprisonment has been significantly reduced. Cost-benefit analysis became important in political thinking about how to respond to crime and estimates were made of the likely impact of prison population reductions on crime. Legal reforms and changes to sentencing practices were subsequently introduced to reduce the number of short sentences, whilst retaining the independent role of the judiciary, and

• introduction of restorative justice measures prior to criminal proceedings and at all stages in the criminal justice process to meet victim’s as well as offender’s needs.

9. An increase in the prison estate would only be necessary if the Government means to accept an increase in the prison population. It is NOT acceptable for Scotland to plan to have by far the highest prisoner rate in Europe of 145 per 1000,000 population, and it is NOT necessary. We continue to imprison people who are not a danger to the public; it is expensive; it is not cost effective; it is contrary to human rights; and it is not moral. Prison numbers could be substantially reduced (by well over 2,000 places1) with safety, by abolishing the use if imprisonment for short terms, coupled with the measures noted at paragraph 8. This means that there is only a need to build ONE NEW PRISON at most in order to upgrade the prison estate and free the prisons from overcrowding so that they

---

1 This figure is arrived at as follows:
Increased use of bail (with tagging, services) – 500 (of 1,000 currently held on remand)
Fine default – 70
No sentences under 6 months – 500
Young offenders – 400 (of 550 currently in custody)
Other community sentences – 1,000 (potential much greater)
Total number of prison places saved = 2,470
can better pursue rehabilitation programmes. In countries that have pursued an expansionist policy on prisons, notably the US, prison numbers continue to rise and so does violence. If more prisons are built they will be filled.

Public protection

10. The public wants to be protected from crime and its consequences. Far from the populist portrayal of an essentially ‘punitive public’, research conducted in Scotland, England (for the Halliday Report) and elsewhere, indicates that the public supports rehabilitative and restorative sentences. They want offenders to be given sentences that will reduce their re-offending in the future. Over the last ten years, support for imprisonment, including long prison sentences, has reduced and support for community sentences has increased. For those offenders who do have to go to prison, the public wants them to return to the community rehabilitated, so that the future number of victims of crime is reduced.

Conclusions

11. In conclusion, we believe that:

- the number of prison places should be decreased, paralleled by a rapid national expansion of all community sentences. The projections in the SPS Estates Review are based on penal expansionist assumptions. The Executive should concentrate on policy and legislative changes to reduce the prison population, including exploring a collaborative approach with the judiciary,

- the Executive should undertake a serious review of costs involved in full national implementation of all community sentences currently available and proposed. The existing Executive policy of piloting community sentences in one or two courts for long periods of time before national expansion should be abandoned. We know that the judiciary is frustrated at present because the full range of community sentences is not available in every court and capacity is limited by resources.
Justice 1 Committee
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Note on publications by Stephen Nathan

Stephen Nathan is a freelance journalist and researcher who has monitored the growth of the private prisons industry since the early 1980s.

He is editor of Prison Privatisation Report International (PPRI), a newsletter published since June 1996. Formerly published by the Prison Reform Trust, PPRI is currently published six times a year on the internet by the Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU), University of Greenwich, London, England (see web link http://www.psiru.org/justice/).


He is also a frequent contributor to radio and television programmes in the UK and abroad.

His other publications include (not a complete list):

Forthcoming:

Prison privatisation in the United Kingdom
and
Private prisons: emerging and transformative economies

Recent articles include:

Aggressively seeking further opportunities: the expansion of the global prison market
HLM, The Howard League Magazine, May 2002

Shakedown in Corrections
The PFI Report, Centaur Business Intelligence, April 2002

Carter's ‘wish list' for industry
The PFI Report, Centaur Business Intelligence, April 2002

Private prisons: An international overview

International prison privatisation: recent developments
Socio-Legal Newsletter No. 35, Socio-Legal Studies Association, November
2001

Private prisons: UK fuels global aspirations
The PFI Report, Centaur Business Intelligence, June 2001

Victoria’s flagship PFI prison sinks
The PFI Report, Centaur Business Intelligence, February 2001

A moratorium on private prisons
Penal Reform International Newsletter, No.43, December 2000

Reliance on PFI custody
The PFI Report, Centaur Business Intelligence, November 2000

The prison industry goes global
Yes! A journal of positive futures, Fall 2000
http://www.futurenet.org/15prisons/15toc_main.htm

Battle lines drawn over prison privatisation in Ontario
CCPA Monitor, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Canada, June 2000

Detention and Training Orders - further experimentation in juvenile incarceration
Youth Justice Matters, Visionquest, June 2000

PFI and Europe’s most privatised criminal justice system
(With Dexter Whitfield) The PFI Report, Centaur Business Intelligence, February 2000

Reports and Papers

Privatising Criminal Justice: The impact of the private finance initiative in the criminal justice system
(with Dexter Whitfield, Centre for Public Services) for the Justice Forum, March 2002


Private adult correctional facilities: fines, failures and dubious practices around the world
Ontario Public Service Employees Union, Canada, February 2000

Prison privatisation in the UK: notes on the Ontario government’s latest thinking
Ontario Public Service Employees Union, Canada, April 2000

Prison privatisation in South Africa; a response to Trade Union Research Project (University of Natal) report
South Africa, July 2000
Earlier reports on private prisons and associated services include:

UK

_Wolds Remand Prison: Contracting Out: A First Year Report_  
_HMP Doncaster: The Doncatraz File_  
_Blakenhurst Briefing_  
_HMP Buckley Hall: The First Eighteen Months_  
_Private Prisons: At What Cost?_  
_Boot Camps: The Return of the Short Sharp Shock_  
_Electronic Tagging: Viable Option or Expensive Diversion?_  
_Court Escort Services: The Case for a National Publicly Run Escort Service_  
(All commissioned by the Prison Reform Trust, UK)

AUSTRALIA

_Private Prisons in Australia: Cause for Concern_  
(Commissioned by the Prison Reform Trust)

Publications referring to Stephen Nathan include:

_British Expert’s Whirlwind Tour Captures Massive Media Attention_ (February 2000):

http://www.opseu.org/ops/ministry/locktalk/locktalkfeb25.htm

_Private Firms Pass Go on the Way to Jail_ (March 2002):

http://www.tribune.attfreeweb.com/byrne08032002.htm

_Prison Privatisation, Penal Reform International:_

http://www.penalreform.org/english/article_privatisation.htm


http://www.world-psi.org/psi.nsf/f28f621e0471d228c125692200604e56/136e4fb140f4e492c125696f004d1b59?OpenDocument
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JUSTICE 1 COMMITTEE

Visit by members to HMP Peterhead

Note by the Clerks

1. Members of the Justice 1 Committee visited HMP Peterhead on Monday 25 March 2002. The members representing the Justice 1 Committee were Christine Grahame (Convener), Donald Gorrie and Michael Matheson. Stewart Stevenson and Richard Lochhead were also present in their capacities as constituency MSP and regional MSP respectively.

