



H M Prison Coldingley

Annual Report of the Independent Monitoring Board

1 August 2010 to 31 July 2011

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 5

 1.1 THE STATUTORY ROLE OF THE INDEPENDENT MONITORING BOARD (IMB) 5

 1.2 THE ROLE OF HMP COLDINGLEY 5

2. SUMMARY 7

 2.1 OVERALL JUDGEMENT 7

 2.2 MOBILE PHONES & DRUGS 7

 2.3 BUDGET CUTS 8

 2.4 INTEGRATED DRUG TREATMENT STRATEGY (IDTS) 8

 2.5 IPPs AND PRISONERS RECALLED TO CUSTODY 8

3. MATTERS ON WHICH WE ASK FOR A REPLY 9

 3.1 MOBILE PHONES 9

 3.2 INTEGRATED DRUG TREATMENT STRATEGY (IDTS) 9

 3.3 THE UNUSABLE OPEN AIR RECREATION AREA 10

4. TREATMENT & TRAINING OF PRISONERS 11

 4.1 THE PRISON COUNCIL 11

 4.2 RESETTLEMENT 11

 4.3 INDUSTRIES 11

 4.4 CATERING COSTS 12

 4.5 DIVERSITY AND RACE EQUALITY ACTION TEAM (DREAT) 13

5. HEALTHCARE & MENTAL HEALTH 15

6. SAFER CUSTODY 16

 6.1 SELF HARM & BULLYING 16

 6.2 THE SEGREGATION UNIT 16

 6.3 HEALTH & SAFETY 16

ANNEXES

ANNEX A – GLOSSARY 18

ANNEX B - BOARD ACTIVITIES AND MEMBERSHIP 19

ANNEX C - ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HMP COLDINGLEY'S POPULATION 20

ANNEX D – APPLICATIONS TO THE IMB 21

ANNEX E – PRISONERS DETAINED IN THE SEGREGATION UNIT 22

ANNEX F – DISCIPLINARY CHARGES 23

1. Introduction

1.1 The statutory role of the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)

1.1.1 The Prisons Act 1952 requires every prison to be monitored by an Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)¹ appointed by the Home Secretary (now the Secretary of State for Justice) from members of the community in which the prison is situated.

1.1.2 The Board is specifically charged:

a - To satisfy itself as to the humane and just treatment of those held in custody within its prison and the range and adequacy of the programmes preparing them for release;

b - To inform promptly the Secretary of State, or any official to whom he has delegated authority as it judges appropriate, any concern it has; and

c - To report annually to the Secretary of State on how well the prison has met the standards and requirements placed on it and what impact such standards and requirements have on those in its custody.

1.1.3 To enable the Board to carry out these duties effectively its members have right of access to every prisoner and every part of the prison and also to the prison's records.

1.1.4 Summary details of the Board's activities and membership during the year under review are at Annex B.

1.2 The role of HMP Coldingley

1.2.1 The prison was constructed in 1969 as a prototype industrial prison where prisoners would be employed in a range of occupations. Originally it catered for category B prisoners but in 1990 it was changed to a category C prison and it now operates as an industrial/training prison.

1.2.2 At the end of the reporting year, 2010-11, the prison's capacity is 513. The erection of a new building over recent years has increased the population by approximately one third.

1.2.3 There are no remand prisoners at HMP Coldingley. Having started their sentences at other prisons, prisoners at Coldingley are usually serving sentences of between two years and life. In recent times Coldingley's prisoners have included an increased number serving short-tariff indeterminate sentences. In the past it has been unusual for prisoners to end their sentences at Coldingley – they have usually moved on elsewhere before release. But latterly we have seen an increase in the number of prisoners who finish their sentences at Coldingley and are released, which has given added importance to work on resettlement.

1.2.4 At the moment there are 72 Lifers compared with 61 last year, and 77 Indeterminate

¹ A glossary of abbreviations is at Annex A.

Public Protection (IPP) prisoners compared with 65 last year – significant increases in both cases.

