

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP & YOI Hollesley Bay

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

26 August–5 September 2014

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2015

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Victory House
6th floor
30–34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	25
Section 3. Purposeful activity	39
Section 4. Resettlement	45
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	53
Section 6. Appendices	57
Appendix I: Inspection team	57
Appendix II: Prison population profile	59
Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	63

Introduction

HMP & YOI Hollesley Bay is an open prison in Suffolk which holds both adult men and young adult men aged under 21. Most of the men held are serving long-term determinate and indeterminate sentences. The population varies from men with only a very short time left to serve, to those subject to release by the parole board. It manages this varying population very well and provides incentives to most of the men to conform to the rules in what is a very low security prison. This is the first full inspection of the prison since 2009 and, similar to then, we found a successful prison that had risen to most of the challenges presented.

Hollesley Bay remained a very safe prison. Most prisoners told us they felt safe and this was reflected by the very few incidents of bullying and violence. Given this, it was surprising that in our survey prisoners were somewhat less secure in this belief than at the last full inspection, which may have reflected changes in the prisoner demographic rather than an increase in bullying and violence, of which there was no evidence. Vulnerable prisoners were well looked after and not routinely sent back to closed conditions, and the challenges around illicit drugs and alcohol were well managed, including the more recent appearance of Spice as the drug of choice.

The prison was a respectful place. Most of the living accommodation was decent and in good condition. While Bosmere unit was well looked after it was old and outdated and had a number of drawbacks which were difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate. It needed to be replaced. The outside grounds were excellent and the whole site was kept clean. Relationships between staff and prisoners were very strong, supported by a very good personal officer scheme. The overall environment was relaxed and supportive and focused on resettlement.

Managers had responded to our previous recommendations about keeping a focus on diversity issues, particularly outcomes for the significant number of black and minority ethnic prisoners held. Nevertheless, over a third of black and minority ethnic prisoners in our survey reported they had been victimised by staff. It was not clear from prisoners we spoke to during the inspection what was underpinning these perceptions, and most outcomes seemed equitable, but managers needed to ensure a greater range of forums were open to explore and address the concerns raised. The supportive nature of the prison meant that there were few discernible poor outcomes for the protected characteristic groups, although some structures were weak and failed to provide reassurance that no one was slipping through the net.

Prisoners were never locked up and had very good access to the pleasant outside area. Learning and skills were very strong with all prisoners engaged in meaningful activities, either inside the prison, or in the community on temporary release. The quality of this work was unusually rated as outstanding by Ofsted during this inspection. Activities were individualised, and targeted on enhancing employability opportunities on release and reducing reoffending. There was also significant benefit to the local community with a wide range of community projects being completed by prisoners on temporary release.

Resettlement provision also effectively supported work to reintegrate men back into the wider community, and reduce risk through some good resettlement pathway support. However, some key offender management work needed attention, including providing men with up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys), and release on temporary licence management needed to fully reflect recent changes to the guidelines.

Nevertheless, Hollesley Bay remained, as at the previous full inspection, an impressive open prison, from which other similar establishments could learn. It was weathering well the various challenges it faced and was providing some very good outcomes for prisoners, and the wider community. It was moving towards a merger with HMP Warren Hill, a neighbouring prison, which would, in itself,

present a new set of challenges in maintaining and building on the evident strong work. As a successful institution it needs to guard against complacency and build on its considerable strengths.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

January 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Hollesley Bay is a category D open prison for adult and young adult men.

Prison status

Public

Region

East of England

Number held

432

Certified normal accommodation

434

Operational capacity

434

Date of last inspections

9-13 February 2009 (full)

17-19 January 2012 (short follow-up)

Brief history

HMP Hollesley Bay opened as a borstal in 1938 on the site of a former colonial college whose original buildings, dating to 1887, now housed much of the administration centre. It became a young offender institution in 1988, and then an open prison for adult men in April 2002. A merger with the adjacent HMP Warren Hill, holding adult category C men, was underway when we visited.

Short description of residential units

The seven residential units across an 85-acre site had a broadly similar population.

Hoxon – consisted of mainly single rooms; two of the four landings accommodated the induction unit

Samforde – a small unit reserved for older men

Blything, Cosford, Stow and Wilford – consisted of mainly single rooms, each with two or three double rooms

Bosmere – a pre-fabricated building with single rooms.

Name of governor/director

Declan Moore

Escort contractor

Serco

Health service commissioner and providers

NHS England (East Anglia) (commissioner)

Care UK (provider)

Learning and skills providers

A4E

Independent Monitoring Board chair

David Smith

About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:

Safety	prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

- **outcomes for prisoners are good.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good.**
There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- **outcomes for prisoners are poor.**
There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

- A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:
- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
 - **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
 - **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection, unless these have already been reviewed by a short follow-up inspection. This inspection follows a short follow-up inspection and does not report directly on progress made against the previous recommendations.

This report

- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and II respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix III of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