2. This note provides a factual account of the visit to HM Prison Peterhead by members of the Justice 1 Committee.

Introduction

3. The Governor of Peterhead Prison, Mr Ian Gunn, formally welcomed members to the prison in the context of the Scottish Prison Service consultation on the future of the Scottish Prison Service Estates (‘the Prison Estates review’).

4. Mr Gunn introduced other senior staff from the prison who would be assisting with the Committee’s visit. These were Jim Anderson, Deputy Governor; Jack Thomson, Unit Manager Support Services; Mike Hebden, Unit Manager Residential; John Duncan, Unit Manager Residential; Tom Cairns, Unit Manager Prisoner Activities; Eric Sandison, Human Resources; Alan Gothard, Estates Manager, Allan Boath; Projects Manager and Tom Fox, Head of Communications at Scottish Prison Service (SPS). Members of the local Aberdeenshire branch of the Association of Visiting Committees for Scottish Penal Establishments were also present.

5. Mr Gunn referred the members to his introductory paper (see Annex A which was distributed to members prior to the visit) which gave a brief background and history of the prison. He indicated that the staff of the prison, as civil servants, could not comment on matters of public policy, and reinforced the statement that staff and prisoners had not been warned against speaking to the MSP’s on matters relating to the Prison Estates review. Mr Gunn stated that prisoners that were to attend the discussion session with the members had not been handpicked and might be in denial of the STOP programme.

Tours of Hall and Services

6. The visiting members were spilt into two groups to examine the prison facilities. One group visited the textiles workshop, the joinery, net and recycling of conveyor belts workshop, Alpha (A) Hall, the laundry, the sports hall, the gym and Bravo (B) Hall. The other group visited the joinery
workshed, the horticulture areas, the crafts workshop, the health centre, Charlie (C) Hall, the education room, and Delta (D) Hall.

Textiles Workshed
7. On entering the workshop the members found it empty as prisoners were on a tea break. Christine Grahame discussed the workshop with the SPS trainer. The prisoners make jeans and green work wear trousers for other prisons and other establishments. There is space available for fifty prisoners, but generally there are twenty-five to thirty-five prisoners, depending on the other programmes run by the prison. The top wage for a prisoner is £9 per week with the minimum being £7 per week (the wage rate is similar throughout the SPS). Prisoners can apply to work in the textiles shed if they have some skill with textiles and equipment. Previous prison records denote this.

8. A concerted effort is made to train lower skilled workers so that they may achieve the higher wage. The ‘training wage’ is £5.40 per week progressing to £6.40 per week. The textiles workshop has a very low wastage rate. Wages are spent in the canteen and what is not spent is given to them in a ‘cashback’ system. The prisoners ‘working day’ starts at 9am and stops at 11.45am for lunch before resuming at 2pm and continuing until 4.45pm.

Joinery, nets and recycling conveyor belts workshed
9. Twenty-four prisoners work in the shed for joinery, netmaking and recycling conveyor belts. The prisoners made garden gates and sheds for commercial companies, with any profit going to a central fund at the SPS. The trainer believed that other prisons like Kilmarnock keep the profit. The trainers have worked in this shed for in excess of fifteen years each. They remarked that up until last year, when it was mooted that the prison might close, there had never had a deficit of work. Members were advised that joinery production was carried out to a very high standard, with little wastage.

10. Christine Grahame spoke to several prisoners. A prisoner from Ayrshire stated that he would rather his family come to Peterhead, than to a prison nearer his home because he feels that is safer for his family. Another prisoner, who arrived at HMP Peterhead in January, did not receive visitors at all but would rather that HMP Peterhead stay open because of his negative previous experiences as a prisoner at HMP Barlinnie.

11. Cargo nets were being made for the oil industry and were of such a high standard that a major company were sending nets to HMP Peterhead for inspection. Prisoners were also dismantling rubber conveyor belts to recycle and make into washers. A prisoner was also getting his haircut by another prisoner who had learnt hairdressing at another prison. The trainer stated that they generally had twenty-five prisoners working on nets. Again, it was stated that the work was top quality with low wastage rates.

12. Christine Grahame spoke to another prisoner who asked her if HMP Peterhead was being closed down. He had been at HMP Barlinnie and HMP Dumfries prior to arriving at HMP Peterhead. The prisoner was not concerned about visits but was concerned that the good relations between staff and
prisoners could disappear should prisoners be moved. He also highlighted the concern for the loss of employment in Peterhead and the surrounding area. On a more minor point, he thought the cells could be better, as could the sanitation. This was mainly the case at weekends when locked up from 5pm until 7.15am the next morning.

Tour of A Hall
13. The group toured A Hall, which is where induction of new prisoners takes place. Inmates are transferred from other establishments to HMP Peterhead. Sixty-six prisoners reside in A Hall. A third of the sentence is spent in A Hall and, according to the prison officers, inmates settle in quite quickly. The induction process acclimatises new prisoners making sure they access the Card System (prisoners receive pay and make exchanges for items from the canteen, etc). This process encourages trust. The cells in A Hall have no power supply other than the light fitting. The prisoners have hand held televisions which are battery powered. Prisoners can buy rechargeable batteries that are recharged for free.

14. A prison officer believed that 98% of prisoners fear a move from the prison to other establishments. To progress out of the penal system, prisoners must go to another prison for a period of time prior to release. Prisoners feel safe and secure at HMP Peterhead due to staff knowledge, training and understanding and the feeling that they are all ‘in it together’. Inmates can work towards achieving Scottish Vocational Qualifications (SVQ’s).

Laundry
15. The laundry was refurbished two and a half years ago and was stated to be the ‘best laundry in the SPS’. It provides a laundry service for sporting teams, the police, and HMP Aberdeen. If HMP Peterhead closed, all the laundry services would be transferred to HMP Perth.

Sports hall and gym
16. The sports hall and gym facilities are heavily used, requiring sessions to be limited to two per week. A prisoner commented that he had never had the opportunity to use a gym and access to staff expertise and personal training plans in other prisons. An officer said that the gym helps to defeat any feelings of isolationism felt by prisoners. An agility course was built where prisoners participated in team building and self-esteem building exercises. On request this was later removed, but a prison in England has since copied the HMP Peterhead model and received commendations for it.

B Hall
17. The Convener spoke to prison officers about the consultation on the future of the Scottish Prison Service Estates. The officers mentioned that prisoners who undermined the STOP 2000 programme are removed to Glenochil.

18. Concerns were raised over the standards to which HMP Barlinnie educates its prison staff about the STOP 2000 programme, as accreditation to run the programme there is invalid if the programme does not commence within 6 weeks and the officer suggested that this often happened. It was suggested
that only seven or eight prison officers can competently run the STOP programme in the central belt (three at HMP Polmont and four at HMP Barlinnie). HMP Peterhead has in comparison nine group workers and four support workers. HMP Polmont uses the adapted version of the STOP programme (see Annex B).