1.2.5 A table showing the ethnic breakdown of Coldingley's prisoners, in August 2011, is at Annex C. In previous years we have given the numbers of foreign national prisoners awaiting deportation. The majority of such prisoners are now detained at prisons designated for that purpose, and the proportion of foreign national prisoners at Coldingley to be deported at the end of their sentences is likely to remain small.

2. Summary

2.1 Overall judgement

2.1.1 During the year the prison has received substantial investment from the Prison Service to enhance its role as an industrial/training prison. The laundry has been replaced by a printing workshop with modern equipment and machines. Together with the other workshops, which include sign shop, windows (double glazing), engineering and BICS (industrial cleaning), the vast majority of prisoners are employed. This provides a work ethic and the prison endeavours to match as closely as possible a normal working week. The purpose built education block provides full-time education for some and part-time education for others, and also offers recognised certified courses. The aim is to give prisoners the work place skills which are transferable to the outside world. This is intended to have a positive impact on high rates of reoffending.

2.1.2 Work was completed during the year on a much needed Visitors' Centre. Though small, it provides shelter, with lavatories, washing and baby-changing facilities, close to the prison gate where visitors wait to enter.

2.1.3 The prison's kitchen received 5 stars from the Food & Hygiene Standards agency.

2.1.4 The horticultural area is now up and running and also offers qualifications.

2.1.5 As has been reported in recent years the changing profile of the prisoners, who are often younger and with shorter sentences, has resulted in greater volatility. However staff are proactive in dealing with disruptive behaviour and the prison continues to retain a generally calm and courteous atmosphere.

2.1.6 Towards the end of the reporting year it was announced that Coldingley is one of nine prisons in the country which are to be market tested for privatisation.

2.2 Mobile Phones & Drugs

2.2.1 This has been raised many times before in our reports and following last year's response from the Minister we were assured that trials are under way that render mobile phone signals unusable. We welcome this and hope that they prove successful. Strenuous efforts are already made at local level, but there may be little more that individual prisons can do without better technical support.

2.2.2 In the meantime smuggling of both mobile phones and drugs is an ongoing problem. We believe that some of the prisoners detained in the Segregation Unit for their own protection are afraid of being bullied or assaulted because of debts incurred for the supply of drugs. We cannot, of course, know to what proportion of 'own protection' cases that applies, but it remains a matter of concern. We are however glad to note that use of the Segregation Unit for 'own protection' has declined by some 43% compared with the previous year.

2.3 Budget Cuts

2.3.1 The Board is concerned that the positive changes this year in the work-based opportunities for prisoners will be threatened by continuing budget cuts. In order to extend the current working day at the prison, which is the Minister's aim, resources need to be available to fulfil this.

2.4 Integrated Drug Treatment Strategy (IDTS)

2.4.1 The Board raises this issue again as a question on which we seek a reply from the Minister – see 3.2 below.

2.5 IPPs and prisoners recalled to custody

2.5.1 There are at present 55 prisoners whose detention has continued beyond the tariff set by the court. That is not in itself wrong: the purpose of the sentence is to ensure that those concerned serve the minimum period set by the court but that thereafter they are not released unless the Parole Board considers it safe to do so.

2.5.2 We have however become increasingly concerned that there is a possible lack of effective communication between agencies: the Probation Service, HM Prison Service, the Parole Board, and the Public Protection Casework Section of the Ministry of Justice, resulting in uncertainty and anxiety for the prisoner.

2.5.3 This problem arose in a form which we regarded as particularly serious, in the case of a prisoner recalled to custody having breached the terms of his licence. The terms on which the Parole Board considered him safe to release were spelt out clearly, and they asked for the case to be returned to them as soon as the conditions they had set had been met. Confirmation that the conditions had been met became available in early December 2010. But the case was drawn to our notice in May 2011 when action by the Ministry of Justice to return the case to the Parole Board in accordance with their directions had still not been completed. The prisoner was eventually released, after our intervention, in late June 2011 after inordinate delay on the part of the Probation Service despite the efforts of Coldingley staff. We believe that he was detained for more than 6 months longer than should have been the case.

2.5.4 We drew the case to the Secretary of State's attention, as an example of worrying lack of communication and coordination between his agencies. The minister's reply, when received over two months later, did not seem to us to address our concerns. We therefore pressed our concerns in a further letter to the minister. We have since received a more satisfactory reply setting out the action taken to make a recurrence less likely.