- S1** *Many prisoners had long journeys to the prison but said escort staff treated them well. Support on arrival was generally good and prisoners received help to settle into life at the prison. Most prisoners felt safe and there were very few incidents. Support for those at risk of self-harm or suicide was good and adult safeguarding arrangements were developing. Security was generally proportionate. Drugs and alcohol were not widely available, and the supply reduction strategy was well managed, although Spice presented a challenge. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was well managed. Formal disciplinary procedures were used appropriately, but there was little use of force. Substance misuse services were very good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** Many prisoners had long journeys to the prison but said escort staff treated them well. Some said they had been given insufficient notice of their transfer to the prison. The lack of a video link facility meant some prisoners faced unnecessary escorts to court.
- S3** Holding cells in the modern reception area were clean and only used for very short periods. Prisoners were treated respectfully throughout the reception process, and searching arrangements were proportionate. Induction orderlies welcomed new arrivals. Prisoners did not have a structured first night interview with a member of staff, which meant prisoners' vulnerabilities might not have been identified early on; however, the generally supportive approach adopted at the prison mitigated this. Otherwise first night support was good, as was the induction process, which usually started the day after a prisoner's arrival. Eighty per cent of survey respondents said that the course covered everything they needed to know.
- S4** In our survey, perceptions of safety were similar to comparator prisons, but poorer than in 2009. Levels of violence were low and most bullying incidents were not serious. Investigations were appropriate, and perpetrators of violence were swiftly returned to closed conditions. Victims of bullying received good support.
- S5** No self-harm incidents had been recorded in the previous six months. Prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide were managed sensitively and appropriately. A well managed team of Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) offered assistance. Formal adult safeguarding arrangements were developing slowly. Awareness of safeguarding was good in the health care department, but other staff needed a better understanding.
- S6** Sound staff-prisoner relationships underpinned good dynamic security. Security was generally appropriate and prisoners signed compacts (signed agreements confirming adherence to community rules) and we found no evidence of rules being inconsistently or unfairly applied. The main challenges related to mobile phone possession and suspicions about drug use. It was not clear if action was taken in response to all intelligence reports. An intelligence-led searching strategy included an appropriate focus on release on temporary licence (ROTL) and work placements. Positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rates were low, although staff and prisoners acknowledged that Spice (synthetic cannabis) was a continuing issue. In our survey, fewer than the comparator but more than at the inspection in 2009 said it was easy to obtain drugs. The establishment's supply reduction strategy involved a well integrated approach across the prison.

- S7 Most prisoners were on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme and none were on the basic regime. A senior manager quality assured the cases of those who were downgraded and on occasion overturned decisions.
- S8 Few adjudications took place; they were mostly for having unauthorised items and returning late from ROTL. Minor breaches were appropriately dealt with through informal warnings or the IEP scheme. Sufficient inquiries were made, punishments were appropriate and some cases were dismissed. However, the prison did not monitor trends or look at tariffs. Force was used rarely, but the routine handcuffing of prisoners being moved to closed conditions was disproportionate. There was no segregation unit. Prisoners who needed to be held in secure conditions were located in the only lockable rooms at the prison in reception, until their onward transfer; they were rarely used.
- S9 Substance use services were well integrated, delivering high quality, recovery-focused treatment and interventions. The peer mentor scheme supported prisoners' recovery very effectively.

Respect

S10 *Living conditions and the environment were generally very good. The Bosmere unit provided a poorer standard accommodation and its layout affected staff-prisoner interaction to some extent. Nevertheless, staff-prisoner relationships were very good and the personal officer scheme functioned well. Managers had invested in diversity work but black and minority ethnic prisoners were more likely than others to feel victimised by staff. The prison failed to provide sufficient support to some disabled prisoners. Responses to complaints were generally good. Legal services were adequate. Health services were good overall. Prisoners complained about the food and self-catering opportunities were limited. Canteen arrangements were reasonable. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

- S11 Residential units were generally clean and well maintained. Association facilities were good and outside areas pleasant. The Bosmere unit, however, was old, cramped and needed to be refurbished or replaced. Applications were dealt with promptly and fairly.
- S12 Relationships between prisoners and staff were very good. In our survey, more prisoners were positive about relationships with staff than at other open prisons. Personal officer work was good across all units although the layout of the Bosmere unit sometimes made regular contact between staff and prisoners difficult. Staff members' entries on P-Nomis (the Prison Service IT system) were consistent but few referred to sentence plans. General consultation with prisoner representatives was good.
- S13 Managers took an active interest in diversity issues and good strategic policies covered the protected characteristics. The equality action team (EAT) discussed a range of data on the treatment and conditions of minority groups, mainly focusing on ethnicity, and few negative outcomes were evident. While some consultation with prisoners took place at this meeting, there were few other forums to explore prisoners' perceptions across all protected groups in more detail. Few discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFS) were submitted and investigations and responses to them were good. Supportive relationships meant that many prisoners' needs were understood and met effectively.
- S14 In our survey 36% of black and minority ethnic prisoners said they had been victimised by a member of staff. Most outcomes were equitable and it was unclear why prisoners had these perceptions and managers needed to find ways of understanding them. The prison did not

focus sufficiently on the needs of Gypsy, Romany and Traveller or gay and bisexual prisoners. Foreign national prisoners received good support. Assistance for disabled men was mixed; most received good support, while a small number did not receive all the help they needed. Personal emergency and evacuation plans were in place.

- S15 Some older prisoners were located in the Samforde unit, which was calm and relaxed and provided a supportive environment. The number of young adults had declined; staff knew who they were and those we spoke to felt well supported. A good range of faith services was available, including classes. The chapel and multi-faith room were good.
- S16 More prisoners than the comparator were positive about the effectiveness and timeliness of complaints. There was a robust quality assurance process. All responses sampled were on time, addressed the issue and were respectful, but some were hard to read. There was no established legal service although demand was low.
- S17 Overall health services were good and most prisoners were very positive about the care they received. Clinical governance arrangements were reasonable but nurse-led chronic disease management was not consistent enough and professional support for staff, including clinical supervision, was underdeveloped. Prisoners had good access to nurse triage and GP appointments. Pharmacy services were generally appropriate. Prisoners waited too long for routine dental appointments, but the service provided was good. Support for prisoners with mental health problems was good.
- S18 Food portions were generous, but many prisoners complained about the quality. Consultation arrangements were not sufficiently effective. Most prisoners could dine together but many chose not to collect meals from the servery. Self-catering facilities were inadequate. Overall, prisoners were positive about the shop selling a good range of goods.

