The Committee will meet at 1.30pm in Committee Room 2.

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

2. **Prison Estates Review:** The Committee will take oral evidence from—

   - Ian Gunn, Governor, HMP Peterhead,
   - Stuart Campbell and Debbie Armstrong, STOP 2000 programme team, HMP Peterhead,
   - Alec Spencer, Director, Directorate of Rehabilitation and Care, the Scottish Prison Service,
   - Councillor Stuart Pratt and Bill McGee, HMP Peterhead Visiting Committee, and
   - Dr Jim McManus, Chairman, Parole Board for Scotland.

Alison Taylor
Acting Clerk to the Committee, Tel 85195
The following papers are attached for this meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda items 1 and 2</th>
<th>J1/02/20/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note by the Clerk (private paper) TO FOLLOW</td>
<td>J1/02/20/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission from HMP Peterhead Visiting Committee</td>
<td>J1/02/20/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission from Dr Jim McManus, Chairman of Parole Board</td>
<td>J1/02/20/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence regarding Prison Estates Review</td>
<td>J1/02/20/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document on available programmed group work at HMP Peterhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justice 1 Committee

Prison Service Estates Review

Submission by Peterhead Prison Visiting Committee

1. The review is based on a perception that there will be savings by driving staffing costs down through the introduction of private prisons. It has not been proved, in the long term, that such cost savings will not be accompanied by reduced standards and safety.

2. The current curtilage of the prison includes a large area of spare ground which would allow for a rebuild of virtually any size to be undertaken. The site would therefore not face the same planning considerations as would any proposals to build on a virgin site. Not only would there be room to build a new prison but also to provide workshop space should that be affected by the construction.

3. A prison housing sex offenders has been accepted in Peterhead. It is a facility which employs local people and which brings business into the area. There are no concerns as to safety. Were the facility to be moved elsewhere local concerns at the new site would require to be overcome.

4. It has been suggested that 28% of prisoners have commented adversely as to the remoteness of Peterhead. However, effectively this means that 72% are either in favour of the location or have no views for or against; indeed 140 out of 240 prisoners recently canvassed are happy with the location at Peterhead.

5. Notwithstanding the views of the prison service approximately 25% of prisoners at Peterhead come from North of Perth and a significant number (the Inspector of Prisons suggests 50%) do not have regular family visits, not because of the remoteness of Peterhead but due to the nature of the crime they committed.

6. Arrangements have been made available for longer family visits so that the perceived remoteness mentioned in the case against Peterhead is counterbalanced by the additional quality time that families can spend at Peterhead. Local hotels and bed and breakfast establishments are happy to accommodate prisoners’ families.

7. With regard to prison staff the work ethic of the local labour force is worth a great deal. Accordingly Peterhead has a low absentee rate for staff and high productivity. It is likely that a significant number of staff would resign from the prison service rather than move away, particularly where spouses have well paid jobs and children are at critical stages in their education.

8. When the Scottish Parliament’s Justice One Committee visited the prison they met with 30-40 prisoners. When the issue of toilet accommodation was discussed very few prisoners felt that this was a problem. Slopping out as such is not the present situation in Peterhead as portable chemical toilets are provided for cells, and these are exchanged on a regular basis by commercial contractors.

9. The food is cooked in the prison kitchen. There is a fear among prisoners that if they were located in a wing of a mainstream prison there could be a possibility of food being interfered with, this is not a fear at Peterhead. At present there is a high satisfaction rate
as to the quality of the food at Peterhead and currently the value for money expended, based on cost of meals per head is amongst the best in the Scottish Prison Service.

10. Due to the concentration of prisoners at Peterhead jailed for similar offences they feel “safe”. There is no likelihood of abuse and violence from other prisoners. Whereas these are instances of families visiting sex offenders in other prisons having been attacked or harassed, this does not happen at Peterhead. There have been recent Press reports as to difficulties faced by such offenders at Saughton, Edinburgh, and there are serious doubts as to safety for such offenders at Barlinnie.

11. Within the Peterhead community prison officers and their families are accepted. Officers can walk to work in uniform. This is not always the case in communities in the central belt.

12. The current buildings are in good condition although old and not to a modern design. It is well maintained and clean and due to the local pride in the establishment it is far better kept than many other establishments. There is also recreational space which does not exist at, for example, Aberdeen.