3. Matters on which we ask for a reply

3.1 Mobile Phones

3.1.1 For many years now we have been asking why the Prison Service cannot take more effective action to prevent the smuggling in and use of mobile phones. Local efforts to prevent smuggling by visitors, and launching contraband over the wire fence, is unlikely ever to be wholly successful despite the attention given by staff and, in recent years, greatly improved cooperation with Surrey Police.

3.1.2 The Prison Service has reported several times that it is developing technical measures to support local management in dealing with the problem, so that mobile phones can be more readily detected and confiscated, or even disabled, if used within the prison. We should be grateful to know how that work is progressing.

3.2 Integrated Drug Treatment Strategy (IDTS)

3.2.1 We have protested in previous reports at the apparent national policy of stabilising drug-addicted prisoners on maintenance doses of artificial opiates such as Methadone, because such a policy seemed to us to waste the opportunity provided by imprisonment of trying to wean such prisoners off drugs rather than releasing them with a well-established and perhaps even reinforced reliance on a long term maintenance dose.

3.2.2 We were therefore pleased to hear, soon after the present government came into office, that the policy was to be shifted towards an emphasis on reduction of dosage of methadone or other substitutes.

3.2.3 That policy is therefore applied locally at Coldingley, with an emphasis on dose reduction, however difficult this may be in the case of some prisoners who may have a long-term history of dependence.

3.2.4 We remain unclear about the underlying policy ethos of IDTS, which is formidably expensive. To send prisoners out at the end of the sentence with a better chance of becoming or remaining drug-free is a highly desirable objective worth significant investment, but the high level of cost demands careful assessment of costs, benefits and the effectiveness of the treatment.

3.2.5 For those reasons, the Board would be interested to know what systems or practices are agreed at national level between the Prison Service and the NHS for assessing the benefits of providing IDTS to prisoners given the differences in their circumstances compared with such patients outside prison; and for the same reasons we should like to know how the NHS and Prison Service assess how many prisoners, at which prisons, would benefit from IDTS.

3.2.6 We are aware of persistent pressure for Coldingley to increase the number of prisoners on the IDTS programme. Is that based on assessment of the needs of Coldingley's own population (when those needs must presumably vary as prisoners come

and go), or is it more broadly based on an assessment of the overall number of prisoners in need of IDTS within the prison system as a whole?

3.2.7 If the latter, is there a clear and established policy identifying the objectives of IDTS as applied within the prison community, and do those objectives take account of the opportunity to use this expensive programme within a closed community deliberately to wean prisoners off drugs, as distinct from the 'harm reduction' approach which justifies the use of maintenance doses of opiates in the rather different circumstances which prevail outside?

3.3 The unusable open air recreation area

3.3.1 We regard it as wholly unacceptable that the sports field remains unavailable. Its construction was a part of the building contract associated with the construction of E wing and the new workshop and education building next to the sports field. The construction, drainage and preparation of this large area were never carried out properly by the contractors and it has remained totally unused. Some remedial work has been attempted, thanks to the best efforts of local staff, but has not been successful, largely we believe because they do not have the time and equipment to undertake the fundamental excavation, drainage works and re-laying needed to remedy the failures of the contractors. The lack of recreational space, which was squeezed as a result of the extension of the prison, is damaging to the well-being of the prison for staff and prisoners alike.

3.3.2 Now that Coldingley houses well over 500 prisoners, many of them quite young, the need for a usable open air recreation area is obvious and urgent. The large area intended as a sports field has remained unusable for the entire period, now well over three years, since the contractors left the site with this part of their work unfinished.

3.3.3 The sports field has been a debacle and we would be grateful to know when it will finally be usable for its intended purpose.

3.3.4 We should also like to know what efforts have been made by the Prison Service's contract managers, on behalf of the taxpayer as well as the prison's staff and prisoners, to demand compensation and remedial action from the contractors.