Purposeful activity

S19 *Prisoners were never locked up and had good access to pleasant outside areas. Management of learning and skills was outstanding and focused on providing appropriate vocational skills. There were excellent links with external agencies to enhance the provision. Sufficient activity places were available and an appropriate range focused on enhancing employability. The quality of provision and prisoners' achievement of qualifications were very good. The library and gym provided a wide range of opportunities, and prisoners' access to both was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

- S20 Prisoners could spend up to 16 hours a day out of their rooms, which was excellent. They could participate in a wide range of activities and could easily access outside areas. Recreation facilities in units were generally very good although less so in the Bosmere unit.
- S21 Learning and skills were very well managed; senior staff provided excellent direction and had a well considered and inclusive strategic plan for the further development of the provision. Vocational training workshops and education were very well resourced and there was a very strong strategic focus on vocational training and skills for sustainable employment. Strong partnerships with local agencies meant prisoners could take up work in the local community and participate in appropriate training in the prison. The prison's quality assurance and improvement framework was sound but did not extend to all the provision. Data was used well and self-assessment was realistic and accurate.

- S22 There was sufficient work and purposeful activity for the population and many prisoners worked in the community. A good range of appropriate work in the prison often led to community volunteering or paid work. A well thought out needs analysis was used extremely effectively to plan education, focusing appropriately on resettlement. Prisoners' induction to purposeful activity was comprehensive.
- S23 Teaching was outstanding; sessions were very well planned. Prisoners were involved and most contributed well during sessions and were keen to succeed. Coaching in the workshops was excellent and there was a good focus on employability. However, in some new education sessions staff did not always ensure all prisoners were sufficiently challenged. English and mathematics were extremely well embedded into all vocational training activity. Support for learners with additional learning needs was excellent; they had a good initial assessment and their progress was monitored regularly. Overall achievement of qualifications was very high and retention rates on all programmes were very good. Learners' work in education and vocational training was exceptional.
- S24 The library was welcoming, all prisoners had good access and attendance rates were very high. It was well stocked with a wide range of material. Library-based activities encouraged prisoners to communicate with their families. Staff interacted well with prisoners, running a wide range of initiatives and working well with external organisations.
- S25 Prisoners' access to the well managed gym was good and it was well used. Physical education facilities were good and a wide range of vocational, structured and recreational activities was available. Prison management had removed all free weights from the gym to promote general and cardiovascular fitness. An appropriate range of provision was available for prisoners who were over 40, overweight, recuperating from injury or prescribed PE for health reasons.

Resettlement

S26 *Resettlement was at the heart of the prison and prisoners were positive about having more responsibility as part of preparations for their release. ROTL was used well to support reintegration, but procedures needed to be updated to reflect national requirements. Some key offender management work was not being completed. Public protection arrangements were robust. Some arrangements for returning prisoners to closed conditions needed attention. Prisoners serving indeterminate sentences were generally positive about the opportunities available. Reintegration work was good and resettlement pathway support was generally sufficient. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

- S27 The overall ethos of the prison was to support resettlement and in our survey prisoners were positive about being given greater responsibility; more than the comparator said they had done something or something had happened to them at the prison to make them less likely to offend in the future. Some very good practical provision was available. The reducing reoffending development plan outlined pathway services and had been informed by a needs analysis. However, more use could have been made of it and discharge questionnaire data could also have been incorporated. Regular resettlement meetings involved partnership agency representatives but not prisoners. Prisoners had good access to the resettlement unit, where orderlies offered advice on the services available and resettlement staff set up and monitored community placements. Case conferences enabled staff to pool ideas and support individual prisoners with specific issues. Use of ROTL was generally good. We observed a comprehensive and well managed ROTL board that interacted well with the prisoners involved. However, some processes had not been revised in line with national changes, which needed to be addressed as a matter of priority.

- S28 There were deficiencies in staff training and experience, and all offender management unit (OMU) staff required formal casework supervision. The offender management and resettlement functions were managed separately. There was evidence of joint work between the teams, but some tension was evident and there were few joint staff meetings to address concerns. Management arrangements and minimal staffing levels also exacerbated these issues.
- S29 Offender assessment system (OASys) document and sentence plan reviews were not carried out routinely on a prisoner's arrival. All prisoners were allocated to a group of well motivated offender supervisors (OS) on arrival but they did not see OSs frequently. However, the link between activity allocation processes and offender management work was good and prisoners could visit a drop-in facility if they had routine inquiries.
- S30 Public protection and multi-agency public protection arrangements procedures were robust and the inter-departmental risk management team operated effectively.
- S31 All prisoners who were moved to closed conditions were routinely re-categorised, which was not always necessary. An average of nine prisoners each month were returned to closed conditions. While most moves were clearly justified more needed to be done to make the procedure transparent. Prisoners serving indeterminate sentences were generally positive about the opportunities available.
- S32 Orderlies screened prisoners to determine their resettlement needs on arrival; however, they did not cover children or family issues. Needs were re-assessed prior to a prisoner's release. Most prisoners left with an address to go to and the five released without one this year had not accepted the accommodation offered to them. The careers service delivered by Tribal was good. The prison did not offer a specific resettlement course, but had introduced business and IT courses that provided useful employment skills and were aimed at prisoners interested in self-employment.
- S33 All prisoners were seen the day before release and given health promotion information, but communication with GPs to ensure continuity of care was not sufficient. Resettlement opportunities for prisoners with substance use problems were good. The national network of community support groups led by the Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust provided assistance. Indeterminate sentence prisoners could participate in one-to-one interventions, including preparation for parole applications and eventual release.
- S34 A good range of finance, benefit and debt advice was offered. Prisoners applied for benefits before being discharged and the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders helped them to open bank accounts.
- S35 Prisoners were positive about the support they received to maintain contact with family and friends. We found some examples of excellent support and relevant information was available in the units. However, the prison did not sufficiently understand or address the needs of men who did not receive family support. Temporary visits arrangements were broadly satisfactory, and the visitors' centre was adequate. Two family days in July and August 2014 had been very well received.
- S36 The prison ran the Sycamore Tree victim awareness course and some prisoners attended programmes in the community. The prison provided support for men who had experienced abuse.