19. Christine Grahame spoke to a passing prisoner. The prisoner believed that he was able to achieve his parole only due to HMP Peterhead. The prisoner and his family are from Dumbarton and he gets a two-hour visit every fortnight. The prisoner stated that he would not benefit from a central belt prison, as he would only get a one hour visit if lucky. He said that he has the freedom to speak to any member of staff about any issue with complete confidence and the staff are exceptional and supportive. The prisoner stated that relations between staff and prisoners are on first name terms and are friendly and open. He added that prison officers treat the prisoners as humans and interact with the prisoners using a humanising process. Generally prisoners are scared about being relocated amongst the general population of other prisons due to fear of assault.

Joinery workshed

20. The other group visited the joinery workshed. The work instructor for the shed stated that the prison had a partnership with Aberdeen College in order to provide educational qualifications to prisoners at SVQ levels 2 and 3. The officer believed that HMP Peterhead was the only prison to do this. Prisoners took an average of eighteen months to complete level 2, and an extra six months for level 3. There are eighteen prisoners in total at present working towards these qualifications, and over fifty prisoners have achieved certificates. Those inmates in the workshed are on a full-time education timetable apart from those who are on the STOP programme. The instructor stated that the education course raised their self-esteem. Prisoners were involved in making a diverse range of items such as cupboards, a dolls house, etc. Prisoners must complete 25 different modules and different practical tasks in order to achieve their SVQ certificate from the college. Once freed, prisoners with a certificate can complete a skills test in Elgin which will allow them to be officially qualified as a joiner. Prisoners stated that many of them had never done this sort of work before but they enjoyed it and now were or would be qualified to an apprenticeship level.

21. Each prisoner had their own cubicle to work in which allowed the instructor to see all the prisoners. The instructor showed the members examples of level 3 work, a roof construction and a staircase, which he said required a very high ability of construction.

Horticulture

22. The group toured the horticulture greenhouses area. A tutor from Aberdeen College was available once a week, and 13 inmates worked in this area on a full-time basis (unless they had other commitments to other programmes). Prison staff said that it took around two years for a prisoner to gain a level 2 certificate for this area. Level 3 had not yet been achieved. Inmates grow plants for HMP Aberdeen but are not allowed to grow for commercial tenders.
under SPS rules. Prison staff mentioned that inmates often had gardening knowledge before joining this area but improved whilst on the course.

Crafts worksheed
23. The group visited the crafts worksheeshid where a wide range of items e.g. furniture, concrete garden planters, etc, were being made by prisoners for sale, charity, commissions or for the prisoners’ families. Staff highlighted that crafts made here had won awards at national level. All prisoners had no crafts skills before joining the programme. Prisoners did not work towards educational qualifications here as elsewhere. One prisoner commented that although he was generally happy, there was no form of progression for prisoners beyond the programmes, e.g. community work, and that he chose not to receive visits.

Health centre
24. At the health centre, the manager stated that the health needs of 286 inmates were catered for. The average age of prisoner is 46 years although a substantial proportion of the inmates were aged 50 to 60, and several were in the 70 to 80 years bracket, which was a particular feature of this prison. Typical medical complaints were angina, asthma and cardiac disease. Unusually, there are little or no problems with illicit drugs in the prison which the manager felt was due to the elderly age profile. The age range meant that the medical bill was very high.

25. The group also visited the health centre ward. Prisoners suffering from dementia receive psychological and physical checks and support from Cornhill Hospital, Aberdeen. There is also a treatment room, a physiotherapy room and a dental room with a full range of medical supplies. The prison employs three psychiatrists and operates an anti-bullying strategy which is proving effective. There are four cells available in the health centre. Cells are bigger than usual due to the inclusion of a hospital bed. There are also 2 cells which are available as an overnight place for prisoners who are prone to self harm. The manager stated that these are rarely used due to the Peterhead ethos.

26. Staff sometimes face problems with prisoners who are homosexuals or paedophiles as these can cause rifts with other prisoners but it was mentioned that staff at Peterhead often notice and address problems like this which are not noticed elsewhere. Cells in the ward are open all day and the officers spend all day with the prisoners in order to build good relations. Staff will often engage in leisure activities with prisoners such as card games which encourages such relations.

C Hall
27. Members immediately noticed that Charlie or C Hall is a smaller, narrower and quieter ‘open’ hall which is conducive to the close knit community of staff and inmates there. Staff mentioned that they did encounter day to day problems but overall the behaviour in the hall was good. Members noted that that hall was particularly clean and well maintained. Five staff worked in shifts to look after seventy-five prisoners. There are various activities available to
prisoners such as a TV area and snooker. Members visited cells which contained a chemical toilet which improved sanitary conditions beyond what members had expected for a hall operating a ‘slopping out’ procedure. These toilets are changed daily. Prisoners are allowed non-explicit pictures in their cells. Members were shown older cells which were no longer used as they were too small, historically prisoners used hammocks for sleeping in these cells.

Education room
28. The education room focussed mainly on computer work, literacy, numeracy and art work. The partnership with Aberdeen College described previously is in operation with a part-time tutor present from the college. All new prisoners receive a basic skills assessment from which an individual programme is put together. There are four levels of English taught and a library is available to the prisoners. Peterhead has instigated a course on computing (European Compute Driving Licenses) and is the first prison to do this. Overall there is a low waiting list for courses, although some are more popular than others. The classes are available over forty-two weeks although there are also summer classes. There is also a guitar class which is taught by an inmate. Painting and other artworks by the prisoners are on display around the prison and staff highlighted the importance of this form of expression, especially for those who had difficulty with other sorts of courses.

D Hall
29. Delta or D Hall houses many prisoners who are involved in groupwork on the various programmes available such as STOP 2000. There are sixty-one prisoners in this hall and four to five officers. Staff stressed the importance of what staff throughout the prison called the ‘ethos’ or ‘monoculture’ of HMP Peterhead in which staff formed a rapport with inmates and prisoners felt able to walk freely in the hall. Staff mentioned that they encountered some problems with denial by prisoners of their crimes. Inmates were offered remedial activities as well as sports due to the older age range of the prisoners.

Presentation on Groupwork and Programmes

30. A copy of the presentation given by the programmes staff is attached (see Annex B). An adapted programme for STOP had been created because many prisoners (20-30%) suffer from an IQ below 80 and had learning difficulties with the normal STOP programme.

31. Members asked a number of questions to the programmes’ staff after the presentation. Members were interested to learn whether there is a telephone help-line for freed prisoners should they have a relapse into criminal behaviour, how often is it used and how effective it is. Prison staff advised that prisoners are encouraged to contact prison staff or external organisations such as the Samaritans should this happen. They could not gauge the success of this. One example was given of a prisoner who had recognised that he would relapse and had returned to the prison requesting help.
32. Programmes staff were asked what percentage of crimes are related to alcohol misuse. It was explained that a significant number are, although the exact figures are not known. The alcohol programme is popular amongst prisoners and many prisoners particularly the elderly use alcohol as an excuse for their crimes. The alcohol and drug programmes are being brought together as an addictions programme with dedicated staff which will include addressing other substance abuses, e.g. solvents.

