



**Independent Monitoring Board**

**HMP Nottingham**

**Annual Report**

**To Her Majesty's Secretary of State at the Ministry of Justice**

**For the period**

**1<sup>st</sup> March 2012 to 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013**

## **Section 1     Statutory Role of the IMB**

The Prisons Act 1952 and the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 require every prison to be monitored by an Independent Board appointed by the Secretary of State from members of the community in which the prison is situated.

The Board is specifically charged to:

- (1) 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.
- (2) Inform promptly the Secretary of State, or any official to whom he has delegated authority as it judges appropriate, any concern it has.
- (3) Report annually to the Secretary of State on how well the prison has met the standards and requirements placed on it and what impact these have on those in its custody.

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.

## Section 2 Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. Statutory Role of the IMB.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Contents</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Description of the Prison</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1 Capacity and Capacity	4
3.2 Operation	4
<b>4. Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 Summary	5
4.2 Particular Issues Requiring a Response	6
4.3 Operational Matters	6
4.4 Previous Year's Concerns	6
<b>5. Mandatory Reports</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1 Equality and Inclusion	7
5.2 Education Learning and Skills	7
5.3 Healthcare and Mental Health	8
5.4 Purposeful Activity (Includes Work)	10
5.5 Resettlement	10
5.6 Safer Custody	10
5.7 Segregation, Care and Separation, Close Supervision	12
5.8 Residential Services (Accommodation, Food, Catering, and Kitchens)	12
<b>6. Other Areas</b>	<b>14</b>
6.1 Induction and Reception	14
6.2 Time out of Cell	14
<b>7. The Work of The independent Monitoring Board</b>	<b>15</b>
7.1 Statistics	15
7.2 Duties	15
7.3 Applications	16

## **Section 3 Description of the Prison**

### **3.1 Capacity and Category**

HMP Nottingham has an operational capacity of 1060 prisoners with a CNA (Certified Normal Accommodation) of 723, which is unchanged from last year, in facilities designated Category B. Accommodation is arranged over seven wings, all of modern design. One wing is designated for VPs (Vulnerable Prisoners) and we commend (Section 5.8.1) the arrangements made in January to transfer them to a larger wing thus giving more capacity and reducing the need for VPs to be held on wings where they might be subject to harassment.

Although the facilities are designed for Category B prisoners we are aware that often more than 40% of prisoners are in fact Category C and are therefore held in more restrictive conditions than security dictates (Section 4.4.2); in addition, more than a quarter are typically held on remand. We are concerned about the number of men held in more secure circumstances than their risk requires, with the implications this carries for restricted self direction, so we were pleased to learn that the prison is expecting to take this into account in a forthcoming reorganisation of the wings and will be designating one wing Cat C. The prison population also includes a variable number of Young Offenders and prisoners detained by the Border Authorities but considered unsuitable for detention centres.

Outside agencies (including voluntary groups) delivering services to the prison include the local PCT (Primary Care Trust) for Healthcare, Milton Keynes College for Education, PACT (Prison Advice & Care Trust) which manages the Visitors' Centre and the provision of refreshments in the visits halls, Catch 22, NACRO (National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders), Emmanuel House and Groundwork.

### **3.2 Operation**

As the reporting period progressed almost all of the initiatives which had been conceived within the concept of a Community Prison three years ago were discontinued; this seemed mostly to result from the need to reduce costs. The prison has therefore returned to being a local facility serving the courts of Nottingham and Derby and the corresponding counties.

Although during parts of the year the prison has operated below its maximum capacity, it has been observed that the closure of a number of prisons and the consequent transfer of prisoners to other establishments has started to put pressure on the accommodation for 'first night' prisoners being moved to Nottingham. This has also 'knocks on' to the reduced potential for these prisoners to receive visitors from more distant parts of the country.

The frequency of incorrect roll calls has been a matter of concern to the Board due to the effect this has had on both staff, when an imbalance occurs at the end of shift, and on prisoners who have not been able to attend Healthcare appointments, visits, etc.

