



Annual Report
of the
Independent Monitoring Board
at
HMP Manchester
for reporting year
1 March 2016 to 28 February 2017
Published
September 2017



Monitoring fairness and respect for people in custody

Section One

The Statutory Role of the Independent Monitoring Board

1.1.

The Prisons Act 1952 and the Immigration and Asylum act 1999 require every Prison and Immigration Centre to be monitored by an Independent Board, appointed by The Minister for Justice, from members of the community in which the prison or centre is situated.

1.2.

The Board is specifically charged to:

- a) 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) Inform promptly the Secretary of State, or any official to whom he has delegated authority as it judges appropriate, any concern it has.
- c) 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.

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.

Section Two

Contents

		Page
Section One	The Role of the Board	1
Section Two	Contents	3
Section Three	Description of the Prison	4
Section Four	Executive Summary	6
Section Five	Specific Areas of the Prison	9
Section Six	Other Areas of the Prison	18
Section Seven	The Work of the Board	24

Section Three

Description of the Prison

3.1

Manchester prison is predominantly a local prison holding adult males sentenced and remanded from courts in the Greater Manchester area. Up to 40 Category “A” prisoners are also held at HMP Manchester. Also there are 4 centrally managed prisoners who are resident in the Specialist Interventions Unit (SIU).

3.2

The residential accommodation comprises two Victorian radial blocks known as the Top and Bottom jail. Both of these have five wings where the population is housed in single or double cells, all having integral sanitation and in-cell power points.

3.3

There is a separate Health Care Centre (HCC) which incorporates both in- and out-patient units. All facilities available in the community including dentistry, optometry, podiatry and pharmacy facilities are also available at the centre. The healthcare provider is the Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust.

3.4

The main education provider is Novus. Classes offered include Functional Skills, Information Technology, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Numeracy, Literacy, Flexible Learning, Art, Life Skills, Parent Craft and Victim Awareness. Some classes are held in the Education Department which is situated in the Bottom jail, whilst others are wing-based for those who are unable to attend and some education classes are situated on the Croft area. There is also educational support for prisoners who work in the workshops on a full-time basis. More than 400 prisoners attend education classes. Pendleton College provides the catering training. There is also a well stocked Library in the Education Department provided by Manchester City Library Services. Prisoners resident in the HCC, the Segregation Unit, SIU and on the Category A wing have wing based access to reading material.

3.5

The workshops, sited separately from the main buildings, include a Laundry, 3 textiles workshops, 2 printing workshops, and a Bakery. There is also an industrial cleaning course running for suitable prisoners.

The Crofters Restaurant gives prisoners an opportunity to practise their cooking and serving skills. All courses offer nationally recognised certificates and are linked to employment opportunities, or alternatively they contain functional skills support.

3.6

There is a large sports hall and several gymnasia. Recreational gym takes place every day. Accredited courses are available. Most wings have cardio-vascular suites.

3.7

The Psychology/Programme Department offers courses to prisoners who apply and are then considered to be suitable candidates.

3.8

The Chapel is situated between the two accommodation blocks where services for different denominations take place every week. A World Faith Centre is situated in the Education Centre. There are several volunteer workers who help the Chaplaincy team.

3.9

Transport for Category B and C prisoners is provided by Geo-Amey, whilst the prison service is responsible for that of Category A prisoners.

3.10

The Samaritans attend the prison regularly. They train the Listeners in one to one skills.

3.11

Certified normal accommodation is 967; operational capacity is 1167, whilst the population at the time of writing this report is 1021.

Section Four

Executive Summary

4.0. Issues of concern for the attention of The Minister

4.1.1.

This Annual Report once again highlights a number of concerns arising from the shortage of staff.

Although we were pleased to read in The Minister's response to our published Annual Report of 2016 that, "safety is of paramount importance and there is no intention to operate with insufficient staff."

We would, respectfully, draw the attention of The Minister to our comments in this report which arise, in our opinion, from continued staff shortages. Not least of which is illustrated in paragraph 5.6.7 by the table of assaults during this reporting year, the number of assaults by prisoners on Officers showing a marked increase in comparison to our Annual Report of 2016.

Our concerns are also expressed in the following paragraphs:

(5.1.3, 5.1.7, 5.2.9, 5.2.14, 5.3.3, 5.3.10, 5.6.3, 6.4.3.)

4.1.2.