33. Another area that members were interested to know about was how self-offending was being addressed. Staff informed members that the programme focuses on the actions typical of self-offending rather than basing the programme on self-offending, although the self-offender is given the chance to discuss personal details in Block 4 of the STOP programme (‘My History’).

34. Committee members wished to find out what Peterhead prison staff knew about STOP and similar programmes elsewhere. Staff explained that, in their view, Peterhead was unique in the UK with regard to the STOP programme as it had integrated support built up over time with a dedicated team who developed a working relationship with prisoners in a safe environment. Staff in Peterhead were responsible for encouraging inmates into programmes as inmates could be scared by graduates of the programmes. The drop out rate is relatively low for these programmes. Prisoners are given every chance to assess their situation by staff before they choose to drop out. As programmes are often in group work, the group to which the prisoner belongs also discuss any proposed drop out to highlight the consequences of this and make a group decision on the matter. Staff were aware that STOP operated in England and once accredited there, it could be used in other countries.

35. After an informal lunch in which members spoke to prison staff from all areas of the prison, members moved to the Education Unit for a series of discussions with a group of prisoners and a group of prison officers who are local officials of the POA union.

Discussion session with prisoners

36. Members introduced themselves to 24 prisoners with representatives from all halls who then raised a wide variety of issues in open discussion. Prisoners were of the strong belief that HMP Peterhead should not be closed for many reasons. Several prisoners expressed the belief that closure would be a disaster. One prisoner stated that, ‘You cannot recreate what exists in HMP Peterhead in other prisons, it is a culture.’ Distributing sexual offenders to a mainstream prison was thought not to be an option, but ‘a death sentence’, especially for elderly prisoners.

37. Prisoners said that Peterhead prison provides a safe secure place for sex offenders who would not be able to move around the prison freely and without abuse if situated in other mixed offenders prisons. One prisoner stated that he was locked in his cell for 23 hours a day in other prisons as it was the safest place for him. Prisoners stated that there was no interaction between staff and prisoners in other prisons that delivered the STOP
programme, e.g. Glenochil, and that visitors to sex offenders were harangued. Children especially were often too frightened to visit. At Peterhead however, prisoners felt that visitors were treated with dignity and care by all in the prison and in the town of Peterhead itself. Prisoners felt that they would not want to do the programmes offered at other prisons, as they would not feel relaxed and secure as they did at Peterhead. An A-Hall prisoner had taken a poll of prisoners and the majority of prisoners preferred to stay at HMP Peterhead than to be moved to the central belt. Some however, might want to move to the central belt if there was a dedicated sex offenders prison (not unit) and staff from HMP Peterhead went with them.

38. Some prisoners had served time at other prisons such as Barlinnie and Shotts before arriving at Peterhead and expressed fear at having to return to these establishments saying that there they had been verbally and physically abused by other prisoners and staff, their food was frequently contaminated with urine or faeces. They often experienced unpleasant living conditions where other prisoners urinated under their cell doors and pushed razors under their doors. Prisoners said that sex offenders were hated by other prisoner types who often stabbed, spat on or scalded the sex offenders. Prisoners said that their mail was censored in other prisons. One prisoner said that in HMP Perth he was caged off in one end of a hall and separated from the general population, fearful of attack. Another prisoner was sent to HMP Greenock and put into the general prisoner population and was attacked with cigarettes in the shower block.

39. Prisoners stated that Peterhead prison staff had taken years to learn the skills required to build up trust with inmates and the culture of group working in the education programmes. Fears were also voiced that if HMP Peterhead closes there will be no support for those on parole, especially as many will be due for parole on the expected closure date (2005).

40. Some prisoners felt that there should be an alternative to the STOP programme available, as some prisoners did not want to do it. One prisoner suggested that there should be an option of a more intensive one prisoner to one staff member, for some programmes, as some prisoners required this. One prisoner disagreed with the others regarding the proposed closure of the prison and complained that staff coerced inmates to do the programmes and those not doing the programmes were discriminated against. He could not go through the system or ‘advance’ because part of the criteria of advancement is to attend and pass STOP 2000 which would move him on to the D category of prisoner. Another prisoner complained that although his behaviour was good he did not want to do the programmes but staff continually told him to do the STOP programme which he felt infringed his human rights. One prisoner mentioned that he had completed the STOP programme and it has made a great difference in his life as he considered himself to be a ‘nutcase’ previously. He had been in central belt prisons and been subject to violent assaults.

41. The prisoners were concerned that the Prison Estates Review consultation concentrated on cost rather than factors such as quality of prison life which
they thought of much greater importance. Prisoners felt that the closure of Peterhead was for political reasons rather than need. Prisoners requested that they be able to see and respond to the consultation, as they would be directly affected by it.

42. Prisoners agreed that progression was unsatisfactory at Peterhead with a lack of college or work placements or Special Escorted Leave (SELS) which had created a bottleneck situation, as demand for placements had outstripped supply. Prisoners mentioned a report by Professor Bill Marshall which had highlighted that 98% of the local community supported the idea of prisoner in community work placements.1

Discussion session with prison staff who represent the Prison Officers Association (POA) union

43. The POA members introduced themselves and asked the Committee members if they had any questions for them. Michael Matheson stated that the two main reasons for closure of the prison seemed to be alleged bad condition of the building fabric and the physical location in relation to family visits. Prison officers advised in their extensive time working at the prison, visits have not been an issue. Many prisoners take ‘accumulated’ visits though, many do not bother with them at all. No one has raised the matter with the Visiting Committee, MP or MSP. The distance from the central belt allows STOP 2000 to work as it gives solace and security allowing prisoners to remain focussed and families sometimes pick up the stigma of having a family member in jail.

44. Many families do not want to visit offenders because the offence was against a family member, e.g. Schedule 1 prisoners (perpetrate 67% of offences against children). The visits are of better quality compared to other prisons as prisoners get two hour visits in a provided family area and families do not feel stigmatised or have fear of attack. Other prisons provide only thirty to forty-five minutes. The families are treated with respect and are provided with facilities such as a children’s play area.

45. Richard Lochhead offered the view that compared to HMP Peterhead, sex offenders do not receive the same support from other SPS colleagues in mainstream prisons. Members were told that sex offenders in other establishments were isolated because mainstream prisoners hate them. Prison officers working in the mainstream pick up on this hate, described by officers as ‘electric hate’ as many mainstream prisoners see it a ‘sport to hit a beast (prisoner jargon for sex offender)’. One officer stated that he re-educated himself to not hate sex offenders after transferring into Peterhead, and that good officers can find themselves affected by this climate of hate.

46. HMP Peterhead has a culture where prison officers assist those seeking help and ‘separate the person from the offence’. Central belt prisoners expect to

---

get violently assaulted by prison officers and prisoners alike and are shocked when this does not happen. Prisoners are in shock and sceptical for the first week, as they cannot come to terms with being treated as humans with an identity. Officers have learned to leave them to settle in for a short while before attempting to build relationships with them.