## **Section 4 Executive summary**

### **4.1 Summary**

At the beginning of the reporting period, strenuous efforts were being made to reduce costs under Operation Greyhound (previously reported) which aimed to make the prison competitive against a background of market testing. In the autumn this situation changed with the introduction of Benchmarking and it is now known that the prison must make savings of £3.7m (over 20%) and reduce staffing by 120. Simultaneously, the reorganisation under the centrally designed Fair and Sustainable restructuring has been on-going. Unsurprisingly, there is unease amongst staff and there has been some confrontation with Governors. As the reporting period came to an end it was apparent that relations had improved but individuals are still personally concerned and such situations raise the risk that prisoners will suffer as a result. (Section 4.2.1.2) The pressure on funds is impacting on the quality and quantity of food provided (Section 5.8.2) and the implementation of the benchmarking structure will reduce the amount of time available for out of cell activities.

During the second half of the reporting period, due to operational exigencies, the prison has had three different Governors coupled with a number of personnel changes at senior management level. These factors have naturally impacted on the operational focus of the establishment to some degree. We are now looking forward to a period of stability as the new permanent Governor makes his mark on the establishment.

Following the publication of HMIP's themed report on remand prisoners last summer we have raised this matter with successive Governors on several occasions. Whilst all are aware of the report and acknowledge our concerns, so far as we can discern there have been no changes to the arrangements for remand prisoners who are held amongst convicted prisoners and may share cells with them. However, remand prisoners can wear their own clothes and do have access to all regime opportunities.

Increasingly signage around the prison refers to 'Offenders' – 'Offender Learning and Skills', 'Offender Healthcare'; we question both the need and wisdom of constantly reminding prisoners that they are 'offenders' with the implications of being outside society and would point out that it is simply wrong to describe remand prisoners as offenders.

Whilst some aspects of prison organisation on which we have previously commented run smoothly, there are areas which concern us for the disruption they cause to prisoner wellbeing. Ensuring that people get to regime activities has been patchy despite the significant efforts made by Governors to monitor and improve both the available activities and access to them. It took months for the situation whereby access to the library was seriously restricted to be sorted out, and lock downs because the roll cannot be reconciled have continued throughout the year, causing education and work to be missed, health appointments wasted and visits disrupted (Sections 5.3.1).

We remain concerned at the frequent late arrival of buses conveying prisoners from the courts to the prison's Reception unit and the effect this has both on the prisoners and staff. (Section 6.1.2)

## **4.2 Particular Issues Requiring a Response**

### **4.2.1 Policy Matters for the attention of the Justice Minister**

**4.2.1.1.** The Board continues to be concerned at the amount of time prisoners with serious mental health problems often spend at the prison before a more suitable location is found. Despite comments in last year's Minister's response on this topic, no improvement to the situation has been evidenced.

**4.2.1.2.** Whilst organisation strategy is a political matter, the Minister should be aware once more of the worsening of staff morale throughout the year due to staffing re-organisations, both past and imminent and other aspects of conditions of service

### **4.2.2. Policy matters for the attention of the National Offender Management Service, (NOMS.)**

**4.2.2.1.** The loss of prisoners' property on transfer seems to be a recurrent theme of prison life as indicated by Applications relating to this matter. Coupled with this is the convoluted mechanism for compensation payments to be made from private prisons to those in the public sector, further increasing the stress on prisoners who have lost possessions. When a payment is eventually made the money is paid into the prisoner's personal account, not his spend account, resulting in the prisoner having to 'save up' to replace his lost goods. This seems to be penalising the prisoner for something not of his making.

## **4.3. Operational matters**

**4.3.1** Attendance at education is very low which means that valuable resources are being wasted (Section 5.2 refers).

**4.3.2** The nature of work opportunities continues to be uninspiring, although during the year additional activities have been introduced, namely waste management and first night centre packs. (Section 5.4 refers).

## **4.4. Previous Year's Concerns**

**4.4.1.** We reported in the last Annual Report that young offenders sent to HMP Nottingham after sentencing are not always moved to YOIs within seven days as we were told would be the case. Although pleased that relocation within seven days now stands at 98%, issues do still arise which appear to be associated with the number of young offenders located at Nottingham, on occasions significantly in excess of 10% of the prison population.

**4.4.2** There has seemingly been no improvement in allocating Cat C prisoners to Cat C establishments during the year. Often more than 40% of Nottingham's prisoner population is awaiting such dispersal.