Main concerns and recommendations

S37 Concern: The standard of accommodation in the Bosmere unit was relatively poor, particularly in comparison to the other units. The unit was a temporary building, which was well past its best. Despite efforts by prisoners and staff to keep it clean, shower areas were poor and it was cramped and noisy, and association equipment was poor. The design of the unit had a negative impact on staff-prisoner relationships.

Recommendation: The Bosmere unit should be upgraded or replaced with permanent accommodation.

S38 Concern: OASys assessments were not properly reviewed when prisoners were transferred to open conditions, prisoners were not always required to submit separate applications for different forms of release and not all ROTL had a clear purpose. While the ROTL policy had been updated to reflect recent changes during the inspection this needed to be followed by more rigorous processes to ensure that risks to public safety were effectively managed.

Recommendation: OASYS and ROTL procedures should be sufficiently rigorous to ensure risks to the public are effectively managed.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners transferring to and from the prison are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

1.1 *Prisoners said escort staff treated them well and that they felt safe during the journey. Many were not told of their transfer in advance and knew very little about the prison. There was no court video link facility.*

1.2 Escort vans were reasonably clean and carried refreshments. Most prisoners had journeys of more than two hours; they were not handcuffed at any stage. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said escort staff treated them well and the majority said they felt safe during the journey. Many had only been informed they were being moved to Hollesley Bay on the morning of their transfer and had not had enough time to let friends or family know. None of the prisoners we met had received any written information about Hollesley Bay prior to their transfer. The lack of a court video link facility led to unnecessary escorts to courts across the country, some of which involved overnight stays at other prisons.

Recommendation

1.3 A court video link should be available.

Housekeeping point

1.4 Prisoners should be informed of their transfer in advance and provided with information about the prison.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into prison and for the first few days in custody. Prisoners' individual needs are identified and addressed, and they feel supported on their first night. During a prisoner's induction he/she is made aware of the prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

1.5 *The reception area and holding room were clean and welcoming, and newly arrived prisoners were treated respectfully. Prisoners were in reception for only a short time before being transferred to the induction unit. First night arrangements were generally good but there was no meaningful first night interview. The induction process was good.*

- 1.6** The reception area was modern, clean and welcoming. The main holding room was good and had notice boards with information. Prisoners received a rub-down search on arrival and were only strip-searched if there was sufficient intelligence to justify this. In our survey, prisoners were positive about their experience in reception: 89% against a comparator of 78% said they were treated well or very well in reception. We observed several prisoners in reception, all of whom were treated well and processed within an hour.
- 1.7** Health care staff saw all new arrivals in reception, but used a room that was insufficiently private (see section on health services, housekeeping point 2.69). Induction orderlies met all new arrivals in reception, accompanied them to the induction unit and gave them useful information about the prison. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) were also available.
- 1.8** Most first night processes took place on the induction wing in the Hoxon unit. Prisoners did not receive a structured private interview with a member of staff until the day after their arrival, but this was partly mitigated by some good informal support that both staff and prisoners provided. First night rooms were clean and well prepared, and prisoners could shower easily in the induction unit. Microwave meals were available for late arrivals.
- 1.9** Prisoners received an induction booklet, a programme and a prison rule guide on the morning after their arrival. A good five-day rolling induction programme, which included orientation tours of the prison, started on the first working day after a prisoner arrived. Induction orderlies frequently helped new prisoners find their way to various parts of the prison to attend induction appointments. The programme was tracked to ensure that all prisoners completed it. In our survey, 80% of prisoners said it covered everything they needed to know.

Recommendation

- 1.10** Prisoners should receive a private first night interview with a member of staff.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels and is safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

- 1.11** *In our survey, perceptions of safety were similar to comparator prisons, but poorer than at our previous inspection. Levels of violence were low and most bullying incidents were not serious. Investigations were appropriate, and perpetrators of violence were swiftly returned to closed conditions. Victims of bullying received good support.*

- 1.12** In our survey, perceptions about safety, including victimisation by staff and other prisoners were similar to comparator prisons, but poorer than at our previous inspection. Older men felt less safe than the general population, and more black and minority ethnic prisoners than others said they were victimised by staff (see section on equality and diversity). The vast majority of prisoners we spoke to during the inspection told us the prison was safe.

- I.13** The prison was well managed and prisoners said there were very few incidents. Only nine bullying incidents had been recorded in the previous six months, most of which were not serious. Six were verbal incidents, one had been an assault, another an alleged assault and one an unexplained injury, judged to have been an accident. Each incident had been appropriately investigated. Perpetrators of violence were swiftly returned to closed conditions. However, we noted that in the vast majority of cases, prisoners refused to disclose the names of perpetrators.
- I.14** The formal violence reduction strategy was complemented by a three-stage anti-bullying process designed to challenge perpetrators. This appeared appropriate, but was very rarely used. Where necessary, victims of bullying received good support.
- I.15** A team of prisoner anti-bullying representatives received support from named officers but had not received any formal training. Not all prisoners knew who they were or what their role was. They attended monthly anti-bullying meetings where managers shared information about recent incidents and invited discussion. However, this was the only opportunity prisoners had to talk about violence and victimisation, and more could have been done to encourage prisoners, particularly black and minority ethnic prisoners and older prisoners, to discuss their experiences (see section on equality and diversity, recommendation 2.25).
- I.16** A local violence reduction survey in October 2013 suggested that 15% of prisoners had been bullied and 40% felt that staff did not manage bullying well. This data had been examined at the anti-bullying meetings, but aside from developing plans to improve the survey, it was unclear what action had been taken to investigate the matter further.