47. Donald Gorrie raised the question of buildings and night sanitation. It was explained that the electronic door system was a viable option. It had, however, been shelved. It was also explained that a new prison build was costed at £26m. This exercise was a joint venture between management and SPOA. The new build was based on P.F.I and public run. After the bid was submitted for evaluation, the staff stated that they had been informed that further costings had to be added, e.g. monthly visits by area director (now Operations Director North/North East) which were seen as trivial attempts to “pad out the figures”.

48. Richard Lochhead asked what would happen to the culture of HMP Peterhead if it closed and what would happen to the staff. Members were advised that approximately 60% would transfer elsewhere and about 40% would resign. It would be a devastating loss if 40% of staff were lost and moving staff to places such as Edinburgh or Glenochil would set the whole programme back 10 years. Particular concern was expressed about those who facilitate the groupwork, as they are integral to making the STOP 2000 programme work. It is unlikely that they would want to move elsewhere when the culture of Peterhead was lost due to closure.

49. The staff felt that the issue with HMP Peterhead moving is that it has a support network in terms of staff and social work department who are geared to the needs of sex offenders, e.g. the whole prison works together as a team. One officer highlighted the commitment of staff to educate themselves further and question their own values. Staff made a point of reading academic papers on sex offenders and not reading sexually explicit tabloid newspapers to help inmates. Officers felt that Peterhead was ahead of the SPS in terms of knowledge on sex offenders.

50. Stewart Stevenson asked whether the POA was an engine for change rather than a barrier as had been suggested by the SPS. An officer said that the POA have never inhibited change but, instead acts as a filter to make changes work. The POA looks for value for money. In recent changes at the prison they have not requested extra staff but managed with the staff they had. Through working with the management the cost per prisoner has dropped from £32,000 pa to £24,000 pa then at the rate of £19,000 pa at present. This was done through staffing reductions, which were not blocked by the unions.

51. Richard Lochhead commented that it was highly commendable that the prison officers had not highlighted their own problems but had demonstrated extreme concern for the inmates and programmes at Peterhead, and for the vision and culture created at the prison. The POA replied that prison officer’s families could face problems as many do not want to leave Peterhead. The officers
themselves do not want to go because they have invested so much and feel that they are making a difference with the work they do in the prison. One staff member said that HMP Peterhead ‘should not be shut on lies’. He felt that the unique culture is created by the staff, not through a SPS initiative, who caught onto the concept after it was in place.

52. Donald Gorrie asked whether civil servants were misrepresenting the truth regarding Peterhead prison. Members were advised that it is possible that the Minister for Justice is being misled and that civil servants are providing the wrong information to him to bias the argument against public sector prisons. Staff at Peterhead are angry as they do not believe that Peterhead’s buildings are in bad condition, and believe that the self-esteem and confidence of the inmates would not exist if the prison buildings were in a state of disrepair.

53. It was suggested that items such as Pension Rights and the SPS College have been added to the costs associated with HMP Peterhead which is creating an incorrect image, especially in relation to HMP Kilmarnock, as they do not get public service pensions. Staff at Kilmarnock are believed to be worse off and possibly of a lower quality. They also explained that they had doubts regarding the 40% differential in cost reduction of any possible private establishment as proposed by the SPS. They felt that 20% has been the previous maximum reduction, with 10 to 15% more likely on average.

54. One officer stated that he would never go to HMP Kilmarnock as private prisons have low pay, long hours and a prison drug culture. He stated that a prison officer in Kilmarnock has to work 80 hours per week to get a ‘living wage’ and there is a suggestion of a huge staff turnover with no commitment to prisoners as there is at HMP Peterhead. Another officer echoed this view. If HMP Peterhead were to close then the staff would probably seek posts with police forces rather than continue with the SPS. Private sector prisons would not want to take on rehabilitation such as STOP 2000 because of the cost implications and the affect that would have on its profit margin. Private prisons would ‘just put all the categories in one place and create a “super sex offender”’ as prisoners would ‘teach’ each other the ‘tricks of trade’ rather than be rehabilitated.

55. Stewart Stevenson questioned why HMP Peterhead has no parole in the community for pre-release prisoners. Staff informed members that the SPS stopped an initiative whereby those nearing the end of their term would get supervised external leave where they could work in the community (as recommended by Professor Bill Marshall\(^2\)). The initiative was to integrate prisoners out into the community as part of their rehabilitation. If prisoners and staff moved to the central belt due to closure of the prison, then there would be no chance of this happening due to ‘Nimbys’ (Not In My Back-yard).

---

Debrief meeting with Management Team

56. Members raised the point that prisoners should be given access to the Scottish Prison Service consultation on the future of the Scottish Prison Service Estates as any proposals on the prison would directly affect them. Ian Gunn agreed that prisoners should be given help from staff to facilitate this.

57. The issue of visits for prisoners was discussed. Prison management said that families feel safer at HMP Peterhead and get longer visits than other establishments, therefore distance is traded for safety. The issue with transport is not a new one and occurs with prisons such as HMP Shotts and Greenock which are also not easy places to access. It was mentioned that the prison was sympathetic to visitors and was willing to help, staff gave examples where the prisoner had been kept open late to help visitors and also examples where visitors had been given medical help. Visits were often seen as a family outing as accommodation was cheap and families felt comfortable at the prison and in Peterhead itself.

58. Committee members asked whether there were any drugs related issues in the prison. Staff stated that drugs are not a major issue at the prison and there is definitely not a problem during visits which usually happens with other establishments.

59. Members were interested to know if there were any issues in rebuilding the prison on new ground in terms of disruption. The Governor could not comment on that matter but others mentioned that the prison, unlike others, has 2 gates which would reduce disruption and that they have greater space than HMP Perth and HMP Barlinnie who both have received work to the structures and fabric of their buildings.

60. Committee members invited staff to comment on what was termed the ‘culture’ and ‘ethos’ of HMP Peterhead and the STOP 2000 programme delivery by other staff. Senior staff felt that the culture did exist prior to STOP 2000, and added that no one was on ‘protection’ in HMP Peterhead as happens to sex offenders in other prisons. It was felt that the Peterhead public plays their part in allowing the sex offenders to raise their self-esteem and thereby encourage rehabilitation. Staff commented that those who attack sex offenders and brand them as ‘beasts and monsters’ will only cause them to re-offend.

61. Committee members asked senior staff to comment on why the initiative supported by Professor Bill Marshall for prisoners to work in the community had been not implemented. It was explained that prisoners had not been placed outside the prison complex as it was felt that this was too much too soon. A proposal had been put forward to the Operations Director but the initiative did not go ahead.

62. Committee members wished to learn if there were any issues relating Special Escorted Leave and work placements for prisoners. Staff made the point that
a bank robber can get a placement, but for a sex offender it is far more difficult. The whole image of sex offenders causes great problems for SELs and placements which makes it far tougher to achieve parole.