We are concerned at the lack of full access to Education and the Library due to the lift continuing to be deemed out of order. We were pleased to read in The Minister's response to our concern last year that:

"the lift has been deemed beyond repair and has been included in a major maintenance bid for 2016/17."

We await developments with interest. (5.2.13.)

4.1.3.

In our Annual Report published in 2015 we expressed our concern that the Victorian buildings of HMP Manchester do not easily match the modern day aims and ambitions of a 21st Century prison.

We have regularly reported the lack of decent dining accommodation. Our belief that no-one should be expected to eat their meals within close proximity to an open toilet as is the case at HMP Manchester, has been acknowledged by successive Ministers who have, nevertheless, pointed out the problems arising from the very nature of the mid to late Victorian buildings.

We believe that as the years pass by, the situation only becomes more profound and more difficult to rectify.

The desire to provide decent, humane, safe accommodation in which prisoners may find a degree of self-respect is extremely difficult to achieve when faced with the squalid, vermin-infested, damp environment more reminiscent of Dickensian England that parts of HMP Manchester are becoming.

Prisoners and staff should not be expected to live and work within such environmentally unhealthy residential premises. (6.2.1)

4.1.4.

The requirement to reduce expenditure throughout the Ministry of Justice has resulted in a reduction of the time allowed to train new members of the IMB. The savings made to the IMB budget during this last year have drastically reduced the time available for effective training. We urge the Minister to review the budget provision in order that new members may be properly prepared for the work they are expected to do in extremely complex situations. (7.2.5.)

4.1.5.

We ask that the Minister reviews the agreed categories for Prisoner Applications to the IMB. Year upon year, we, like other Boards report directly to the Minister often expressing concern about the changes in prison regime.

We find it somewhat surprising that the list of Categories of Applications required by and agreed with the Minister does not refer to prisoner concerns about the day to day regime.

In our opinion a category allowing prisoners to express their concerns about regime changes would provide first-hand experience and evidential information for the Minister. (7.2.7.)

4.2. Issues of concern for the attention of HM Prisons and Probation Service (formerly the National Offender Management Service).

4.2.1.

The contractor, Amey takes an unacceptable time to complete necessary repair work. Damaged cells are often taken out of use due to lack of repairs, placing undue pressure on staff to manage prisoners accordingly. (5.3.12)

Broken windows are commonplace and electrical equipment is left useless due to totally unnecessary delays by Amey.

In one Wing 16 showers have been sealed off and condemned due to lack of repairs. (6.2.2.)

4.2.2.

The main kitchen continuously has a backlog of repairs, creating logistical problems for the staff that expected to produce the required meals on time.

(6.6.2.)

4.2.3.

The wing serveries are regularly hampered by faulty equipment, such faults having been reported for months. (6.6.6.)

4.2.4.

The central management of the staff incentive scheme "Payment Plus" creates undue problems for senior staff at local level. The scheme appears to be implemented according to need and then cancelled without any acknowledgement or reference to the continuation of such need. This prohibits local management from achieving the best placement of available staff. (7.2.16)

Section Five

Specific Areas of the Prison

5.1. Healthcare

5.1.1.

A separate Healthcare centre houses both in-patient and primary care services. The majority of healthcare services available in the community are available in the prison, including dentistry, optometry, podiatry and pharmacy services – alongside subcontracted alcohol and substance misuse services.

5.1.2.

During the current reporting year, responsibility for healthcare provision became part of the remit of Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust following the amalgamation of the previous provider trust with Greater Manchester West NHS Foundation Trust. The Board has not evidenced any adverse effects associated with the transfer.

5.1.3.

During the summer months of 2016, Prison Officer staffing levels on the in-patient unit caused the Board some concern. As might be expected, the unit frequently houses difficult patients requiring multiple Officers to unlock. We have witnessed, on a number of occasions insufficient staff available to unlock affected prisoners, so hampering both medical care and prisoner regime. The situation has, however, improved in recent months.

5.1.4.

The Board remain concerned about the high level of missed appointments in the primary care centre. Anecdotal evidence pointed to the failure of the prison to ensure patients were informed of, and escorted to, their appointment, rather than prisoners declining to attend. The Board randomly sampled a number of missed appointments and confirmed this to be the case. We are encouraged, however, with the actions being taken to address this issue.

5.1.5.

As detailed elsewhere in this report, HMP Manchester holds prisoners in Victorian built cell blocks which cannot effectively accommodate those with mobility difficulties. This inevitably leads to inappropriate use of in-patient facilities to hold disabled men who do not require medical treatment.