**4.4.3** Prisoners with mental health issues continue to be a concern. All too often the prison struggles to have these men accommodated appropriately either in hospital or other secure premises better able to cater for the prisoners' needs. Prisoners whose disability is such they have a propensity to violence have occupied considerable resources within the SARU (Segregation Assessment and Resettlement Unit) during the year. This is neither the appropriate place for the individuals nor is this the purpose of the SARU, as segregation may not be in the best long term interests of the prisoners so detained.

**4.4.4** We are continuing to observe the impact on prisoners due to delays in transferring from the courts, resulting in prisoners sometimes not being settled in cell accommodation

until late in the evening; staff being unable to leave at the appointed end of their shift, and we are seriously worried that the pressure created by this situation risks signs of distress in prisoners at this vulnerable time being missed (Section 6.1.2).

## **Section 5 Mandatory Reports**

### **5.1 Equality & Inclusion**

The IMB board has met regularly each month with the Governor to discuss and address equal access for prisoners regarding regimes/facilities and what action is required to remove disadvantages to prisoners under the Equality 2010 Act. We are pleased that a Governor Grade has now taken responsibility for monitoring each protected characteristic group.

Research was undertaken in the latter part of the year which has recognised certain perceived inequalities in allocation of jobs, and sanctions concerning privileges and punishments. Some action has been taken and work is on-going to rectify inequalities in the allocation of work.

#### **5.1.1 Race Equality**

New DIRF (Discrimination Incident Report Forms) were introduced in June 2011. Until recently they were simply investigated, but are now explored and responded to. From January – Decembers 2012 there were a total of 179 DIRF with 121 referring to Race complaints.

The Board has noted that the proposed faith awareness training for staff has now been passed to Chaplaincy to address and hope the training will be implemented soon, although we recognise that this is not a mandatory requirement.

#### **5.1.2. Disability**

During the year around 250 prisoners were on average declared to have a disability with 100 having a mental health issue. Prisoners complete a self-declaration of what they feel their disability is but this is not medically informed. Peer support groups have been set up for older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities.

An Equality Action team will resume operation in April 2013 chaired by the Governor. In future, feedback from the team this will be a regular agenda item at SMT (Senior Management Team) meetings. The Board will feel more assured if an annual plan is agreed and regularly reviewed for progress by SMT. Plans for the reorganisation of residential areas to be implemented during 2013 include a designated area for older prisoners and those with severe disabilities and we hope that this will provide an environment in which these prisoners can feel less pressured by younger men.

### **5.2 Education, Learning and Skills**

Until August 2012, Learning and Skills was provided under the OLASS 3 (Offender Learning & Skills Service) contract with Lincoln College. The Board has previously commented on difficulties associated with that contract and there was little change during its final months. It seems to be an unavoidable consequence of contracted partnership working that there is a period towards the end of a contract when commitment to improvement by the contractor is an unrealistic expectation.

From April the prison introduced a structured day which entailed prisoners having scheduled activities, work or education, either during morning or afternoon sessions and all other commitments, healthcare, visits etc., in the other part of the day. For various reasons this did not work as well as the prison had hoped and one consequence was erratic numbers attending education. Whilst considerable management effort was devoted to resolving the problems, improvement was slow.

Milton Keynes College took over the contract in August 2012 with the introduction of OLASS 4.

The Governor of HMP Nottingham leads a cluster which also includes HMPs Ranby and Sudbury and it is becoming evident that that the prison has more control in directing the structure of education than was the case under OLASS 3. Ultimately it is expected that provision at Nottingham will focus on life skills for prisoners at the beginning of their sentence and work skills in preparation for release, although the fact that most prisoners at Nottingham are serving relatively short sentences will make the distinctions less marked than at other establishments. Initial change was slow, but there is now some progress with engaging third sector organisations to enhance the offer as was anticipated in the OLASS 4 bidding process and towards the end of the reporting period the Governor was clearly taking control of directing resources towards the prison's priorities. Engagement against contract ran below 50% up to the end of the reporting period and problems getting people to attend continued. It may be that provision within the contract simply exceeds what is needed and we expect this situation to become clearer with time as we are aware of significant structural changes in the pipeline.

We welcome the increase in pay for attending education which was introduced at the end of the reporting period to ensure that its status was not undermined by better pay for work in cases where prisoners can clearly benefit from improving their basic skills.