63. Committee members thanked Ian Gunn and all others involved for facilitating a worthwhile and educational visit for Justice 1 Committee members.
Annex A

HMP PETERHEAD
GOVERNOR: IAN D F GUNN

1. Introduction

HMP Peterhead is a national resource for convicted, long-term adult male sex offenders, offering a range of programmes designed to challenge offending behaviour in order to reduce the risk of reoffending on return to the community. The design capacity is 306 places, with 10 places (the mothballed Peterhead Unit) currently out of use. Due to the nature of the prison, all prisoners are in single cell accommodation and overcrowding is not an issue for us. The prison has a total staff complement of 240.9 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) although the current number of staff in post is 224.4 FTE. There is a shortfall of 20 officers in the Operations Group complement but the recent national recruitment campaign only succeeded in attracting 2 new staff for Peterhead. The prison is being supported by a special payments scheme and detached duty from other establishments.

The focus of the work of the prison is to reduce future crime by developing and implementing a range of programmes to provide offenders with appropriate opportunities to make positive changes to their behaviour. Prisoners are also able to access opportunities to develop their skills through education, work, physical education and therapeutic interventions.

2 Target Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Ach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults on Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults on Prisoners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes³:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive skills</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offending</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner Learning Hours (PLH)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Drug Testing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Reportable Incidents⁴</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ The programme numbers achieved does not include programmes currently underway.
⁴ There was a National Target for H&S Reportable Accidents in 2000-01 but it was not disaggregated to Establishments.
3 **Condition of Estate**

3.1 The Peterhead Estate is contained within a secure perimeter. However, within the perimeter the estate is generally in poor condition: many of the prison buildings including the residential accommodation are exhausted. However, cells have recently undergone redecoration and, in the last 2 years have been equipped with modern furniture and integral light switches. There has also been major capital investment in fire safety.

3.2 Because of the construction of the accommodation buildings, introducing night sanitation would be a costly, time-consuming, and disruptive exercise, which would delay the final demise of these buildings for only a short period. Therefore the cost-effective answer is rebuilding for the long term.

3.3 Replacing the residential accommodation would still leave outdated support buildings and infrastructure, resulting in continuing high maintenance, and the overall size (350 places) would not meet the present and projected SPS need for accommodation for sex offenders. Clearly, the resolution of this issue is not for local management and the options for the way ahead are a matter under the aegis of the Estates Review.

4 **Specific Issues**

4.1 The SPS has a comprehensive menu of accredited programmes available to address offending behaviour. At Peterhead accredited programmes for anger management, cognitive skills and sexual offending are delivered. All prisoners complete a comprehensive risk/needs assessment to ensure that the appropriate intervention is offered. There is a particular emphasis on interventions for sex offenders in the form of ‘STOP 2000’, the national sex offender programme. ‘STOP 2000’ is delivered by a multi-disciplinary team consisting of specially trained prison officers, psychologists and social workers.

4.2 The programme is based on a model designed by leading world authorities and is ranked as one of the most effective interventions available for sex offenders. A leading international authority on the treatment of sex offenders has acknowledged that the work at Peterhead is of a high standard and represents a significant achievement for the SPS and its staff. The delivery of programmes to prisoners is fully supported by the excellent relationships between all staff working with prisoners, evidenced by the very high uptake of ‘Sentence Management’ indicating that the offenders are motivated towards addressing their offending behavior. This would not be possible without all staff supporting the core business of the prison, delivering the SPS ‘Correctional Agenda’ and thereby contributing to the reduction of recidivism.
5 Summary of Current Position

5.1 Clearly, the Estates Review is having an unsettling effect on both staff and prisoners at Peterhead. Although staff members acknowledge that the existing accommodation for prisoners is unsuitable for the future, there will inevitably be a great deal of concern about plans for individual family circumstances until firm decisions are made.

5.2 Prisoners are also expressing concerns about the future. The dominant belief amongst prisoners here is that sex offenders are targeted by ‘mainstream’ offenders and they need a supported regime with no contact with other types of prisoners. As there are only long-term sex offenders at Peterhead, prisoners do not need to be segregated and can therefore enjoy a more relaxed and normal regime which supports the drive towards encouraging offenders to take part in programme activity.

5.3 I have been the Governor at Peterhead since October 2001 and I am delighted to have been given the opportunity to maintain and develop the excellent work being delivered at the establishment. The prison has recently won a prestigious award, achieving Beacon Site status under the ‘Modernizing Government’ initiative and will celebrate its first Beacon site event on 14 May 2002 and was also a finalist in the 2001 TNT Modernizing Government Partnership Award Scheme. My early perceptions of the management and staff and the standard of work produced throughout the establishment are very positive.

Ian D F Gunn
Governor
HMP Peterhead
1 Feb 2002
H. M. PRISON
PETERHEAD

AVAILABLE
PROGRAMMED
GROUP WORK

- COGNITIVE SKILLS
- ANGER MANAGEMENT
- RELATIONSHIPS GROUP
- ALCOHOL GROUP
- DRUG AWARENESS
- DRUG EDUCATION
- PRE RELEASE
- STOP 2000
- ADAPTED SEX OFFENDER PROGRAMME
- SEX OFFENDER AWARENESS PROGRAMME
**COGNITIVE SKILLS**

**TARGET GROUP:** All who wish to examine and question their own thinking and improve their ability to deal with problem solving and emotional changes effectively.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaders</strong></td>
<td>Gordon McCauley and David Fairlie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td>8 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Six times per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Length</strong></td>
<td>36 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sessions per Week</strong></td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups in Parallel</strong></td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Deliveries per Year</strong></td>
<td>Six groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIMS**

To provide an opportunity for individuals to address and modify tendencies towards impulsive, egocentric, illogical and rigid thinking. This programme encourages people to stop and think before acting and to fully consider the consequences of such acts both for themselves and others.

It also aims to develop an ability to conceptualise alternative ways in which they might respond thus requiring that they consider the needs and feeling of others, including the potential victim(s) of any act.

**Specific areas addressed include:** -

- Problem Solving
- Creative Thinking
- Social Skills Development
- Negotiation Skills
- Critical Reasoning
- Values Enhancement

Management of emotions also plays a prominent part throughout and becomes specifically featured in the second half where the maintenance and examination of an “Anger Diary” requires people to acknowledge the existence of emotions and to examine the possibility that they might influence or control these.
ANGER MANAGEMENT

TARGET GROUP: - All who recognise they need to examine the role of anger and emotional control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Davie Fairlie, Dale Galley, John Hamilton, Carole Hill, Gordon McCauley &amp; Kirsty Stirling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>8 – 10 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Four times per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length</td>
<td>12 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per Week</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in Parallel</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIMS

This group seeks to enable group members to develop strategies, which will assist them to deal more effectively with feelings of anger thereby helping avoid situations in which such emotions might previously have resulted in violent outcomes.