5.1.6.

During the reporting year the Board repeatedly expressed concerns that statutory social care provision was unavailable as the Local Authority were unable to commission an appropriate provider. We are pleased to note that an arrangement

has now been put into place between the Local Authority and the NHS Trust to provide required social care services within the establishment.

5.1.7.

Despite considerable investment in healthcare services, and most likely a result of an ageing prisoner population, the number of prisoners needing external hospital treatment remains high. At the time of writing there are six prisoners currently away from the prison, so taking over thirty Prison Officers away from their normal work over the course of a day. Given the long-standing pressure on staffing levels, this additional burden leads to an unacceptable curtailment of the normal prison regime.

5.1.8.

Notwithstanding the above, the Board witness the continued dedication of individual Prison Service and NHS staff in providing excellent medical services to prisoners in very difficult circumstances. Their flexibility, care and compassion are all commended by the Board.

5.2. Education and Skills

5.2.1.

Education and Skills continue to be provided under contract by NOVUS (previously The Manchester College). The prison regards the education of prisoners as a high priority, and through a Service Level Agreement the partnership works effectively. Even when available staffing numbers are low the prison's activity staff work hard to find ways to ensure that prisoners receive their education.

5.2.2.

The teaching staff are a stable workforce and this undoubtedly impacts positively on the learners. If a member of staff is absent sessions are not cancelled but a replacement steps in.

5.2.3.

The curriculum is broad and balanced, although influenced by changes in national funding. Where possible every effort is made to meet the educational needs of prisoners. All prisoners entering education are initially assessed and then allocated to an appropriate course. Anyone whose Functional Skills are below level 2 will be allocated to English, Mathematics and Improving Own Learning. Individual learner support is offered through inclusive learning methodology on the courses.

5.2.4.

Initial assessment now takes place in a dedicated workshop each morning where staff from other organisations (Shelter, Job Centre Plus, Careers, DELPHI) work alongside education staff on assessment and induction activities. In co-operation, the agencies identify needs and put together pathways for the learners. This creates a

more positive start to the prisoner journey and they leave with a plan and contacts for moving forward.

5.2.5.

The Learner Forum continues to be held regularly and feedback from prisoners is used to shape new programmes and activities. An Annual Awards Ceremony is held each year to recognise the achievement of individual prisoners.

5.2.6.

Teachers plan a variety of cross curriculum themes which take place throughout the academic year. This years have included International Day of Peace, World Contraception Day, World Aids Day, Black History, Mental Health Awareness, Holocaust Memorial, Children in Need, Fairtrade and Health Education.

5.2.7.

A visit was organised by a theatre group who performed a play written by an ex prisoner. The drama took place in a prison cell and reflected many issues relevant to the audience and it was well received

5.2.8.

A Dictionary of British Values has been produced by NOVUS staff and this is used with learners to promote equality.

5.2.9.

Although attendance at education classes has increased during this year through the efforts of officers and teachers, the shortage of staff has affected the level of participation. However, the success rates of prisoners who have attended have been high.

5.2.10.

There has been no OFSTED inspection this year but the result of an initial guidance visit was an Outstanding Grade 1 evaluation.

5.2.11.

The library service is provided by Manchester City Council and is situated adjacent to the education department which enables joint projects and partnership working.

5.2.12.

The fact that the lift has been out of order for a considerable time has caused concern regarding accessibility.

We note from the Minister's response to our published Annual Report of 2016 that:

"The passenger lift in Education has now been deemed beyond economic repair and has been included in a major maintenance bid for 2016/17."

(13th July 2016)

We await the developments with great interest.

5.2.14.

The situation with regard to prison staffing continues to significantly affect the numbers of prisoners who can attend the library. Although attendance numbers have increased slightly this year, they remain only fifty per cent of the levels enjoyed before the major reductions in staff.

The reinstatement of a dedicated officer who works with the library has had a positive effect on participation.

5.2.15.

The number of prisoners participating in the "Storybook Dads" scheme has more than doubled this year, from 16 to 37.

5.2.15.

The Library was a finalist in the Manchester City Council Awards for Excellence in the Diversity in Action Section.

5.3. Segregation

5.3.1.

IMB members have continually found the Segregation Unit to be extremely clean and tidy. There have, however been numerous occasions when cells have been out of action for unreasonable amounts of time due to damage to cells. This has, at times, affected the operation of the unit. The IMB have occasionally witnessed prisoners being brought to Segregation when no cells were available.

5.3.2.