Outcomes for prisoners in terms of accredited qualifications have continued to improve as they did in the previous reporting period. Prisoner surveys by the education staff and our own enquiries generally reveal positive responses to the provision by those who do engage. We understand that OFSTED who inspected towards the end of the reporting period were positive in their assessment of the provision but at the time of writing, the report was not available. We acknowledge the merits of the new national careers advice service which will be an important part of the prison's efforts to improve the prospects for prisoners on release.

The library service was underused for most of the period and we repeatedly expressed concern that prisoners were not being given the access to library materials to which they are entitled. Much of the difficulty arose from staff non-availability and library access not being appropriately prioritised. We acknowledge the efforts of governors and library staff to address the problem by taking book trolleys to the residential wings and are pleased that by early 2013 further changes had been put in place. Although the situation was not fully resolved, we are aware that the prison was working on further measures.

### **5.3 Healthcare and Mental Health**

#### **5.3.1 Healthcare.**

Four meetings of the Health Partnership Board were planned during this reporting period but only three meetings took place. Although a programme of Board meetings is planned annually, these have to be changed on a regular basis to fit in with the changing availability of Board members. Robust questioning of the prison health care provider is lacking when performance levels are not being met. It is proposed though not yet implemented that the Health Partnership Board will hold meetings at the prison cluster level with operational

meetings held monthly in the prison. A member of the IMB will attend the operational level meeting whenever possible. The Relationship between the IMB and Healthcare varies depending on individual members of staff and their understanding of the role of the IMB but on the whole they are reasonably good. HMP Nottingham has a number of older prisoners with social care issues and at present the prisoners are having this care cost covered by the Health Partnership Board even though this area of care is not included in the Board's contract agreement.

The ECA (Enhanced Care Area) which was next to a hatch used for dispensing Medicines including Methadone on A wing has now been moved to a much more appropriate place on F wing. This means that prisoners in need of enhanced care are not be subjected to the constant flow of prisoners past their cell and high noise levels.

Healthcare has now implemented the proposal that the member of staff responsible for prisoner appointments checks P-NOMIS to avoid appointments clashing with prisoner visits, and this seems to be working well. Despite this action DNA (Did Not Attend) levels remain above the target level of 20% most of the time. This is due to a variety of reasons, from a not infrequent stand fast roll call through to prisoners deciding they don't want to attend their given appointment. There is on-going work around the DNA problem and as yet it hasn't effectively resolved this issue.

General Health checks are usually completed within 24 hours of a prisoner's arrival at the prison and clinics catering for differing health issues are provided, including sexual health screening, in a purpose built healthcare area. Whilst the prison has no in-patient care provision, prisoners requiring that level of care are transferred to the appropriate hospital and bed watch is arranged.

The position remains the same as in our last report regarding no member of the healthcare team's involvement in the prisoner induction programme and therefore prisoners have no real understanding of the expected time between a request for an appointment and an appointment date. Many prisoners seem unaware of the health service complaints system PALS (Patient Advice and Liaison Service) and use the IMB application forms for complaining about personal healthcare matters. Both these and other related issues could be addressed by the information given during an induction talk. The Healthcare manager understands that this needs to be addressed as soon as possible.

A podiatry service is available but the waiting list is long and priority is given to those prisoners with medical conditions which require foot care as part of on-going care e.g. diabetics. This service is not provided by the main health provider but by another organisation.

VPs (Vulnerable prisoners) now have access to lunch time specialist clinics when the rest of the prison is in patrol state. The take up for these clinics is good and prisoners feel they are in a safe environment.

### **5.3.2 Mental Health**

There continues to be two vacancies for mental health nurses and together with over 320 missed primary and secondary mental healthcare appointments in the six month period from September 2012 - February 2013, gives rise to concerns that waiting times for mental health assessments have increased. On occasions a prisoner can wait up to five days, from the time he enters the prison to assessment.

It has been noted over this reporting period that a nurse has not always been present at SARU (Separation and Reassessment Unit) reviews nor in their absence a medical report of

any medical concerns sent, though a nurse has generally attended where a prisoner with mental illness has had a review.