13. One of the strongest cases for Peterhead is the monoculture for dealing with the STOP programme. Staff have developed it from a nil position. In other prisons it is only undertaken on a low scale, mainly due to the fact that most long term sex offenders are at Peterhead. The staff/prisoner working relationships within Peterhead are good and such that the stress factor for staff is relatively low.

14. As many of the staff will not move, should the facility be transferred elsewhere it is unlikely that the current atmosphere within the prison could be recreated, certainly not in the short term. Despite the SPS assurance that STOP can be delivered elsewhere the destruction of the team atmosphere at Peterhead can only be counterproductive.

15. With regard to the STOP programme it has not been explained how this is to be recreated within a different facility. It is accepted that Justice Minister Jim Wallace has stated that STOP will always be in the public domain. However for reasons stated above, it will be difficult to replicate the commitment of staff in another establishment.

16. As the prison service has indicated that there would be a leaving package for staff not prepared to move it is likely that there would be a considerable leakage of quality staff from the prison service. Whilst there is a potential for staff recruitment within the central belt it is the experience that will be lost.

17. Accepting that some private finance input is necessary, a privately-built – publicly run facility at Peterhead is quite clearly the Visiting Committee’s preferred route. This has not been formally costed by SPS, despite ample opportunity having been available prior to publication of the consultation documents. Although such an arrangement has not to date been introduced within the Scottish Prison Service it is common elsewhere, such as within the English Prison Service and through many government and local authority projects. Contractual relationships can be set out specifying where responsibility and risk lies for insurance and other purposes.

18. It is understood that the prison officers at Peterhead support a 500 new-build Unit within the site of the existing prison.

19. Drug taking is low at Peterhead as compared with any other prison. In part this appears due to the distance of Peterhead from the central Scotland belt.
20. The quality of work from the prison workshop is high; contracts are met on time with goods produced being of a good standard. Wastage is understood to be the lowest in Scotland.

21. The quality of the STOP programme at Peterhead has been praised on an international basis. The Visiting Committee are also grateful that support for retention of the prison extends to the local community, national and local politicians, the Chief Inspector of Prisons, the Association of Prison Visiting Committees, the Scottish media and the Churches. The only support for closure arises from the estates review – perhaps another case of “knowing the price of everything, but the value of nothing”.

Keith Jones
Clerk, Peterhead Prison Visiting Committee

15th May 2002
Justice 1 Committee

Prison Service Estates Review

Submission by Dr Jim McManus

(Brief CV of Jim McManus: Senior Lecturer in Law, University of Dundee; Chairman, Parole Board for Scotland; Expert Adviser, Council of Europe Committee for Prevention of Torture (the CPT); formerly Scottish Prisons Complaints Commissioner, Consultant to HM Inspectorate of Prisons (E+W), member of Parole Board for Scotland. Author of Prisons, Prisoners and the Law(Greens, Edinburgh, 1994).)

1. It is beyond debate that urgent steps are necessary to eliminate unacceptable material conditions in several of our prisons. The CPT is among many bodies which have criticised “slopping out” as an inhuman and degrading practice, for staff and prisoners alike. The elimination of this practice is now both an instrumental and symbolic imperative. Recent proposals to create “Toilet Patrols” are not an answer. Such patrols would be demeaning for staff, incredibly expensive in resources (there needs to be three person present safely to open a cell during a lock-up period), and would require proper supervision to ensure that they provided an appropriate service. Toilets are not the only facility absent from the buildings targeted in the Review. Power points in cells have proved, where available, a boon in providing positive diversions for prisoners otherwise condemned to mindless boredom during lengthy lock-up periods. Those buildings not already converted also suffer from other design and age related features which render their continued use in the 21st Century both unacceptable and uneconomic. Adapting them to today’s requirements would require enormous resources and a long time.

2. It is not beyond debate – or, indeed, control – that prison numbers should stay at the present high level or increase, as projected, to 7,200 or 7,600. The number of people in prison is the result of several variables, including the amount of crime committed and detected, the choice of imprisonment as the appropriate response and the length of time to be served in each sentence. Any estimate of future demand for places is bound to involve guesswork. One thing seems clear from experience throughout the world: if prison places are created, they will be used. I think we need to be more proactive as a society in determining how much resources we are prepared to spend on prison places and creating mechanisms for ensuring that these places are allocated to those society has most need of having in prison. Continuing to use prison for very short
sentences is a manifest waste of an expensive resource; using prison as a response to drug use (as opposed to drug dealing) wastes both resources and lives. Steps are already being taken by the Scottish Executive in these areas and in creating viable alternatives to prison. These moves should be increased with the aim of bringing the Scottish imprisonment rate down to the European average rather than simply accepting even higher rates for the future.