The IMB has consistently found all records and lists of prisoners held in the unit to be up to date and accurate and the details of any prisoner currently on ACCTs are always available.

5.3.3.

Staff continue to deliver a stable regime for the prisoners held on the unit. However, this has proved difficult at times due to staff shortages. The IMB have witnessed a number of occasions that some prisoners were unable to be unlocked due to the individual risk assessment for that particular prisoner requiring more staff than was present.

5.3.4.

Staff interaction with all prisoners is consistently professional. The IMB have frequently witnessed new prisoners entering the unit being transferred from the wings. They are always spoken to in a professional manner and made aware of where they are and their surroundings. Although this can be very stressful for the prisoner being moved into segregation; staff always do their utmost to de-escalate potential confrontations.

5.3.5.

The IMB is not aware of any prisoners being refused or missing their visits. Prisoners are regularly taken off the unit to one of two visiting areas depending on the prisoner's current category status.

5.3.6.

Members of the IMB will visit every prisoner held on the unit at least once a week. Due to the changing population within the unit it is not uncommon for the IMB to visit the unit more than once a week. Arrangements can be made to see prisoners in private if staffing and resources allow. If a meeting cannot take place an appointment will be made, if appropriate.

5.3.7.

Dirty protests are fairly uncommon, however there have been a number of incidents within the last year. Such protests hamper the running of the unit due and can be very unpleasant for staff and prisoners alike. The prisoners undertaking dirty protests are offered a shower daily.

5.3.8.

Although procedures are in place to ensure that the IMB are routinely contacted when a prisoner is located in Segregation, such contact is not always made. Whilst these omissions are few in number and can be for a variety of reasons, it is important that contact is made and the IMB has an opportunity to visit the prisoner within the recommended time period.

5.3.9.

All prisoners held on Segregation are reviewed weekly. The experience of the IMB is that the reviews are conducted in a professional manner with all the appropriate departments of the prison present.

On occasions when a prisoner does not attend the review the decision of the panel is subsequently communicated verbally to the prisoner by the presiding Governor. The paperwork is always scrutinized and signed by a board member.

The prison will always try and relocate a prisoner back into general population if there is no reason for them to remain in Segregation. This can, however, be problematic as sometimes if a prisoner feels vulnerable he may wish to stay on the unit. The prison management team will always endeavor to work with the prisoner in order find suitable accommodation elsewhere.

5.3.10.

The Segregation Unit is one of the busiest parts of the prison and dynamic in nature.

The staff deal with some of the most difficult prisoners within the system. The unit suffers from staff shortages on occasions and this is managed daily, sometimes hourly.

5.3.11.

All the dealings the IMB have with the Segregation Staff are excellent and professional.

5.3.12.

There have been issues with repairs to damaged cells taking far too long to repair which in turn puts pressure on the Segregation staff having to manage prisoners.

5.4. Specialist Intervention Unit (SIU)

5.4.1.

The SIU is a small unit consisting of 6 cells with a normal operating capacity of 4. Its purpose is to hold men centrally managed in the Close Supervision Centre system who are participating in the Managing Challenging Behaviour Strategy (MCBS).

5.4.2.

The IMB visits the unit on a regular basis and always find it to be a positive environment. Staff have recently identified a prisoner with artistic skills and with the help of the staff and the education department this prisoner has decorated the entrance stairs to the unit.

5.4.3.

Staff are collaborating with the Royal College of Psychiatrists working towards the Enabling Environments Qualification which promotes:

- Places where positive relationships promote well-being for all participants;
- Places where people experience a sense of belonging;
- Places where all people involved contribute to the growth and well-being of others;
- Places where people can learn new ways of relating;
- Places that recognise and respect the contributions of all parties in helping relationships.

The work needed for this qualification requires the participation of staff and prisoners alike.

This is an excellent example of staff and prisoners working together to achieve a common goal.

The Board congratulates the SIU staff for the work being currently carried out as results are being seen with a prisoner progressing back into general population.

5.5. Security

5.5.1.

The main issues facing security have been with mobile phones, drugs (including new psychoactive substances) and offensive weapons. The prison has been faced with new challenges in respect of ways drugs are entering the establishment with the use of drones which are difficult to detect.

5.5.2.

Measures have been taken to move prisoners from specific cells where drones have been sent and a strategy to police drone activity has also been introduced.

5.5.3.

The introduction of a designated CCTV vehicle to patrol external areas of the prison has also been deployed as a new measure to detect drug activity.