4. Treatment & Training of Prisoners

4.1 The Prison Council

4.1.1 The Prison Council meets monthly with staff and prisoners present. This provides invaluable lines of communication and brings to light any issues at an early stage. It is well attended and a positive addition to the life of the prison.

4.2 Resettlement

4.2.1 We believe that Resettlement continues to be taken very seriously and that there is a structure in place to ensure that the subject is properly addressed by prison management and staff via the Resettlement Committee. The 'Road Map' document of 'Pathways' to resettlement continues to be the prime means of detailing the objectives and support planned to be available to prisoners.

4.2.2 Previous concerns regarding monthly resettlement meetings continue in some respects. Meetings of the Resettlement Committee are planned to take place monthly but cancellations have occurred. The large number of intended participants gives rise to frequent gaps in attendance causing subjects to be held over from one month to another.

4.2.3 Because of the large number of subjects and departments involved in the area of Resettlement, the Committee has looked at ways to streamline and combine the work of the various sub meetings that take place monthly within the prison. For example, the participation of Healthcare has brought about a more structured determination of the fitness of a prisoner to work after release. Further developments will be achieved in the direct access to Job Centre Plus by the installation of Broadband.

4.2.4 Due to funding cuts, the support given to the prison by the charity Shelter is no longer available. To overcome this unavailability of support, Coldingley has trained three officers to take on the additional role of Housing Officers and two Orderlies who are able to provide advice and guidance to other prisoners. Housing Officers and Orderlies alike have been trained by Shelter in their roles.

4.2.5 Although Coldingley is not a resettlement prison it is nevertheless now able to retain six D category prisoners. It is further exploring the retention and local role of the D category prisoner from those prisoners who were living within Surrey and wish to remain at the prison.

4.3 Industries

4.3.1 We were concerned last year that the impending closure of Coldingley's industrial laundry, following closely on the increase in the number of prisoners held as a result of new accommodation, might limit employment opportunities.

4.3.2 We are glad that those concerns were, in the main, unjustified. By the standards of most prisons, Coldingley continues to provide a range of employment of an industrial nature which offers training against formal standards such as NVQs which are recognised outside

and which therefore play a valuable part in resettlement.

4.3.3 We note that Coldingley has, for those reasons, been chosen as one of the prisons to pilot the Secretary of State's intention to move to a longer working week for prisoners, matching the sort of working conditions and hours which they could expect to find in employment after release. We believe Coldingley is well equipped, in terms of its industrial infrastructure and the experience of its staff, to take on that role. We are bound to note, however, that at Coldingley the result would merely be a reversion to the pattern of working hours which prevailed at Coldingley up until a few years ago, when difficulty in staffing workshop hours and, in particular, the imposition of a 'one size fits all' core day, brought about successive reductions year on year in the previous brisker industrial regime. We were as disappointed then as local staff and managers were to see the adverse effect on Coldingley's industries and the realistic training for work outside which they aim to provide. We certainly hope that a return to such conditions can be achieved, but those conditions seem to us to have been abandoned on cost grounds in a financial environment far less stringent than has to be faced today.

4.3.4 Full employment is achieved in the range of engineering, sign making, industrial cleaning and double-glazing unit manufacturing shops. They are well supported by training in computer skills, horticulture, and part-time and full-time educational opportunities for those needing them.

4.3.5 Repairs to the large workshop area formerly occupied by the industrial laundry are not yet complete because substantial strengthening of the floor is required. Half the available area has been equipped, at considerable expense, with modern printing equipment capable of turning out a range of printed stationery products.

4.3.6 While we commend the investment in modern printing and paper folding machinery, we cannot help questioning the overall economics of the project. The sophisticated printing equipment is so fast that its output in no more than two or three hours of operation per week provides assembly work for prisoners, such as folding and gluing envelopes, filing pouches and file covers, for a full working week. The resulting manual labour is close to the mailbags end of the spectrum of prison work. Even if the economics of the new equipment were to be improved by winning more printing orders, it is doubtful whether the prison could provide sufficient prisoners to cope with the output unless they were drafted in from the other productive workshops which offer far better ranges of industrial training than the basic assembly, folding and gluing operations which support the rapid output of the new printing machinery.