Recommendation

- I.17** **The prison should investigate prisoners' perceptions about safety and address any concerns raised.**

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

The prison provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Prisoners are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- I.18** *No self-harm incidents had been recorded in the previous six months. Prisoners at risk of self-harm were managed sensitively and appropriately. A well managed team of Listeners was available.*

- I.19** There had been no incidents of self-harm in the previous six months, and only seven prisoners had required care using formal case management processes for prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide. Their distress was mostly caused by family issues. The support offered was excellent: staff interacted with prisoners frequently, held supportive reviews and communicated well with various departments. Rigorous management checks also took place. We observed excellent release planning for a prisoner who was at risk of self-harm; it involved numerous agencies both in the prison and community. Staff had received appropriate training.

- I.20** There had been no deaths in the prison since our previous full inspection, but a prisoner who had been transferred elsewhere to complete offence-related work had taken his own life. Staff from Hollesley Bay had informed and supported his family, whom they knew well.
- I.21** A team of well supervised Listeners provided prisoners with support, but it was rarely required. Listeners had regular meetings with the local branch of the Samaritans, whose staff organised regular training and attended quarterly meetings with prison managers, where they helped to review data on areas such as bullying incidents and unexplained injuries.
- I.22** A Listener suite in the Blything unit, where constant supervision was possible, meant that even very distressed prisoners could be managed, and we found no evidence of prisoners being transferred out of the prison because of their risk of self-harm. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) arrangements could usually continue in these circumstances, but were reviewed. Each wing had a cordless Samaritans telephone that prisoners could borrow.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.²

I.23 *Formal arrangements were developing slowly, but staff did not have a sufficient awareness of safeguarding.*

I.24 Formal adult safeguarding arrangements were developing slowly. The prison had been a member of the local safeguarding adults board since March 2014, and a framework document had been drafted but not agreed. Awareness of adult safeguarding was good in the health care department, and one man was receiving appropriate support. Elsewhere, staff's understanding of safeguarding needed to be developed.

Recommendation

I.25 **The safeguarding adults framework document should be finalised and staff should understand safeguarding procedures for adults at risk.**

² We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

Security

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- I.26** *Security was generally proportionate. The main challenges were the possession and use of mobile phones and the synthetic drug Spice. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) rates were low. Regular searches and intelligence reports were widely disseminated, but we were not assured that appropriate action was always taken promptly.*
- I.27** The level of security was broadly appropriate. Monthly security meetings were well attended, included police liaison officers and had an appropriate agenda.
- I.28** Sound relationships underpinned good dynamic security. Most prisoners were purposefully occupied and we saw many examples of prisoners and staff interacting in a relaxed manner. Prisoners signed compacts (agreements confirming adherence to community rules) on induction and we found no evidence of the rules being inconsistently or unfairly applied. Prisoners could move around certain defined areas freely and the restrictions in place were reasonable. Four prisoners had absconded in the year up to the inspection, proportionately fewer than in 2012 and 2013. Visitors were rarely banned: only one ban was in place during the inspection.
- I.29** The security department received a reasonable number information reports (IRs). Most were associated with suspected drug use, especially Spice, or mobile phone possession. The detailed analysis of IRs focused on these two areas. A tracking system was in place to record the progress of target searches from initial request to completion. Most searches were completed promptly and around a quarter, 40 since April 2014, had led to finds of unauthorised items. However, we were not assured that unit managers always responded promptly to requests from the security department to challenge, warn or advise prisoners about the information received.
- I.30** An intelligence-led searching strategy was appropriately focused on ROTL and work placements. It included regular searches of vehicles prisoners used for jobs in the community. Frequent checks were made of work placements and joint operations had taken place with Suffolk police. Search dogs from neighbouring HMP Warren Hill were sometimes deployed. Finds from prisoners' rooms and other areas around the prison were mostly consistent with intelligence reports. Twenty phones had been found over the previous five months.
- I.31** The few strip-searches that took place were only conducted on the authority of the duty governor; there had been five since January 2014.
- I.32** The average positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to August 2014 was very low at 1.13%. In our survey, fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons, but more than at our previous full inspection, said it was easy to get drugs. However, intelligence indicated that novel psychoactive substances (NPS) like Spice were commonly available. Although staff and prisoners were well informed about the dangers of NPS, prisoners said that the lack of effective tests to identify their use made them attractive. The prison had a good range of supply reduction initiatives, delivered through a proportionate and well integrated strategic approach.

- I.33** Compact-based drug testing (CBDT) was used regularly on prisoners who applied for ROTL. They could detect a wide range of drugs, including chemicals that might arise from the ingestion of some varieties of Spice. However, there had been only two positive tests in the previous six months, which was lower than might have been expected, given other intelligence.
- I.34** In our survey, alcohol availability was similar to the comparator. In the six months to August 2014, six alcohol breathalyser tests had been conducted following suspicions, two of which were positive.

Housekeeping point

- I.35** Action in response to IRs should be taken promptly.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners understand the purpose of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and how to progress through it. The IEP scheme provides prisoners with incentives and rewards for effort and behaviour. The scheme is applied fairly, transparently and consistently.

- I.36** *The IEP scheme operated fairly. Most prisoners were on the enhanced level while none were on the basic regime. Quality assurance processes were meaningful. Demotion to the basic level did not automatically result in a return to closed conditions.*

- I.37** The prison operated the IEP scheme fairly. It comprised four levels: entry, basic, standard and enhanced. At the start of our inspection, 88% of prisoners were on the enhanced level, 22% on the standard regime and none on the entry and basic levels. The scheme was governed by an up-to-date policy. Differences between the levels were sufficient to encourage responsible behaviour. Prisoners could be upgraded or downgraded depending on their behaviour. Since 1 April 2014, the prison had reviewed the IEP levels of 102 prisoners. Sixteen per cent of reviews had resulted in an upgrade while 19% had led to a demotion. A senior manager reviewed the cases of prisoners who were downgraded and in one instance the decision was overturned. A downgrade to the basic level did not automatically result in a return to closed conditions, for example, a prisoner was restored to the standard level after eight days on the basic regime.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Prisoners understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.