5.5.4.

There has been a marked increase in the number of prisoners on 'closed visits' over the course of the year which is linked to improved intelligence on those prisoners actively engaging in drug related activity.

5.5.5.

The Security Department gained an overall Green Rating in 2016 from the Annual Security Audit.

5.6. Safer Custody

5.6.1.

The number of Deaths in Custody during the reporting year was 8 of which 4 were from natural causes. The remaining four deaths are awaiting Inquests.

5.6.2.

IMB members were informed of the deaths and attended the prison immediately where appropriate.

5.6.3.

In the IMB Annual Report ending February 2016 we made several comments relating to shortages and the resulting effect on the prison regime. Redeployment of staff due to shortages was also highlighted and our concerns expressed in that report.

We were subsequently pleased to read in the response from the Minister that:

“Safety is of paramount importance and there is no intention to operate with insufficient staff”

It is then with some concern that we are once again reporting evidence of redeployment of staff which is counter-productive to their designated role.

The Disability Liaison Officer was redeployed for a total of 178 hours over a three month period, losing 96 hours in one month alone.

The Foreign National Officer was redeployed for a total of 193 hours in eight months of the reporting year.

The adverse effect on the safety of prisoners resulting from the redeployments outlined above appears to contradict the Minister’s comment about “safety being of paramount importance” and is of great concern to the Board.

5.6.4.

A total of 424 incidents of Self-Harm have been reported during the year.

5.6.5.

There were 362 Serious Incidents reported during the year.

5.6.6.

The importance of good relationships between prisoners is highlighted by the fact that of the 320 reported incidents of violence, 69 resulted from an argument between prisoners and 55 stemmed from the desire for retribution for offence caused.

5.6.7.

The following Table illustrates the number and category of assaults during the reporting year.

Number and Category of Assaults March 2016 – February 2017.

	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Total
Prisoner on prisoner	15	13	18	13	16	12	7	15	11	8	13	17	158
Prisoner on staff	5	3	7	11	7	2	18	7	12	8	4	5	89
Total	20	16	25	24	23	14	25	22	23	16	17	22	247

Although the total number of assaults has decreased from last year, a reduction of 8.2%, and the number of prisoner on prisoner assaults has also fallen by 16.4% it is of great concern that the number of assaults by prisoners on Officers has increased by 11.25% during the same period.

In our view there is a direct correlation between the staff shortage and the increase in assaults on Officers by prisoners.

5.6.8.

HMP Manchester has taken steps to proactively investigate all violent assaults and introduced a programme of a “3 R Approach” – Record, Respond and Reduce.

Prisoners are reassured by the concept of Zero Tolerance and the determination to prosecute through the courts is to be applauded.

Section Six

Other Areas of the Prison

6.1. Equality

6.1.1.

The total number of prisoners on the PEEPS register currently stands at 30, of which there are 9 wheelchair users with varying levels of mobility.

6.1.2.

In our Annual Report published in 2016 we highlighted the difficulties facing prisoners with disabilities in HMP Manchester. At the time we stated that the prison:

“does not lend itself to easy access in a number of areas.”

We were subsequently pleased to read in the response from NOMS, dated 13th July 2016, that:

“a business case had been approved for 10 Disability Discrimination Act compliant cells to be created on residential accommodation during 2016/17.”

This project will greatly improve the quality of life for prisoners with disabilities in HMP Manchester and at the time of writing (February 2017) we look forward to the work being started in order that the suggested timetable might be achieved.

6.1.3.

We are concerned about the number of hours lost by the Disability Liaison Officer due to redeployment. From April to June 2016 the officer was redeployed for a total of 178 hours. Such a high level of loss must surely detract from the importance of the support for disabled prisoners.

6.1.4.

At the end of February 2017 there were a total of 127 prisoners of 43 different nationalities in HMP Manchester.

6.1.5.

The number of Foreign National prisoners being held subject to an IS91 certificate is 10, one detainee having been deported in February 2017.

6.1.6.

Although mention has been made elsewhere in this report concerning the continued problems of redeployment of staff, we must express our concern at the number of hours lost this year by the Foreign Nationals Officer who lost 193 hours due to redeployment over an eight month period. Once again this appears to contradict the Minister's assurance that "there is no intention (on the part of government) to operate with insufficient staff."

6.2. Residential Services

6.2.1. In our Annual Report published in 2015 we expressed our concerns that the accommodation problems posed by a Victorian Prison in the 21st Century acted against the achievement of decent, hygienic accommodation for prisoners.