3. Particular issues with Low Moss, Barlinnie and Peterhead.

(a) **Low Moss** The buildings at Low Moss are well past their sell-by date. Only the demand for short-term places in the west of Scotland has kept it open. Many prisoners do anything (short of not re-offending!) to avoid being sent there. It is a very difficult prison for staff to control, despite the low security status of the prisoner group. No-one will lament its closure in its present form.

The one big advantage of Low Moss is its location. Close to the population it serves, it is relatively easy for social workers, lawyers and family and friends to visit prisoners; escorts to courts and hospitals are efficiently organised. Prisoners come from, and will return to, its environs. The site is large and reasonably discreet from its surroundings. There is thus a strong case for retaining this site for prison use.

(b) **Barlinnie** Again, there seems to be little dispute that standards in parts of Barlinnie are not acceptable and that the costs of upgrading existing facilities are prohibitive. However, this site is also ideally located, though it is not clear that retaining a capacity of 1000+ prisoners in one place is a sensible idea.

(c) **Peterhead** The proposals in relation to Peterhead have attracted the most interest, and criticism from at least some parts. There is no doubt, however, that the status quo is not an option. The existing physical plant is old, primitive in design and very difficult to adapt to introduce toilets and electric power. Adaptations would, of course, be possible, but at great cost and probably lesser material benefit than a new build. We must then consider the case for and against carrying out that new build at Peterhead.

*The Case for Peterhead as a Location:*

i. Committed and adaptable staff: Peterhead staff have shown over the years an ability to adapt to different prisoner groups and a level of professionalism of which they can be justifiably proud. The area has always been a good recruitment ground for the Prison Service and the possibility of remaining in the area is a powerful draw for many staff. It would not be possible for more than a handful of staff to be redeployed within the Service without requiring them to move house.

ii. There is a large site available, with plenty of room for building to be carried out while existing accommodation continues to be used.
iii. There seems, at least now, to be local support for the continued siting of a prison here.

iv. The existing group of prisoners, convicted long term sex offenders, requires to be separated from other groups of prisoners, both for protection and to enable them to concentrate on addressing offending behaviour.

v. The staff have become trained and experienced in delivering an offending behaviour programme which they say is highly successful at preventing re-offending.

The Case Against Peterhead as a Location

i. The geographical situation of Peterhead means that the vast majority of its prisoners are drawn from a long way off. This poses problems, often insurmountable, for visits, from family, lawyers and social workers. Almost every prisoner will be released some day; those with no family ties will experience greater difficulty in re-engaging with society. Many sex offenders lose immediate family contact as a result of their conviction. Situating them away from easy visits compounds this situation. Throughcare work by social work teams is becoming an increasing reality in Scotland. Maintaining regular contact between community based workers and prisoners maximises the impact of social work intervention. It is rendered very difficult if prisoners are situated a long way from their home areas. Finally, the gradual reintroduction of prisoners into the community towards the end of their sentences is much easier if the prison is situated close to different large centres of population. It is particularly difficult to ask one medium sized town to bear the brunt of accepting responsibility for the preparation for release of this particular group of offenders.

ii. While there is debate about the merits of concentrating all sex offenders on one site as opposed to dispersing them around the system, the case for concentration to guarantee safety seems well made at the moment. The problem is that Peterhead is not currently large enough to hold all sex offenders – there are currently some 580 in the system and Peterhead’s maximum capacity is 300. Any new facility should be able to accommodate this larger number.

iii. Much has been made of the STOP programme for sex offenders. I think, however, that the jury must still be out on the success of the programme in Scotland. It is well known that the reconviction rates of sex offenders, and particularly intra-familial offenders, are very low anyway and such offenders require to be followed up over a lengthy period in order to reach any valid conclusions. We simply have not had sufficient time for this to be done in Scotland (and the STOP programme itself has undergone significant changes in the short period it has been available).
iv. In any event, the proportion of prisoners completing the STOP programme at Peterhead is very small. Around 30 prisoners per year complete the programme – approximately 10% of the capacity of the prison. Equally, only a small percentage of the staff are involved in programme delivery. Many prisoners are unsuitable for the programme – because of their legal status, their ability to cope with groups, their intelligence and their physical health. Gearing the whole regime round the programme thus has severe downsides, the threat of return to a less protected environment being a significant control tool.