- I.38** *There were few adjudications. Formal disciplinary systems were used appropriately. However, the prison failed to monitor trends or focus on tariffs. There was little use of force and no segregation unit.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.39** There were few adjudications – an average of eight per month – mostly for the possession of unauthorised items and returning late from ROTL. Custodial managers considered the appropriateness of officers using adjudication procedures for other offences, and minor breaches were appropriately dealt with through informal warnings or the IEP scheme.
- I.40** Adjudications took place in an office in one of the residential units and involved one officer and an adjudicating governor. Proceedings were clearly explained to prisoners and sufficient inquiries were made. Punishments were appropriate: cautions were used and some charges were appropriately dismissed. The prisoners' circumstances when they returned late from ROTL were taken into account and efforts made to confirm evidence put forward as a defence.
- I.41** Where there had been a guilty finding for breach of ROTL, decisions about further releases were made at a risk assessment board in the context of the prisoner's overall behaviour. There was no assumption that future releases would be suspended, which was appropriate.
- I.42** The adjudications committee meeting, which brought together adjudicating governors, had not met since May 2013. It was scheduled twice a year and while the deputy governor reviewed all completed adjudications, adjudicating governors did not monitor trends or discuss tariffs.

Housekeeping point

- I.43** The adjudications committee should meet every six months.

The use of force

- I.44** Force was used rarely and only one significant incident had taken place in the previous six months. Following an assault against staff in May 2012, local policy now required the routine handcuffing of prisoners being removed to closed conditions, which in some cases could have been disproportionate. Use of force forms almost exclusively documented the handcuffing of compliant prisoners being escorted from their residential unit to reception before their transfer. Ninety-one per cent of uniformed staff had completed control and restraint refresher training within the timescale required.

Recommendation

- I.45** **Decisions to use handcuffs should be based on an individual risk assessment.**

Segregation

- I.46** There was no designated segregation unit, but there were four clean holding rooms in reception if prisoners needed to be held securely. The daily reception checklist recorded the use of these rooms, in most cases for between one and three hours before transfers took place, usually to the adjacent Warren Hill prison.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.

I.47 *Substance use services were well integrated and delivered high quality, recovery-focused treatment and interventions. The peer mentor scheme supported recovery effectively.*

I.48 The Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) provided psychosocial services while Care UK offered clinical drug treatment. The drug strategy committee met bimonthly and was well attended. The strategy document was up to date and was linked to an action plan that had been informed by a needs analysis conducted in 2013. Most action points had been completed but the action plan had not been updated since February 2014.

I.49 The RAPt team had an active caseload of 55 (13% of the population). The team provided a good range of recovery-focused interventions, including the Stepping Stones group programme and structured and unstructured one-to-one sessions (see section on reintegration planning, drugs and alcohol).

I.50 Prisoners could attend weekly Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings, often run by prisoners but with visiting speakers. Drug and alcohol recovery was promoted through art therapy and the Recovery Through Nature project, which saw prisoners working at a local nature reserve. Ten peer mentors delivered inductions, co-facilitated some groups and promoted positive attitudes and alternative lifestyles to other prisoners.

I.51 At the time of the inspection, five prisoners were receiving buprenorphine opiate substitution treatment. No-one was on methadone, although it was potentially available. The room where prisoners received controlled drugs had a remotely controlled electronic lock and reinforced glass up to the ceiling between patients and nursing staff. Prisoners said they found this demeaning and inconsistent with the principles of open conditions.

I.52 Clinical and psychosocial services were well integrated through regular multidisciplinary team meetings and jointly conducted clinical reviews. Prisoners told us that the nursing staff and GP were very accessible and supportive.

Recommendations

I.53 **The drug strategy action plan should be updated, inform developments and detail lines of accountability.**

I.54 **The controlled drugs administration room should be more welcoming and security arrangements should be in line with what is required in open conditions.**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions. Prisoners are aware of the rules and routines of the prison which encourage responsible behaviour.

- 2.1** *Residential units were clean, brightly lit and generally in good condition. Outside areas and gardens were excellent. However, the Bosmere unit was old, cramped and required replacement. More reasonable adjustments for wheelchair users were needed. The applications system and laundry facilities were good.*
- 2.2** Prisoners lived on seven units spread across the 85 acre site. The units varied in size with the smallest holding 15 prisoners and the largest 80. Older prisoners lived in the Samforde unit and new arrivals in the Hoxon unit. The remaining prisoners were allocated to other units.
- 2.3** With the exception of the Bosmere unit, residential units were in very good condition. Communal areas were light, clean and spacious. Furnishings were generally in a good state of repair. Association areas were good (see section on time out of cell) and prisoners could dine in large communal areas. Most shower and toilet areas were in a good state of repair; however, the shower unit in the Stow unit was still in poor condition. Outside areas and gardens were very attractive and largely free of litter. Unit-based cooking facilities were inadequate with only one microwave and toaster in each unit (see section on catering).
- 2.4** Eighty men lived in single rooms in the Bosmere unit. This prefabricated unit was old, cramped and provided a relatively poor living environment (see main recommendation S37). Corridors and rooms were dingy. Despite the best efforts of staff and prisoners, shower units had black mould and were poorly ventilated. The layout of the unit inhibited regular contact with staff (see section on staff-prisoner relationships) and it was noisy. In our survey, fewer prisoners in the Bosmere unit (47%) compared with all other units (78%) said it was normally quiet enough to relax or sleep at night time. Prisoners could not dine together and ate in their rooms and association equipment was limited (see section on time out of cell).
- 2.5** The applications system worked well. In our survey of those prisoners who had made an application, more than the comparator said applications were dealt with fairly (86% compared with 72%) and promptly (77% against 62%). The number of telephones available was adequate and prisoners could make calls in private.
- 2.6** Most prisoners wore their own clothing but many complained about restrictions prohibiting family and friends from sending in new clothes. Laundry facilities were good. Prisoners could have their clothes washed by an orderly or wash them themselves. Many prisoners chose to wash their own sheets rather than obtain a fresh set from the clothing and exchange store. The sheets we examined in the store were worn and covered in hairs. Detainees could easily access their stored property on request.