Core areas: -

♦ To link anger, aggression and a lack of self control with offending behaviour
♦ To recognise the signs and causes of anger
♦ To raise awareness of the consequences of violence
♦ To learn practical ways of dealing with anger
♦ To increase self esteem and confidence
To develop assertiveness and communication skills
RELATIONSHIPS GROUP

TARGET GROUP: - All those who recognise that they have experienced problems in forming and maintaining relationships

Leaders :- Allan Shannon and Debbie Armstrong (John Raine)
Capacity :- 10 per group
Frequency :- 3 times per year
Overall Length :- 14 sessions
Sessions per Week :-One
Groups in Parallel :-None
Total Deliveries per Year :-Three

AIMS

The group is aimed at prisoners who have had difficulties forming and maintaining relationships in the past. Participants need not have taken part in offence specific groupwork prior to commencement of the programme.

The aim of the programme is to develop self-awareness, gain a better understanding of intimate relationships and how we may develop and maintain them effectively and constructively.

The programme adopts a cognitive behavioural approach and uses a combination of group discussions, brainstorm, chart lists and role-plays throughout the sessions.

The programme will cover areas such as:
- Attitudes, values and beliefs
- Choosing partners
- Emotions
- Power and Control
- Communication
- Problem solving
- Managing conflict
- Ending relationships assertively
Priority will be given to those prisoners whose relationship deficits have contributed to their offending behaviour.
ALCOHOL GROUP

TARGET GROUP: - Those who recognise that alcohol use and abuse has been a significant feature in their lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Jackie MacPherson and Nick Glass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity :</td>
<td>10 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency :</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length :</td>
<td>20 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per Week :</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in Parallel :</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliveries per Year :</td>
<td>Four groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AIMS

♦ To develop an awareness of the nature and effects of usage of alcohol
♦ To examine the role that alcohol usage has had in individual lives
♦ To examine the impact alcohol has had on the individual in terms of:
  ➔ Health
  ➔ Relationships
  ➔ Home life
  ➔ Work
  ➔ Behaviour
♦ To begin the process of developing strategies for controlled usage or abstinence as appropriate to their individual needs
♦ To identify other possible areas where further work is required, e.g.:
  ➔ Relationships
  ➔ Anger Management
DRUGS AWARENESS

TARGET GROUP: - All who recognise they have issues to address in the area of drug abuse.

Leaders :- Davie Fairlie and Ian MacDonald
Capacity :- 10 per group
Frequency :- Demand led
Overall Length :- 12 sessions
Sessions per Week :- One
Groups in Parallel :- None
Total Deliveries per Year :- Demand led

AIMS
♦ To have people identify the role drug abuse has had in their lives
♦ To examine personal and extended impacts this has had for them and those around them
♦ To identify ways in which drug abuse can be minimised for all concerned

MODULAR CONTENT
♦ Positives and negatives of drug use.
♦ Drug categorisation
♦ Understanding risks and harm associated with drug use
♦ Drug use and offending
♦ Drugs and the law
♦ Harm minimisation
♦ Tolerance level awareness
♦ Coping with a drug free lifestyle
♦ Impact of my drug use on the community, family and myself
♦ Health issues associated with drug use including HIV/AIDS and hepatitis
**MDT DRUG EDUCATION**

**TARGET GROUP:** All who have used or abused drugs / substances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Ian MacDonald and David Fairlie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Demand lead from MDT Programme positive tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length</td>
<td>6 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per Week</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in Parallel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliveries per Year</td>
<td>Demand lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIMS**

To provide an opportunity for an educational and informational follow on to a positive test carried out under the MDT Programme.

In this we ask people to examine the role of substance abuse in their lives and identify ways in which change may be achieved and sustained.

**MODULAR CONTENT**

♦ Drug definitions and categorisation
♦ Attitudes towards drug use
♦ Positives and negatives of drug use in prison
♦ Health issues associated with drug use
♦ Associated risks and harms of drug use
♦ Risky behaviour
♦ Understanding the drug taker
♦ The misuse of drugs act
**PRE RELEASE**

**TARGET GROUP:** All prisoners within 3 months of release or parole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>A combined team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Maximum of 15 per group according to demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Four per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length</td>
<td>Spans approximately 6 – 8 weeks in varied length inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per Week</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in Parallel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliveries per Year</td>
<td>Demand led</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIMS**

By use of a modular approach, to provide accurate and current information on relevant topics to those approaching release. The course also aims to provide awareness of current issues in society i.e. HIV / AIDS, Alcohol and Drug awareness and the likely changes to be managed in the context of “How it used to be”.

**MODULES**

**EMPLOYMENT** – Workshop format comprising a five-day input from an employment training specialist, APEX. The qualification obtained during this course is an SQA Level 1 in Job Seeking Skills.

Areas covered include the current state of the job scene, form filling and interview skills, maximising skills, experience and qualifications and the preparation of a C.V. Also dealt with are issues of particular importance to prisoners on discharge, such as disclosure of criminal convictions etc.

**BENEFITS AND ENTITLEMENTS** – Half day workshop by Benefits Agency staff covering up to date information on these and any other relevant areas of concern to individuals. Specifics include definition of eligibility for benefits, claim form completion etc.

**DRUGS, HIV & SAFE SEX** – Presented by Aberdeenshire Social Work Department, a community based specialist worker. This half-day input aims to dispel the myths
surrounding these areas and to provide factual information and a responsible perspective with which to resume a role in society.

**ALCOHOL AWARENESS** – This half-day input provides an awareness of the use and abuse of alcohol in various settings, the attendant health issues and provides reinforcement for those who have previously undertaken more in-depth work in this area. In doing this, it presents individuals with the information on which to base a decision to drink in moderation or to follow a policy of abstinence as is appropriate to their own situation.

**THROUGHCARE & SUPERVISION ON RELEASE** – Presented by members of the Prison based Social Work team, this session allows participants to explore and clarify concerns they may have in respect of areas of supervision, license conditions and registration in a supportive environment. Whilst it is recognised these areas are fully covered in pre-release Through Care meetings, it presents a safe opportunity to review concerns prior to transfer for release.

**RETURNING TO THE COMMUNITY** – One day input by course staff on an information / discussion basis. It seeks to remind people of the possible changes in society’s attitudes and how the reality of their position within relationships / friendships etc. may well have altered from that anticipated / remembered. Coverage of issues of immediate concern is also carried out in respect of awareness of current costs of living, basic budgeting and other basic “living skills”.

**RELAPSE PREVENTION FOR OFFENDERS** – A one day input from STOP Programme staff which, whilst drawing on the principles of the STOP process, offers thinking on the likely recurrence of pre offending thinking and optional routes and support mechanisms available to individuals irrespective of the nature of convictions. Allied closely to the Returning to the Community session, it seeks to challenge thinking that previously held values and attitudes within the community themselves present risk of return to an offending lifestyle.