We in fact questioned whether, or not, HMP Manchester could continue to be viable as a prison with much of the residential accommodation dating from the mid to late Victorian era.

We, once again must ask a similar question. We have, throughout this reporting year, witnessed the problems caused by an on-going infestation of vermin in parts of the residential accommodation.

A plague of rats has contributed to a shower block being closed on a permanent basis, creating further problems for the prisoners concerned as they need to access adjacent wing accommodation to shower.

Prisoners frequently report the presence of mice in their cells, usually present at night. Bed clothes, personal clothing and other belongings are often being soiled by the vermin.

Wing Officers have also needed to take measures to deter mice from the office accommodation on the wings, temporarily sealing up gaps around heating pipes etc.

Apart from any issues of decency and hygiene arising from this situation there must surely be an environmental health concern which needs a concerted effort on the part of the prison service to eradicate.

Prisoners and staff should not be expected to live and work within such unhygienic, unhealthy, environmentally dangerous, unacceptable residential premises.

6.2.2.

We are extremely concerned about the lack of progress on the part of the contractor Amey in tackling necessary repair work.

In one wing 16 showers are out of order and condemned by Amey due to lack of repairs. Broken windows are commonplace and electrical equipment is either left in a dangerous state or rendered totally useless due to lack of repair.

Kitchen equipment often takes several months for repair due to the lack of availability of spare parts resulting from the age and repair needs of the equipment.

HMP Manchester has been described to us by the kitchen maintenance contractors "Service-line" as having the oldest equipment within the service, much of it in need of complete replacement. Once again the question arises of the feasibility of maintaining such archaic equipment.

6.3. Visits.

6.3.1. Visits Centre:

The staff at the Visits Centre care greatly about the visitors and their experiences of going into prison. Several of the staff have a background in health and social care provision as evidenced in the manner in which the centre is run.

6.3.2.

Prisoners receive a reception letter when they first come into prison dealing with the visiting processes. This letter is then intended to be sent out by the prisoner to family and friends. The first visit is booked by the visitor with subsequent visits being booked by the prisoner using the Unilink system

6.3.3.

The Unilink system relies on the prisoner booking a visit which is convenient to the visitors. Unfortunately given the problems of communication between prisoner and visitor the visit can be cancelled by one of the parties involved without the knowledge of others involved, often causing distress and frustration.

6.3.4.

The length of time taken to vet visitors of Category "A" prisoners can often lead to complaints from families. This vetting is, however, outside of the prisons control as it is undertaken by the police.

6.3.5.

In spite of the efforts by the staff to create a positive and welcoming environment, the Visits Centre is in need of refurbishment with a full modernisation of all facilities.

6.3.6.

The Visits Centre staff are very attentive and take great care to explain the searching process to visitors, problems do, however, arise where English is not the main language used by the visitor. There are no leaflets available in other languages, nor are there any translating services available. Language Line is available for those wishing to pre-book appointments but this is not easily accessed.

6.3.6.

Staff conducting the search process at the Gate do so, in the main, in a sensitive, professional manner, recognising the stress which can be caused by the necessity of searching, particularly where young children are involved. Cultural factors are also sensitively handled in order not to cause distress.

However, Prison Service Instructions and Governor's Orders perhaps require greater explanation and qualification in order to avoid misinterpretation.

For example, the regulation banning "fluorescent clothing" undoubtedly had more to do with "hi-visibility" clothing as worn by some officers than it did when refusing entry to a young girl visitor wearing a brightly coloured top to visit her father. Although such experiences are unfortunate and few and far between they can be extremely distressing for the individuals concerned.

6.3.7.

The visiting area within the prison is equipped with all necessary amenities.

6.3.8.

All staff whose work is connected with the visits process are trained in child safeguarding.

6.3.9.

There is a crèche area in the visits hall which is open for all visits.

6.3.10.

With adequate advance notice special arrangements can be made to ensure that visitors with disabilities or impairments are attended to appropriately and sensitively.

6.4. Resettlement.

6.4.1. Accommodation available on release.

Partner agencies are experiencing issues with accommodation for high risk offenders. Many of the supporting communities are focusing on medium to low risk offenders only. This is of concern to the Board as accommodation is of paramount importance for those being released and the lack of it has been linked with the risk of re-offending.

6.4.2.