4.3.7 We accept that Coldingley must train its prisoners for a range of work skills, not all of them highly technical: and the full potential of the new print shop for both production and training cannot be fully realised at this early stage. We welcome the new installation and look forward to its continuing development.

4.4 Catering costs

4.4.1 Although we have some concerns about the state of the kitchens (see 6.3 below) in

the year under review there have been only two applications to the IMB on food matters. The kitchen staff are to be congratulated on the quality of the food made available on very tight budgets.

4.4.2 But IMB members are well aware in their private capacities of current price increases on basic food items. If food is not of a reasonable quality in prisons it can become the cause or focus of a range of complaints and difficulties. We would expect that, if that is to be avoided, some significant increases in the kitchen's budget for basic food costs will be needed during the current financial year, carried through into next year – a matter for national rather than local action.

4.5 Diversity and Race Equality Action Team (DREAT)

4.5.1 The HMCIP report in June 2010 stated that there was a comprehensive diversity policy and a small well informed diversity team. The summary of key changes from previous PSOs in April 2011 was noted. There remained a requirement to consult and involve prisoners regarding communication strategies, and to consult and involve other stakeholders, particularly those who are members of minority groups.

4.5.2 Key changes included:-

- a - Discriminatory Incident Reporting Forms (DIRF) - in place of Racist Incident Reporting Forms (RIRF). It is envisaged that further change will take place in 2012 to use generic systems, principally the complaint system;
- b - No requirement for a team or regular meeting regarding Race Equality;
- c - Issues previously handled by Race Equality Officers would be handled through the DIRF system.

4.5.3 The team at HMP Coldingley work conscientiously and well with the Diversity Orderlies and believe that the established regular meetings (every 2 months) of the Diversity and Race Equality Action Team should continue. The Action Plan is monitored and progress reported at each meeting.

4.5.4 Analysis of the RIRF and the DIRF figures shows that during the year from 1 August 2010 to mid April 2011, 79 RIRFs were received, of which 7 were substantiated. RIRFs received during that period consisted of

- 44 alleging staff victimising prisoner
- 29 alleging prisoner victimising staff
- 6 alleging prisoner victimising prisoner.

4.5.5 When the forms were changed to DIRFs, 23 were received to the end of July 2011 and 3 were substantiated. These were categorised as 1 relating to disability, 2 to gender, 16 to race, 4 to religion or beliefs and 1 to sexual orientation.

4.5.6 Analysis by categories of those against whom allegations were made, and their alleged victims, showed the following:-

- 5 alleging staff victimising prisoner

- 15 alleging prisoner victimising staff
- 1 alleging prisoner victimising prisoner
- 1 alleging staff victimising visitor
- 1 alleging visitor victimising staff

This represents a reduction from the previous year in the total number of forms received from 130 to 102 and also in the number substantiated from 27 to 10.

5. Healthcare & Mental Health

5.1.1 The Board has continued to monitor any problems with outside medical appointments for prisoners. Some have been cancelled for operational reasons and we accept that may sometimes be unavoidable. There is an inevitable tension between the internal staffing needs of the prison and the resulting difficulty in providing staff as escorts for outside medical appointments. This can only be tackled by cooperative working between prison management and local healthcare managers, and we know that all concerned are well aware of these difficulties and are working together to handle them.

5.1.2 Applications to the IMB on healthcare matters have not increased during this year – the rate of queries to us, at an average of two per month, was identical with last year.

5.1.3 Some prisoners have been unhappy that they could not get opiate-based painkillers. We can understand the need for medical practitioners in a prison to be as careful as possible about such prescribing while still meeting their patients' genuine needs, but there is little we can do to help with such complaints when they arise – we can only direct prisoners towards the NHS's own complaints procedures.

5.1.4 At the end of the year under review there were growing signs of problems in staffing adequate dental care. We are monitoring the situation and will continue to do so, having raised our concerns with the Governor and local health care managers.

5.1.5 Budget constraints have not caused any significant issues but the smoking cessation programme may suffer should there be further reductions.

5.1.6 There have been several staff vacancies during the year but most posts are now filled (with the exception of the temporary problems with dentistry mentioned above which resulted in large part from an absence caused by maternity leave). Overall the healthcare team works well to cover any shortages.

