

SPSO decision report

Case: 201200934, **Scottish Prison Service**
Sector: scottish government and devolved administration
Subject: policy/administration
Outcome: not upheld, no recommendations

Summary

Mr C, who is a prisoner, complained that there had been an unreasonable delay in completing his end of programme report for Constructs (an offending behaviour programme in which some prisoners may participate). Mr C felt the delay in completing his report was preventing him from progressing through the prison system to less secure conditions.

The prison confirmed that the completion of Mr C's report had been affected because of staff absences, the delivery of another programme and development of the programmes environment. The prison also confirmed there was no timescale laid down for the completion of reports. In an effort to progress outstanding reports, the prison told us a list was created for prisoners who were awaiting end of programme reports for Constructs. This list ran in order of individual prisoners' parole qualifying dates and reports were dealt with in that order to ensure critical dates were not missed which would impact on progression. The Scottish Prison Service also told us that they estimated the timescale for the completion of an end of programme report for Constructs would be three months from the end of the programme, but this would depend on the complexity of the individual report. In addition, there was no evidence to support Mr C's claim that the completion of his report was preventing him from progressing to less secure conditions. For a prisoner to progress to less secure conditions, they must be approved by the prison's progression risk management team (PRMT). At the time of making his complaint, Mr C had not been approved.

Our investigation found that the available information confirmed that a number of factors had impacted on the completion of Mr C's report. However, it was in fact finalised just over three months after he completed the programme. After this, he was referred to the PRMT but his progression to less secure conditions was refused. In light of this information, whilst we recognised Mr C's report was not completed as quickly as he would have liked, we felt the time taken was reasonable and we did not uphold his complaint.