Basic mental health training given by a mental health nurse with a teaching qualification continues to be available to uniformed officers, and we are pleased to learn that the staff training calendar has now been revised and updated to ensure that each staff training day includes mental health training, either as a standalone 2.5 hour course or as part of the full day's Safer Custody course.

The proposed in-depth training for some uniformed staff on the wings and all of the SARU staff, because of the prevalence of prisoners suffering varying degrees of mental illness, has not as yet been implemented. This gives rise to the question of the importance given by the prison to the understanding of prisoners with mental illness.

#### **5.4 Purposeful Activity (Includes Work)**

Obtaining outside contracts for work continues to be problematic but towards the end of the reporting period evidence of new work opportunities started to emerge assisted by changes in personnel engaged in the task of seeking fresh openings. A number of workshops are involved in manufacturing various textiles, which although this provides occupation for prisoners, it is failing to meet the needs of providing useful experience for prisoners in the wider workforce once they are released. Various activities are designed around servicing the prison estate such as the provision of 'first night packs', and there are aims to increase external contracts e.g. cleaning carpet tiles. The composting of waste to produce fertiliser and thus obtain revenue for the prison appears to be a positive move, however it is not yet possible to sell the end product.

We are aware that issues have been raised nationally regarding a lack of meaningful activity in prisons, and we will continue to monitor changes which are expected to take place.

#### **5.5 Resettlement**

A positive move has been that of the Governor taking control of release on the Home Detention Curfew (HDC) – 'tagging' scheme. The effect has been a modest increase in the number of early releases so far. On-going, we hope it will have the effect of reducing the prison population and giving more prisoners the ability to settle back into a non-custodial life.

All the evidence suggests that ex-offenders do best if they have a place to live, become employed and receive positive support post-release. The prison target of 88% having a place to live (which as we anticipated in our last report, was missed for a short period mid-year), regrettably meaning that several hundred prisoners are being released annually from HMP Nottingham with nowhere to live. Of course, many of those concerned will have been homeless prior to imprisonment but others lose their accommodation because they are in prison. We acknowledge the work done by the prison in cooperation with local authorities and other agencies; working with this vulnerable group offers the wider opportunity to reduce homelessness and so improve the chances of men avoiding reoffending, so we hope that in the coming year there will be improvements in this area.

#### **5.6 Safer Custody**

The Board was pleased to note that in the inspection in January 2013 by the Interception of Communications Commissioner's Office (IOCCA) the prison emerged 'extremely well' with a very good level of compliance and numerous examples of good practice were cited.

The Board has given full support to the current Governor's policy of not transferring prisoners to other Establishments who have committed serious assaults on prisoners or staff until the Police have completed their enquiries. In particular this gives support to Officers injured in the course of their duties.

The number of Listeners has fluctuated throughout the year with there rarely being a Listener per Wing. The Board would like to see this improved.

## **5.7 Segregation, Care & Separation, Close Supervision/Security**

### **5.7.1 Segregation, Care & Separation**

The Board has expressed concern about prisoners who have been located inappropriately in the SARU for too long. Such prisoners cannot be located on the wings because they have made serious attacks on staff. Two in particular we now understand are at last being assessed for the high security estate. Staff on the SARU have endeavoured to provide an improved regime offering exercise but it is still not ideal for prisoners to be on such a limited regime for an extended period of time.

During the reporting period there have been 29 cases of prisoners getting on the landing netting involving 43 prisoners. In January 2013 there were four such incidents. It is a serious offence as not only does it endanger the prisoner but it threatens the good order and discipline of the establishment and disrupts the running of the Wing. Reasons put forward by prisoners for such action are varied, but vary from a desire for relocation to the Segregation Assessment and Resettlement Unit (SARU) for their own protection, to staging a protest regarding transfer to another Establishment. To date these cases have not been concerted indiscipline but individual protests.

### **5.7.2 Violence Reduction**

Assaults on staff and prisoner on prisoner violence have continued to cause concern during the year. Protocols for more information sharing about individual prisoners between all staff, including Healthcare, are being developed. It is good to note an increase in staff training in control and restraint and there has been a 92% decrease in the use of force with methods of de-escalation used more by staff.