5.1.7 We have once again raised with the Minister our concerns about the Integrated Drug Treatment Strategy (IDTS) – see 3.2 above.

6. Safer Custody

6.1 Self harm & Bullying

Coldingley continues to be alert and proactive to issues of self harm and bullying. This is becoming increasingly important as the number of vulnerable/at risk prisoners has increased over the past year. We regard the number of prisoners needing to be located in the OSU for their own protection as in part an indicator of levels of bullying and intimidation, often over debt. We are therefore glad to note a significant proportionate reduction of 43% in such cases this year – see Annex E. This is the second year in succession which has seen a reduction, though this year's is even larger. This reflects the effort made by staff to deal effectively with bullying and other anti-social behaviour.

6.1.1 Open ACCT (Assessment Care in Custody Teamwork) documents are monitored professionally and sensitively by staff. The newly installed safe cell has been used a number of times this year.

6.2 The Segregation Unit

6.2.1 The Segregation Unit continues to have periods when it is extremely full and has from time to time struggled with the demands the prison makes upon it. In the resulting testing circumstances staff have performed well. Use of the Unit on grounds of good order or discipline has regrettably increased by some 16% on top of the large increase last year. But we are pleased to see the substantial proportionate reduction in its use for prisoners' own protection, already noted above.

6.2.2 The Board continues to question why it is necessary to segregate so many prisoners instead of using the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) Scheme, which the Board considers to be capable of more effective use at Coldingley. The number of prisoners on Basic Regime is minimal. At a snapshot date in September 2011 while this report was being prepared, there were 326 on the Enhanced level of privileges, 177 at the Standard level, and just 3 at the Basic level. For many a reduction to Basic regime is probably a more powerful incentive to better behaviour than the relative peace and comfort – and absence of work – experienced in the Segregation Unit.

6.3 Health & Safety

6.3.1 In the Board's reports for 2008-9 and 2009-10 we commented that serious safety problems reported by Crown Premises Inspection Group (CPIG) in November 2008 had not been resolved. We are pleased to report that, although the necessary work has not been completed, funds have now been allocated to deal with all major items identified by CPIG.

6.3.2 We also reported last year that too many prisoners in workshops fail to use Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). This remains a problem observed frequently during our visits. The number of supervisory staff in workshops is small in proportion to the number of prisoners, which no doubt makes close supervision difficult. But we believe they should be more willing to confront prisoners who fail to follow the rules. If there were a more deterrent

approach to enforcement, particularly by use of the IEP system to threaten or impose loss of privileges, the safety risks might be more effectively reduced.

6.3.3 The kitchen floor is dangerously slippery and is a serious hazard to anyone visiting or working in the kitchen. This applies both to the flooring of the main work area and to the uphill slope to the servery area. We have brought it to the attention of the Governor at our monthly meetings, and we know this is a matter of concern to him and to kitchen managers. Deep cleaning has been carried out but the problem persists. At the end of the year under review we continued to maintain pressure for the necessary and urgent work to create a permanent resolution, and we welcome signs of early decisions on a programme for the necessary works. In its present state it is an accident waiting to happen.

Annex A – Glossary

ACCT	Assessment Care in Custody Teamwork
BICS	British Institute of Cleaning Science (nationally recognised training in industrial cleaning)
BOSS	Body Orifice Security Scanner chair for detection of items concealed within the body
CARATS	Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice and Throughcare Relating to Drugs
CC	Cellular Confinement
CD	Compact disc
C-NOMIS	A new Prison Service inmate database
CPIG	Crown Premises Inspection Group
DIRF	Discriminatory Incident Reporting Form
DREAT	Diversity and Race Equality Action Team
DVD	Digital Versatile Disc
GOOD	(Location in the Segregation Unit for) Good Order or Discipline
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
IDTS	Integrated Drug Treatment System
HMCIP	HM Chief Inspector of Prisons
IEP	Incentives and Earned Privileges
IMB	Independent Monitoring Board
IPP	Indeterminate sentence for Public Protection
IRC	Immigration Removal Centre
MDT	Mandatory Drug Test
NOMS	National Offender Management Service
NVQ	National Vocational Qualification
OP	(Location in the Segregation Unit for) Own Protection
OSU	Observation and Separation Unit (nowadays Segregation Unit)
PCT	Primary Care Trust (NHS)
POA	Prison Officers Association
PSI	Prison Service Instruction
PSO	Prison Service Order
RAPt	Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust
REAG	Race Equality Advisory Group
RIRF	Racial Incident Report Form
ROTL	Release on Temporary Licence
SMARG	Segregation Monitoring and Review Group
SMART	Systematic Monitoring and Analysis Race Equality Template
UKBA	United Kingdom Border Agency
VDT	Voluntary Drug Test
VRQ	Vocationally Related Qualification