Shelter are now linking with “On the Out” in an attempt to address the accommodation gap for prisoners with short sentences, however, short sentences often do not allow time for the agencies to arrange accommodation resulting in the prisoner being released without the full necessary support. In January 2017 of the 160 prisoners released a total of 102 had settled accommodation (63%).

6.4.3. Jobcentre Plus.

All prisoners due for release are invited to attend for interview to obtain advice and discuss issues they may encounter in the outside community. Unfortunately the availability of escort staff due to staff shortages has had an impact on the number of prisoners able to take advantage of this process.

6.5. Programmes.

6.5.1. The main achievement this year has been the successful introduction of HRP programme to the Category “A” prisoners, with the sessions being held on the Unit.

6.5.2.

The last six months has shown an improved attendance for all current programmes

6.5.3.

The Violence Reduction Programme now operates without exclusions, providing increased support for those attending.

6.5.4.

The prison is to be commended for the success of ongoing programmes and their move forward with support and implementation of programmes for Category “A” prisoners.

6.6. Catering.

6.6.1.

The Board undertook a thematic review of the Catering facilities during an extended period in late Autumn 2016. This review included the main kitchen and the wing serveries.

In addition to the employed professional staff, the kitchen employs up to 24 prisoners on a daily basis.

6.6.2.

The kitchen review included the following activities:

- a) Bakery ovens
- b) Pot washing
- c) Cooking
- d) Serving
- e) Sandwiches

f) Cleaning

Following several observation sessions spent in the kitchen at various times of the day we were impressed by the management team and prisoner workforce who are well motivated to produce the meals on time each day, often working under difficult circumstances caused by lack of workers and/or faulty equipment.

The problems created by faulty equipment are further exacerbated by the slow or lack of response by Amey

Much of the catering equipment is outdated and difficult to repair due to lack of spare parts, indeed, Service-line; the maintenance contractor considers the equipment at HMP Manchester to be amongst the oldest to be in current in use in prisons and in need of a complete refurbishment.

6.6.3.

The menu options are varied and rotated every month with five choices of meal each day, including at least two options for all prisoners at lunchtime and hot dinner in the evening. A great deal of effort goes into the menu preparation and prisoner's opinions are taken into account via a "prisoner questionnaire" of likes and dislikes. Religious celebrations and cultural differences are also reflected in the menu choices available at certain times of the year.

6.6.4.

In our opinion the work rate and management of the kitchen is excellent.

6.6.5.

An essential part of the review focused on the Serveries on the wings. As can be expected there is a marked difference in all Serveries as staff and prisoners involved are always changing. Although the method of control and operation varies across all of the serveries we believe that there are certain aspects of good practice which could be adopted by all concerned to achieve the best possible environment for the servery.

Maintenance of equipment was the prime complaint from the servery staff, Amey being heavily criticised for the lack of response to repair requests. We found a large number of faults on the servery equipment some having been reported for several months.

6.6.6.

At the end of the catering review a report was forwarded to the Governor for information.

Section Seven.

The Work of the Board.

7.1 Board Membership

7.1.1.

The membership of the Board shows a net gain of two over the year. Two members took up their appointments in April 2016, followed in December by a third who was originally interviewed by the IMB at HMP Styal and placed on the new initiative of the Reserve List prior to deciding to move to HMP Manchester.

December also saw the departure under the Tenure of Office Regulations of the Board's longest serving member. Whilst acknowledging the need to avoid over familiarity and complacency arising from extended service, we remain concerned at the loss of experience created by these regulations.

The Board organised a successful recruitment drive in the Autumn resulting in six candidates undergoing the CTC Clearance with a view to joining the Board later this year.

7.2. Board Activity.

7.2.1.

The Board has been fully represented at Area Chair's Meetings, High Security Estate Meetings, Category "A" Review Panels, Close Supervision Centre Management Meetings and the Close Supervision Centre Advisory Panel Meetings (the latter being a recent involvement by the IMB).

7.2.2.

The Board hosted the North West Area Chair's Meeting in February 2017 which included an informative tour of the prison for the visitors.

7.2.3.

In addition to the normal Rota and Prisoner Application duties, members have visited the prison at evenings and weekends in order to achieve a balanced view of the establishment.

Board members also undertook two in depth thematic reviews during the course of the year, focusing on Visits and Catering, both of which are reported elsewhere.

7.2.4.

The following table outlines the work of the Board throughout the reporting year.