Recommendation

- 2.7 The shower areas in the Stow unit should be refurbished.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.8** Sheets from the clothing and exchange store should be clean and in good condition.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their time in custody, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

- 2.9** *Relationships between staff and prisoners were very good. Personal officer work was good generally but weaker in the Bosmere unit. Case note entries were good, as were consultation arrangements.*

- 2.10** Relationships between prisoners and staff were very good. In our survey, more prisoners than at other open prisons said that staff treated them with respect (85% compared with 74%) and that there was a member of staff they could turn to for help (81% against 74%), although the latter was lower than at the previous full inspection. Prisoners consistently told us that staff were helpful. We saw staff and prisoners addressing each other in a relaxed and respectful manner.
- 2.11** Personal officer work was also good. In our survey, more prisoners than at other open prisons said they had a personal officer (89% compared with 69%) and that their personal officer was helpful (78% against 68%). Prisoners we spoke to confirmed they had regular contact with their personal officers.
- 2.12** In our survey fewer prisoners in the Bosmere unit than in other units said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem (58% compared with 85%) and that a member of staff had checked on them in the previous week to see how they were getting on (30% against 58%). They were also less likely to say that their personal officer was helpful. The poor layout of the unit was likely to have been a major factor as prisoners did not have to pass the office to leave the unit, which meant there could have been fewer opportunities for staff to interact with prisoners.
- 2.13** Personal officers and other staff made consistent case note entries on P-Nomis (the Prison Service IT system). Entries reflected prisoners' negative and positive behaviour, but few referred to sentence plans.
- 2.14** Consultation was good. A prisoner representative from each unit attended monthly consultation meetings. Minutes showed that many issues prisoners raised were addressed.

Recommendation

- 2.15 Staff and personal officers in the Bosmere unit should check on and interact with prisoners in their care.**

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic³ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

2.16 *Strategic management of equality was good and the senior management team was actively involved. The equality action team (EAT) included prisoner diversity representatives, but not enough was being done to ensure the views and needs of all protected groups were being addressed. There were few discrimination incidents, investigations were good and most outcomes appeared equitable. The generally strong and supportive relationships ensured many of the prisoners' needs were met, although there were exceptions. For example, black and minority ethnic prisoners were more likely to report being victimised by staff and some disabled men did not receive all the support they required.*

Strategic management

- 2.17** The governor chaired the EAT and was supported by the active involvement of other senior managers. Strategic policies that covered the protected characteristics were good and had been reviewed and were up to date. Managers had reflected on previous inspection recommendations and clearly saw equality and diversity work as a key priority.
- 2.18** Each residential unit had a prisoner diversity representative and some of the specific protected groups, such as prisoners with disabilities, older and younger prisoners, foreign nationals and those from the Gypsy, Romany and Traveller communities, had dedicated prisoner representatives. Photographs and contact details were displayed in all residential units. We spoke to a group of prisoner diversity representatives who were generally positive about senior management and staff support for diversity issues.
- 2.19** The EAT met every month and was well attended by both staff and prisoner diversity representatives and appropriate information was presented and discussed. Further action that needed to be taken was identified and monitored at subsequent meetings.
- 2.20** A monitoring tool identified under- or over-represented minority groups in a range of areas, and most outcomes appeared equitable. The data were shared freely with prisoner diversity representatives, who said they found them very helpful. Data suggested for over three months that black and minority ethnic prisoners were less likely to apply for or be granted release on temporary licence, but while this had been discussed it had not been fully investigated.
- 2.21** The prison relied largely on the EAT and strong relationships between managers, staff and prisoners to identify and meet prisoners' needs. While this was effective in many instances, there was a lack of formal support processes for some groups, including consultation forums for specific groups to ensure their concerns were identified and addressed (see section on protected characteristics).

³ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

- 2.22** The number of discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) submitted had declined over the previous three years and only three DIRFs had been submitted in the six months before the inspection. All were monitored by the governor and investigations and replies were good. Blank forms were readily available in the residential units.
- 2.23** Almost 80% of staff had received diversity refresher training in the previous 12 months, and a similar number had completed further training in recognising 'unconscious bias'.