Annex B - Board activities and membership

12 monthly meetings of the IMB were held during the year, with the Governor or his representative present for part of each meeting.

52 weekly rota visits were made to the prison by Board members (and in practice these weekly visits always involve visits on several days during the duty week).

185 applications to the Board were received from prisoners – a reduction of some 13% compared with the previous year. Statistics relating to the subjects of their applications are in Annex D.

At the beginning and end of the reporting year the Board had 10 members, two members having resigned and two new members having been appointed. Names of members are listed below.

<i>Members of the Board – 2010-11</i>	
Mrs Gail O'Flaherty	Chairman
Mr John Tilbury	Vice Chairman
Mr Gerry Ramsden	Board Development Officer
Mr Brian Bailey	
Mrs Chantal Hardy	Resigned during the year
Mr Roy Harrington	
Mr Michael Sherley	
Mr Peter Stone	Resigned during the year
Mrs Jill Taylor	
Mrs Gill Walker	
Mrs Anne Eve	Appointed during the year
Mrs Stephanie Griffiths	Appointed during the year

Annex C - Ethnic composition of HMP Coldingley's population

Ethnic composition of prisoners at HMP Coldingley - August 2011			
			%
A1	Asian Indian	8	1.6
A2	Asian Pakistani	5	1.0
A3	Asian Bangladeshi	1	0.2
A9	Asian Any Other	4	0.8
B1	Black Caribbean	86	16.9
B2	Black African	21	4.1
B9	Black Other	19	3.7
M1	White/ Black Caribbean	11	2.2
M2	White/ Black African	0	0.0
M3	White/ Asian	3	0.6
M9	White/ Asian Any Other Background	3	0.6
O1	Chinese	1	0.2
O9	Chinese/ Any Other	2	0.4
W1	White British	320	62.9
W2	White Irish	4	0.8
W9	White Other	14	2.8
NS	Not Specified	7	1.4
	Total	509	

Annex D – Applications to the IMB

CODE		SUBJECT	2010-2011	2009-2010	% increase over 2009-10
A - Accommodation	A1	Cell quality	7	7	0
	A2	Wing/cell allocation	2	4	-50
B - Adjudications and Segregation	B1	Adjudications – internal	3	5	-40
	B2	Adjudications – external	0	1	-100
	B3	Rule 45/49 segregation	0	0	-
C - Diversity	C1	Racial issues referred to prison staff	0	1	-100
	C2	Racial issues not referred to staff	0	1	-100
	C3	Other diversity issues eg disability	0	1	-100
D - Education, Training or Employment and regimes	D1	Education/employment	19	14	36
	D2	IEP	2	9	-78
E - Family/visits	E1	Visits	7	3	133
	E2	Resettlement issues	0	2	-100
	E3	Mail/Pin phones	1	5	-80
F - Food/kitchen related	F	Food/kitchen issues	2	0	-
G - Health related	G	Health issues	24	24	0
H - Property	H1	Property related to previous prison/IRC	34	30	13
	H2	Property related to current prison/IRC	12	23	-48
	H3	Canteen/Argos/Facilities list	5	4	25
I - Sentence Related	I1	Basic sentence (inc. remand time)	4	1	300
	I2	HDC	4	5	-20
	I3	Immigration/deportation	0	0	-
	I4	Categorisation	9	11	-18
	I5	Police days	0	0	-
	I6	ROTL	1	2	-50
	I7	Parole Board	5	3	67
J - Staff/Prisoner/Detainee related	J1	Applications about staff	9	12	-25
	J2	Applications about prisoners/detainees	0	0	-
	J3	Applications from staff	0	0	-
K - Transfers	K	Transfers	13	14	-7
L - Miscellaneous	L	Miscellaneous	22	30	-27
		Total	185	212	-13