### **5.7.3 Security**

During the year there have been a number of false general alarms on the wings. This is of concern as designated staff have to leave their post and rush to the alarm. Even more worrying is that on at least one occasion there was a poor response to a general alarm call. Expansion of CCTV on the remaining wings may aid detection of those interfering with the alarms.

We welcome the development during the past year of the prison's approach to information led investigations which has reduced the possible risk of danger to prisoners and staff.

## **5.8 Residential Services (Accommodation, Food, Catering, and Kitchens)**

### **5.8.1 Accommodation**

Residential accommodation generally continues to be in good state of repair as should be expected given the age of the re-built prison. A programme of refurbishing cells in the Segregation Assessment and Resettlement Unit (SARU) was about to start at the end of the reporting period to refresh the cells and make them less susceptible to damage by occupants by using the latest range of furniture and fittings. Some units in cells have been badly damaged and the flooring ripped up so more robust flooring and safer units are to be fitted.

A well organised move of Vulnerable Prisoners (VPs) from F Wing to the larger G Wing (with G Wing prisoners being relocated to F Wing) was carried out without incident in a well co-ordinated and professional manner. It was particularly pleasing to observe prisoners cooperating both with staff and each other to implement the move which proceeded without

incident over the course of a morning. The effect of the move was, as far as possible, to accommodate all VPs together rather than have other Wings used as VP 'overflow' locations, which naturally interfered with the Regime on the non-VP locations.

The 'dining out' arrangement which started last year has been expanded to include all Wings except C Wing, on a limited basis, as part of the IEP (Incentives and Earned Privileges) scheme. Prisoners can make their choice between eating in their cells or with fellow prisoners in especially put aside accommodation, the latter giving more association time to those who choose to participate.

The booking of visits was transferred from the prison service to PACT (Prisons Advice & Care Trust) within the visitors' centre, during the year with the effect of significantly improving the experience of the initial contact visitors have with the prison. Members of PACT are able to answer the normal range of questions new visitors pose thus giving additional support to friends and family members visiting for the first time.

### **5.8.2. Food/Catering**

Applications about food are relatively rare given the size of the prison population, either emanating from written complaints to the IMB or as recorded and inspected by IMB members at the serveries, although 'on the hoof' complaints are always to be expected. The Board does however have concerns at the ever increasing squeeze on the money allocated to feeding prisoners which has fallen from £2.10 per day to £1.97 per day.

Understandably there was concern from some Muslim prisoners that they had been fed food contaminated with pork during the 'horse meat scandal', however the situation was quickly defused by the prison's Iman who undertook a personal inspection of the kitchen. Some orchestrated complaints from one particular Wing reached the IMB, and were able to be resolved as there was no evidence that any pork had entered halal food because suspect meat had been isolated and returned to the supplier before it entered the prison's food chain.

### **5.8.3 Kitchens**

Repairs to defective kitchen items seem to take an inordinate amount of time to complete and consequently produce unnecessary stress on the kitchen staff and workers. Enquiries have revealed that this is largely due to the process by which contracts are let to facilitate the work and delays in obtaining replacement parts, some of which are sourced from overseas. Long overdue work to replace the kitchen flooring was started towards the end of the reporting period. The use of the prison's Bistro enabled prisoners to always be provided with one hot meal per day whilst the refurbishment proceeded.

## **Section 6 Other Areas on Which the Board Wishes to Report.**

### **6.1 Induction/Reception**

#### **6.1.1 Induction**

The Board is concerned that the Induction sessions are too generic with too little emphasis being placed on the difference between remand and convicted prisoners.

#### **6.1.2 Reception**

The Board's observations are that the Reception area is well managed with prisoners treated appropriately. The throughput of prisoners in Nottingham places considerable strain on the Reception operation, with the equivalent of the prison having a complete new population every three months. The board has, however, expressed concerns a number of times about prisoners arriving late at night from the courts. This is of sufficient concern to the Board that a proposition to the national IMB Conference has been made asking the MOJ /NOMS to review the implementation of the whole system of transporting and holding prisoners and to take corrective action on the contract.