Once again, the figures show the commitment by the Board towards Segregation Reviews with a 100% attendance this reporting year. (264 Reviews)

IMB Manchester Board Statistics	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Recommended Complement	24	24	24	24
Number of Board Members at the start of the reporting year	11	16	13	14
Number of Board Members at the end of the reporting year	16	13	14	16
Number of new members joining within the reporting year	6	1	3	3
Total number of members leaving within the reporting year	1	4	2	1
Total number of Board Meetings during the reporting year	12	12	12	12
Average attendance at Board meetings during the reporting year	10	11	9	11
Number of attendances at meetings other than Board Meetings during the reporting year	25	34	38	40
Total number of visits to the prison including meetings during the reporting year	599	660	573	713
Total number of Applications received	135	123	106	116
Total number of Segregation Reviews held	212	282	234	264
Total number of Segregation Reviews attended	212	279	233	264
Total number of Adjudication sessions attended	9	10	4	22
Total number of Call Out attendances	3	8	32	5
Total attendance at Training sessions	29	23	21	16
Total Training visits for new members with Mentors	47	126	13	107
Board attendance at Annual Team Performance Review	9	12	9	9

The training and mentoring of new members has needed a major commitment this year, resulting in a significant increase in attendance.

This is an aspect of the Board's work which should be recognised and continued allowance made for the effective mentoring of new recruits. We are concerned that the allowance made for such activity has been significantly reduced as a result of efficiency savings.

7.2.5.

The Annual Team Performance Review took place in October with nine members attending.

7.2.6.

A total of 22 Adjudications have been observed during the year. From our observations we believe that the adjudications are conducted in a fair and open manner, with full participation of the individual concerned and with parity of outcome across the sample monitored.

7.2.7.

The following table shows the number and category of Applications received by the Board from prisoners during the reporting period, together with the four previous year's figures for comparison.

Code	Category	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17
A	Accommodation	2	6	5	5
B	Adjudications	0	2	0	0
C	Equality/Diversity related	0	2	3	8
D	Education/Employment/ Training including IEP.	2	6	6	2
E1	Family/visits including mail and phone	41	14	10	27
E2	Finance and pay	N/A	5	5	2
F	Food/kitchen related	0	2	4	5
G	Health related	11	11	14	9
H1	Property within the establishment	34	10	8	9
H2	Property in another establishment or in transfer	N/A	15	19	8
H3	Canteen facilities/catalogue shopping and Argos	N/A	4	1	5
I	Sentence related including HDC, Parole Release dates, Re-categorisation	17	25	11	3
J	Staff/prisoner related including bullying	12	8	11	22
K	Transfer	3	3	7	2
L	Miscellaneous	13	10	2	10
	Total number of Applications	135	123	106	116

7.2.8.

All Applications are reviewed and allocated a category as required for the Minister, according to the agreed list of categories.

We repeat our belief stated last year that the list of agreed Categories should include a section for “Regime”. We believe that the inclusion of “Regime” will more readily highlight any concerns and dissatisfaction that prisoners may have relating to day to day prison life.

We therefore once again request that the agreed list of Applications be amended to include “Regime”.

7.2.9.

A number of Applications received were submitted under the auspices of “Confidential Access to the Chair of the IMB”. None of these were considered to be appropriate as Confidential Access Requests and all were either returned to the individual concerned with a written explanation for their return, or were treated as routine Applications to the IMB and dealt with accordingly.

The Board maintains its stance in not condoning the misuse of the Confidential Access process.

7.2.10.

In our Conclusion last year we implored the Minister to take account of the impact of any future policy changes on the prison population as a whole.

We were pleased to read in his response the Minister “recognised that HMP Manchester, (like other establishments), was in the process of one of the most significant change programmes for a generation”. The Minister’s response also highlighted that the benchmarking process was not a “one size fits all” approach and referred to ways in which HMP Manchester was being supported through a variety of means, including a reduction in Operational Capacity and the addition of extra staff to provide a “buffer” over and above the agreed staffing target.

The use of Payment Plus as an incentive to staff was also appreciated. However, the lack of continuity of the scheme created a degree of dissatisfaction and uncertainty amongst staff unnecessarily. The goodwill of staff becomes strained when the basis upon which they are in receipt of incentives is changed without consultation, varying from week to week.

In our view the local management of staff and resources becomes increasingly more difficult when hampered by unnecessary central interference.

7.2.11

The members of the IMB at HMP Manchester are to be congratulated for their dedication and commitment to achieving a fair, safe and humane environment in which those held in custody and those who work with them may gain a level of understanding and motivation towards a positive sense of community.