v. STOP is also available elsewhere in the Scottish Prison Service and there is no reason why the programme cannot be delivered by appropriately trained staff in any situation. Guaranteeing prisoner safety is a precondition to any intervention, but this could be done, for example, by making Glenochil, with accommodation for almost all sex offenders, the specialist prison for this group. The fact remains, unfortunately, that most prisoner time in any sentence is spent surviving imprisonment and most staff time maintaining order, safety and security. Programmes of any kind will only ever take up a miniscule percentage of the time of both groups. Developing an estates strategy by reference to one such programme does not make sense.

4. The Public/Private Debate

At the heart of this debate is a profound question of political and moral principle on which I am no more qualified to comment than anyone else. We now have experience of a private provision in Scotland and it is therefore possible to comment on comparative service delivery.

In this regard, it does seem that private provision can have particular advantages. The private sector seems to be able to build new prisons much more quickly than the public sector. Perhaps this is because they have to be given a definite specification at the outset and thus know exactly what is required of them – unlike the constantly changing plans and programmes which dogged the building of HMP Shotts, the last new public sector build in Scotland. Perhaps, too, they have readily available to them a sufficient number of qualified and experienced technical staff to manage the building and the contracts.

Secondly, private sector prisons are much more accountable than state prisons. The contract under which they are run specifies in minute detail what they must provide on a daily basis. Contract monitors are on-site all the time. Any failure to meet a contract term can be identified immediately and the response is also immediate and meaningful – the imposition of a financial penalty. Though this process has taken place in relative secrecy, there is no doubt about its efficacy.
State prisons which fail to meet much less specific targets do not suffer such immediate retribution.

The presence of a Controller, appointed by Scottish Ministers, and the requirement that all staff are approved by public authorities provides a strong measure of protection for the interests of the State and of prisoners.

Two particular criticisms have been advanced of our private prison. One is that they are not good at “Addressing Offending Behaviour” or prisoner programmes. To be fair, it should be noted that this was not required by the contract, which concentrated on the provision of meaningful work for prisoners. SPS appears to have changed its mind about “What Works” since the contract was drawn up and has moved its focus to programmes. There is, however, a considerable body of evidence which identifies employment on release as the most significant factor in reducing the likelihood of reconviction. Whatever is the case, HM Chief Inspector's recent report on Kilmarnock shows that Kilmarnock put proportionately at least as many prisoners through programmes as any SPS establishment – and these programmes were led by professionally qualified staff rather than by trained prison officers.

The second criticism is about the rate of staff turnover at Kilmarnock compared with SPS establishments. Like is not being compared with like in this regard. The appropriate comparator in SPS would be turnover in newly recruited B and C band staff, where the rate is inevitable higher as people find they are not suited for the job or are attracted by higher incomes elsewhere.

Though I am no expert on costs, it is relatively easy to see where cost savings are made by private providers. Staffing costs are the main marginal cost in running a prison. Incorporating good design and the most modern electronic and mechanical systems in a new build greatly reduces reliance on human beings. The relative figures for staff in post in HM Chief Inspector's Kilmarnock report shows the extent of that. Flexibility in staff attendance systems further reduces staff costs. SPS is the victim of its history in this regard and has only recently begun to address the fact that its staff attendance system reflects the demands of a time long past. Private providers start with a clean sheet and can devise a system which meets the operational requirements of new buildings, new programmes and new technology. If staff absence rates are a good measure of staff stress, the fact that Kilmarnock has the second lowest level of staff days lost per year of all prisons in Scotland (HMCIP’s report) might indicate that the staffing level is satisfactory. At the same time, Kilmarnock produces greater out of cell time and more constructive activities for prisoners (i.e. a better regime) for almost all categories of inmate.

The figures for respective costs given in the Estates Review are surprising. Few external commentators expected them to be so far apart, though everyone knows that private provision, free of historical baggage and with new buildings, is much
cheaper for the State. Presuming the figures are accurate - and I have as yet seen no reasoned challenge to them – it is difficult to see how the state sector can eliminate (as opposed to close) the gap in the short term.