When GeoAMEY took over responsibility for transporting prisoners to and from the courts in the East Midlands it quickly became clear that their financial targets would be met by minimising journeys. As a result, it is not unusual for prisoners to arrive at HMP Nottingham late into the evening having waited a long time in the court cells and then some hours on a bus. At its worst this has resulted in men not being settled into cell accommodation on the first night wing until 11pm and there being a lack of proper food. This is stressful for prisoners, especially those without previous experience of custody who are particularly vulnerable. It also puts unpredictable demands on staff who are forced to extend their working hours. Staff in such circumstances may well be less likely to notice small signs of distress amongst prisoners, which is worrying.

We know that the prison and the contractor have discussed the problems and tried to streamline procedures but this is limited in its effect by the commercial separation of one part of a system for moving prisoners from court to custody which results in other parts of the system having to absorb demand fluctuation.

The Board would like to see a Listener available in Reception which is not currently the case.

### **6.2 Time out of cell**

During the year a number of initiatives were trialled to improve out of cell time, with limited success. One of these was to effectively split the prison into two with half the prison population working in the morning with association, visits, healthcare, etc. in the afternoon and the other half vice-versa. Unfortunately too many complications ensued, not least with facilitating visits around visitors' commitments, and so the idea was abandoned. However the prison should be commended for its resourcefulness in attempting to improve the out of cell time.

The proposal mentioned in last year's report to increase the number of family days has still not materialised and indeed is now confined to one session per school holiday period.

## Section 7 Work of the Independent Monitoring Board

### 7.1. Board Statistics

Recommended complement	20
Number at start of reporting period	13
Number at end of reporting period	13
Number of new members during reporting period	3
Number leaving during reporting period	3
Number of Board meetings during the reporting period	12
Total visits to the Establishment	497
Total number of Segregation reviews held	135
Total number of Segregation reviews attended	118
Date of Annual Team Performance Review	Not undertaken in 2012/13.

At the end of the reporting period arrangements were being made to complete this exercise which has been delayed following a significant change in the composition of the Board, as shown above.

Individual members of the Board have worked well and each contributed their skills to make an effective and harmonious team. The Board has benefitted tremendously from the support of a dedicated and very efficient clerk and also appreciates the occasional help of his colleagues. All 12 Board meetings during the reporting year have been attended by either the Governor or Deputy Governor.

### 7.2. Duties

The Board has continued to monitor the prison through a weekly rota visit; members also visit to attend Reviews in the SARU, deal with Applications and monitor the work of the prison through attending a wide range of meetings. The Board appreciates the positive attitude of the three different Governors employed during the reporting period and the wider management team to its work. The organisation of our work continues to evolve; taking a flexible approach has allowed us to cover all responsibilities in spite of fluctuating membership.

No visits to other Establishments were undertaken during the reporting period although we hosted a visit from HMP Dovegate, and made preparations for two planned visits from a neighbouring prison. Members have completed National Courses as appropriate and in addition some members have attended control and restraint training sessions at the prison. Members of the prison staff and occasionally representatives of partner organisations have continued to attend our board meetings and provide a much appreciated source of training.

The number of serious incidents took place during the year necessitating the opening of the Command Suite. On all occasions a member of the IMB attended the incident, which allowed the Board to update and refine its operational procedures.

### 7.3. Applications

Code	Subject	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	Accommodation				42
B	Adjudications				6
C	Equality & Diversity (inc Religion)				21
D	Education/employment/training inc IEP				31
E1	Family visits inc mail & phone				29
E2	Finance/pay				10
F	Food/kitchen related				81
G	Health related				32
H1	Property (within current establishment)				43
H2	Property (during transfer/in another establishment)				53
H3	Canteen, facilities, catalogue shopping, Argos				12
I	Sentence related (inc HDC, ROTL, parole, release dates, re-cat, etc.)				21
J	Staff/prisoner/detainee concerns inc bullying				43
K	Transfers				19
L	Miscellaneous				62
	<b>Total number of IMB applications</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>490</b>
	Of total: number of IMB Confidential Access was:				1

The increase in 2010 when compared to 2009 has to be set against the fact that the prison did not reach full capacity until July 2010. We do not have any concerns about the level of applications, which appear to have stabilised, although coping with an average of 12 per week, and unpredictable peaks of over 20 has challenged our resources on occasions.

A breakdown of the figures into the categories above is not available where no data is shown. As reported last year this is due to the figures being lost during two accommodation moves.

Total complaints categorised for 2012 is higher than the number of Applications due to some Applications raising multiple issues.