Annex E – Prisoners detained in the Segregation Unit

	2009-2010		2010-11		
	Good order or discipline	Own protection	Good order or discipline	Own protection	Cellular confinement
August	6	8	8	4	8
September	7	10	9	2	2
October	15	9	9	2	7
November	11	9	10	0	12
December	4	8	8	3	3
January	11	6	7	4	7
February	9	3	6	5	6
March	8	0	2	5	5
April	5	7	9	2	13
May	1	7	15	3	19
June	6	8	11	7	17
July	9	6	13	9	17
Total	92	81	107	46	116
% change against previous year	55.93	-10.00	16.30	-43.21	(not recorded previously)

Annex F – Disciplinary Charges

<i>Note - charges in this list are arranged in descending order of the frequency of their occurrence (if proved) in 2010-11. Charges unused in the year do not appear in the list.</i>		August 2010-July 2011			% increase over previous year	August 2009-July 2010		
		Proved	Dismissed	Total		Proved	Dismissed	Total
Charges by paragraphs of Prison Rule 51		Proved	Dismissed	Total		Proved	Dismissed	Total
22	Disobeys any lawful order	125	26	151	-25	165	35	200
12a	Has in his possession any unauthorised article	103	56	159	-6	89	81	170
20	Uses threatening, abusive or insulting words or behaviour	92	10	102	-15	110	10	120
17	Deliberately damages any part of a prison or any other property, other than his own	20	4	24	26	16	3	19
1	Commits any assault	15	12	27	42	8	11	19
9	Is found with any substance in his urine which demonstrates that a controlled drug has, whether in prison or on temporary release under Rule 9, been administered to himself or by another	15	10	25	-68	48	31	79
4	Fights with any person	13	10	23	-8	14	11	25
6	Intentionally obstructs an officer in the execution of his duty, or any person (other than an inmate) who is at the prison for the purpose of working there, in the performance of his work	13	0	13	0	8	5	13
18	Absents himself from any place he is required to be or is present at any place where he is not authorised to be	12	1	13	0	8	5	13
13	Sells or delivers to any person any unauthorised article	10	0	10	233	3	0	3
5	Intentionally endangers the health or personal safety of others or, by his conduct, is reckless whether such health or personal safety is endangered	8	3	11	-35	8	9	17
8	Fails to comply with any condition under which he is temporarily released under rule 9	5	0	5	400	1	0	1

<i>Note - charges in this list are arranged in descending order of the frequency of their occurrence (if proved) in 2010-11. Charges unused in the year do not appear in the list.</i>		August 2010-July 2011			% increase over previous year	August 2009-July 2010		
		Proved	Dismissed	Total		Proved	Dismissed	Total
Charges by paragraphs of Prison Rule 51		Proved	Dismissed	Total		Proved	Dismissed	Total
14	Sells or, without permission, delivers to any person any article which he is allowed to have for his own use	2	0	2	0	1	1	2
15	Takes improperly any article belonging to another person or to a prison	2	0	2	-60	4	1	5
19	Is disrespectful to any officer or any person (other than a prisoner) who is at the prison for the purpose of working there, or any person visiting a prison	2	0	2	-33	2	1	3
12b	Has in his possession a greater quantity of any articles than he is authorised to have	1	0	1	-	0	0	0
20a	Uses threatening, abusive or insulting racist words or behaviour	1	2	3	-40	3	2	5
23	Disobeys or fails to comply with any rule or regulation applying to him	1	1	2	-92	22	4	26
24	Receives any controlled drug or, without the consent of an officer, any other article during the course of a visit (not being an interview such as is mentioned in Rule 38)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
25a	Attempts to commit any of the offences defined in this Rule	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Totals		442	136	578	-21	520	213	733