5. Conclusion

The question of public/private provision cannot be decided on cost and service delivery criteria only. However, it is beyond question that prison cells without easy access to toilets and electric power are not acceptable and that urgent action is overdue in relation to each of the identified establishments. Strategically, such action should also address the other disadvantages inherent in old or non-purpose built establishments. The main disadvantage of Peterhead is its distance from the homes of most of its clients. The costs of renovating existing buildings are very high and the benefits from renovation would be limited. New build, in appropriate locations, is the obvious answer. In determining the amount of new build really required, careful consideration should be given to the potential for reducing the prison population by, for example, the expansion of drug courts and the elimination of wasteful short-term sentences.

Perhaps one way to resolve the political and moral questions relating to privatisation would be to restrict private sector involvement to the running of remand facilities. Remand prisoners are not being punished, yet their location alongside convicted prisoners and supervised by the same staff renders their positions virtually indistinguishable from each other. HMCIP has already praised the conditions of remand prisoners at Kilmarnock and steps have been taken to improve matters at Edinburgh Prison. However, the fact remains that remands generally are given the poorest conditions in any prison. An ideal solution would be to have two separate systems, with remand prisons (and all the associated escorting duties) run by the private sector, which could not then be accused of “profiting from punishment”, and convicted prisoners dealt with fully by state owned and run establishments.

Jim McManus
14 May 2002
Dear Mr ... 

THE CLOSING OF PETERHEAD PRISON

I am writing to you to express my concerns with the closing of Peterhead Prison from the view of a visitor.

As you can see I live in Inverness and Peterhead is far closer for me to visit than any other prison. If my husband is moved to Glenochil Prison for example, at the present time I have to take a train to Aberdeen and then a bus to Peterhead which only takes 3 and a half hours, if Peterhead was to close it would mean train to Stirling and there is no bus service to Glenochil it would mean having to get a taxi which costs £10 each way, also at the present time the visits are at 10 am in the morning and it would mean I would have to go down the night before.

I am sure I am not the only visitor that does not have a car and has to use public transport. At the moment it is not a problem but at Glenochil and any other prison in the central belt it would be. I have had first hand experience of this last year when my husband was down there for 6 months.

Another concern I have is for the safety of my husband and myself as a visitor if he is moved. At the present time they are all in one unit but if they are moved and have to mix with other prisoners can you ensure they safety? Also mine and other visitors safety.

I feel the prison service has only thought about money when making this decision. Peterhead is the only prison of its kind and all the hardwork that has been done there will be lost.
I hope the views and concerns of the prisoners and visitors will be taken into account when a decision is being made.

Yours sincerely
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>Leaders :</td>
<td>Gordon McCauley and David Fairlie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity :</td>
<td>8 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency :</td>
<td>Six times per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length :</td>
<td>36 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions per Week :</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in Parallel :</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliveries per Year :</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

Leaders :- Davie Fairlie, Dale Galley, John Hamilton, Carole Hill, Gordon McCauley & Kirsty Stirling
Capacity :- 8 – 10 per group
Frequency :- Four times per year
Overall Length :- 12 sessions
Sessions per Week :- One
Groups in Parallel :- Two

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Allan Shannon and Debbie Armstrong (John Raine)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>10 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>3 times per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Length</td>
<td>14 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>Three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET GROUP: -</th>
<th>All who recognise they have issues to address in the area of drug abuse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders :-</td>
<td>Davie Fairlie and Ian MacDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity :-</td>
<td>10 per group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency :-)</td>
<td>Demand led</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>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Deliveries per Year :-</td>
<td>Demand led</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET GROUP: -</th>
<th>All who have used or abused drugs / substances.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders :-</td>
<td>Ian MacDonald and David Fairlie</td>
</tr>
<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><strong>Leaders:</strong></th>
<th>A combined team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity:</strong></td>
<td>Maximum of 15 per group according to demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency:</strong></td>
<td>Four per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Length:</strong></td>
<td>Spans approximately 6 – 8 weeks in varied length inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sessions per Week</strong>:</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups in Parallel</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Deliveries per Year</strong></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

Leaders :- A combined team of Prison and Psychological Staff
Capacity :- 8 per group
Frequency :- One per year
Overall Length :- 80 sessions lasting up to 2 hours
Sessions per Week :- Four per week
Groups in Parallel :- None
Total Deliveries per Year :- One delivery

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
SEX 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)