When discussing issues of release with prisoners, please bear in mind that advice on specific areas of concern in relation to health issues is available by
arrangement with Healthcare Staff as are condoms at the time of release, whether on home leave or liberation.
**STOP 2000**

**TARGET GROUP:** - All prisoners who have been convicted of a sexual offence and who wish to address their offending behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders :-</th>
<th>A combined team of Prison, Social Work and Psychological Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity :-</td>
<td>10 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency :-</td>
<td>Maximum of 5 groups per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length :-</td>
<td>85 sessions lasting up to 2 ½ hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per Week :-</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in Parallel :-</td>
<td>Up to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliveries per Year :-</td>
<td>5 groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STOP 2000**

The **STOP 2000** programme adopts a group work based approach to addressing offending behaviour and is delivered over a period of approximately one-year. Each group comprises of 10 offenders who have been convicted of sexual offences against children and/or adults. Groups meet twice per week (approximately 2 ½ hour sessions) and are led by a programme team of Prison Officers, Social Workers and Psychologists. Priority is given to those men who are considered to be at a high risk of re-offending.

**Aims of the Core Programme**

1. To bring sex offenders out of denial and minimisation
2. To enhance their understanding of the victim’s experience (develop victim empathy)
3. To help them develop plans and strategies for avoiding re-offending (relapse prevention)

**Block 1** - Establishing the Group

**Block 2** - Understanding distorted thinking (Errors in the thought process)

**Block 3** - Coping strategies (Effective & Ineffective)

**Block 4** - My History

**Block 5** - Active accounts (Offence)
Block 6 - Fantasy (Sexual thoughts)
Block 7 - Patterns in my offending (Understanding motivation in offending)
Block 8 - Peer feedback and goal setting (Improving skills at giving support)
Block 9 - Costs and gains of my offending
Block 10 - Victim empathy using written and video accounts
Block 11 - Victim narrative
Block 12 - Victim perspective role-plays
Block 13 - Victim letters
Block 14 - Old Me (Attitudes, values and beliefs leading up to offending)
Block 15 - Future me (Development of functional coping strategies)
Block 16 - Future me alternatives to offending
Block 17 - Getting to future me
Block 18 - Setbacks
Block 19 - Future me role-play
Block 20 - Ending
**APAPTED SEX OFFENDER PROGRAMME**

**TARGET GROUP:** All prisoners who have been convicted of a sexual offence and who wish to address their offending behaviour, and who have an IQ of less than 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>A combined team of Prison and Psychological Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity:</strong></td>
<td>8 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency:</strong></td>
<td>One per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Length:</strong></td>
<td>80 sessions lasting up to 2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sessions per Week:</strong></td>
<td>Four per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups in Parallel:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Deliveries per Year:</strong></td>
<td>One delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADAPTED SEX OFFENDER PROGRAMME**

The adapted programme has been designed to be more interactive by using a more flexible and creative style. This is done through the use of drawing and role-plays. The Group meet four times per week (approximately 2 hours per session) and are led by a programme team of Prison Officers and Psychologists. The key element for the ADAPTED programme is that it is an ACTIVE process between group members and facilitators.

**Aims of the Adapted Programme**

- To increase sexual knowledge
- To modify offence justifying thinking
- To develop the ability to recognise feelings in themselves and others
- To gain an understanding of victim harm
- To teach relapse prevention

**Block 1 -** Getting going

**Block 2 -** “Old Me”

**Block 3 -** Sex Education
| Block 4 - | My feelings |
| Block 5 - | Making excuses |
| Block 6 - | The four stages of offending |
| Block 7 - | My offence |
| Block 8 - | What happens to me when I offend |
| Block 9 - | Review |
| Block 10 - | Other people’s feeling |
| Block 11 - | What my offending does to victims |
| Block 12 - | Risky things |
| Block 13 - | Introducing “New Me” tactics |
| Block 14 - | “New Me” in prison |
| Block 15 - | Ending the group |
EX OFFENDER AWARENESS PROGRAMME

TARGET GROUP: - Those who are denying some element of their offence(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>John Hamilton and Dale Galley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity :-)</td>
<td>10 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency :-)</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length</td>
<td>20 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per Week</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in Parallel</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliveries per Year</td>
<td>Two groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AIMS**

The aims of the programme are to reduce risk, change attitudes and increase the likelihood of future self-control.

Although some men will move toward full admission and some will move on to STOP 2000, the aim of the programme is not to gain a confession. Challenge and attack most often leads to further entrenchment and often, increased risk. With sufficient rapport, some confrontation will be possible.

**Key Elements of the Programme**

- Defining sexual offending
- The consequences of sexual offending
- General group building and increasing trust among group members
- Attitudes, values and beliefs about sexual offending and relationships
- Consent
- Power & Control
- Finklehor’s four preconditions for offending
- The Offending Cycle
- Human sexuality and general sex education
- What denial is about
- Victim harm and some basic victim empathy
- Rules for general human conduct
- Responsibility
- Assertiveness training
- Improving self-esteem
- Process of change (motivational cycle) and concepts of relapse prevention
- Behavioural practice and control
- Reducing anxiety about revealing offences by exploring fictional ‘offender’ and his journey from offending to disclosure to prosecution to rehabilitation
- Links with treatment. Encourage members to understand that these are the same subject areas as are addressed in STOP 2000, but with the crucial difference that men on STOP 2000 discuss all of these issues on a directly personal level (as opposed to the hypothetical level)
JUSTICE 1 COMMITTEE

Appointment of adviser on the Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill

Note by the Clerk

1. The Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill is expected to be introduced in mid-June. It is likely that the Justice 1 Committee will be the lead Committee on the Bill. The proposed content of the Bill is outlined in the Scottish Executive’s Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill consultation document (May 2001). This consultation document has a draft Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill attached.

2. Title conditions are conditions which apply to land ownership. The commentary on the draft Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill outlines two main objectives. Firstly, to achieve greater clarity in the law. Secondly, to reduce the number of outdated burdens by making it easier to discharge or vary them. The consultation paper on the draft Bill states that this will make it possible to update the property registers over time and to achieve greater clarity about the burdens and enforcement rights applying to owners. The draft Bill creates a regime for the way in which land will be held in the future, and also makes transitional arrangements for burdens and rights which exist at present.¹

3. The Bill will be a long and highly technical one and it is suggested that the lead committee might find it helpful to have an expert adviser to assist in drawing up the Stage 1 report. The role of the adviser could include:

- briefing the Committee on the background to, and technical aspects of, the Bill;
- drawing up a list of people from whom to invite written evidence;
- summarising the issues arising from written evidence;
- advising the Committee on witnesses for oral evidence and suggesting lines of questioning;
- drawing out key issues for the Stage 1 report.

The adviser’s assistance would probably not be required in relation to Stage 2 although it would be possibly to hold a couple of days of their time in reserve in case of any new or technical issues arising at this stage.

4. The Committee is asked to agree to the appointment of an adviser to assist in consideration of Stage 1 of the Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill.

¹ Title Conditions (Scotland) Bill Consultation, May 2001, para 12