Recommendations

- 2.24** **The EAT should investigate when monitoring data consistently suggests inequitable outcomes for minority groups.**
- 2.25** **The prison should routinely consult prisoners in the protected groups to ensure their concerns and needs are identified, and where possible, addressed.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.26** Around 42% of prisoners were from black or minority ethnic groups and in our survey 36% of black and minority ethnic respondents said they had been victimised by a member of staff. These prisoners' views during the inspection were mixed: some described situations where they felt discrimination had taken place; but many others said that they had never experienced discrimination at the prison. The reasons for these perceptions remained unclear and prison managers needed to explore them further. In addition, the prison did not focus sufficiently on the needs of Gypsy, Romany and Traveller prisoners.
- 2.27** The foreign national group met when there were more than 10 foreign national prisoners in the prison, but the foreign nationals officer personally visited each prisoner at least once a month if there were fewer. Little translated information was available, but the demand for it was low. Staff were aware of a telephone interpretation service, but could not remember it being required; it had not been used over the previous 12 months. The prison paid for a 15-minute overseas phone call a month for foreign national prisoners who did not receive visits.
- 2.28** Support for disabled prisoners was somewhat mixed and arrangements needed to be put on a more formal footing. Enhanced consultation with disabled prisoners was required to ensure all their needs were being met. Several prisoners with disabilities told us they had problems with tasks, such as collecting meals and cleaning their rooms, and there was no formal peer support system. However, the health care department provided some reasonable support (see section on health services, paragraph 2.53), and both staff and prisoners offered good informal assistance.
- 2.29** The provision of suitably adapted accommodation for disabled prisoners was too limited. During our inspection, a wheelchair user in the Wilford unit could not enter his room in his wheelchair because the door was too narrow, although some reasonable adjustments had been made to the room's shower unit. A room in the Blything unit was wheelchair accessible, but no other adjustments had been made. The doors to adapted showers in the Blything unit were too narrow. Good personal emergency and evacuation plans were in place for those who needed them, and most staff were aware of them.
- 2.30** Almost one fifth of the population (79 men) were aged 50 or over. The Samforde unit's 15 spaces were reserved for older men. The prisoners there valued the quiet and relaxed environment. All prisoners over 50 had access to an impressive walled garden with allotments.

- 2.31** The number of young adults had fallen since the previous inspection, and there were now just 14 (3.3%). Except for two gym sessions a week reserved solely for young adults, nothing else was in place specifically for this group although, those we met felt supported and did not raise any specific concerns.
- 2.32** The prison had identified a very small number of gay and bisexual prisoners, but had decided not to run a consultation group to avoid any unintended identification. However, no other alternative had been considered, and this group lacked formal support.

Recommendation

- 2.33** **Suitable adapted accommodation should be available for prisoners with disabilities.**

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are able to practise their religion fully and in safety. The chaplaincy plays a full part in prison life and contributes to prisoners' overall care, support and resettlement.

2.34 *The chaplaincy provided a good range of services and classes for prisoners from all major religions. There was a good chapel and multi-faith room. The chaplaincy was well known and prisoners said they were helpful.*

- 2.35** The chaplaincy was well known throughout the prison and provided a good range of services, classes and pastoral support covering all major faiths. In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons said they found it easy to attend religious services, to see a chaplain or a religious leader and that their religious beliefs were respected.
- 2.36** All Christian services took place in a well-equipped chapel, as did some non-Christian services. In addition, there was a large multi-faith room, primarily used for Muslim prayers. It had good washing facilities. Muslim prisoners were satisfied with arrangements for Ramadan, including the use of the multi-faith room late in the evening.
- 2.37** If they were eligible for temporary release, prisoners of minority faiths could apply to attend worship in nearby community facilities. The chaplaincy also organised prison visits from a number of religious ministers. Bereavement counselling was available through the team. We spoke to many prisoners who told us that chaplaincy staff were approachable and helpful.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective complaints procedures are in place for prisoners, which are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely responses. Prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.

2.38 *Responses to complaints were on time, polite and addressed the points raised. Quality assurance was good and complaints data were analysed regularly.*

2.39 In our survey, more prisoners than in the comparator said that complaints were dealt with fairly and promptly. The number of complaints had declined slightly in the previous 12 months, despite an increase in the prison population. A small number of prisoners told us that they were reluctant to make a complaint, especially against an officer, as they believed it would affect any later release on temporary licence decision. We did not find any grounds to support this perception.

2.40 The deputy governor read all complaints and managed a robust quality assurance process, which included data analysis to identify any trends or emerging themes. In our sample, all responses were on time, polite and answered the complaints well, although some were difficult to read.

Housekeeping point

2.41 Replies to complaints should be legible.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or remand, both on arrival and release. Prisoners are supported by the prison staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

2.42 *Overall provision was appropriate for the population held. Facilities and opportunities for private visits from legal representatives were adequate. However, survey responses to questions about access to legal services were poorer than the comparator.*

2.43 There was no established legal services provision but offender management and unit staff could provide ad hoc support. Most prisoners were progressing through their sentence and there were rarely requests for this kind of assistance. The prison had implemented our previous recommendation and included a question about legal services provision in their annual needs assessment. Over the previous two years the annual needs assessment indicated that 13% of prisoners felt their need for legal services had not been met. Residential units had information folders about obtaining legal advice, including on dealing with family and childcare problems. Prisoners also had access to the free community legal helpline.

- 2.44** Facilities and opportunities for private visits from solicitors or probation officers were adequate and an average of 20 were arranged each month. In our survey, responses about access to legal representatives were poorer than the comparator. The relatively remote location of the prison might have been a factor.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.

- 2.45** *Overall health services were good and prisoners were very positive about the care they received. Clinical governance was reasonable, but support for staff, including clinical supervision, was underdeveloped. Prisoners' access to nurse triage and GP appointments was very good, but waiting times for the optician and dentist were too long. Nurse-led chronic disease clinics did not run consistently. Pharmacy, dental and mental health services were good.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.46** Care UK provided primary health services. Regular governance meetings informed the well attended partnership board. Working relationships between the provider, prison and NHS England commissioners were excellent. A health needs assessment from March 2014, regular audits and lessons learned from complaints and adverse incidents informed service development. Prisoners' involvement was good.
- 2.47** An experienced non-clinical manager and a senior nurse led services at Hollesley Bay and Warren Hill prisons. The provision was being developed so that a single multi-professional team covered both prisons; however, staffing shortages had affected the service, including chronic disease clinics and staff development.
- 2.48** At least two nurses were based in the health care department between 7am and 5pm Monday to Friday, and from 7am to 2.30pm at weekends. Nurses from HMP Warren Hill provided weekday cover until 7pm and until 5pm on weekends and covered staff shortages. A local practice provided five GP clinics a week. Daily health care team meetings supported effective communication.
- 2.49** Nursing staff used a comprehensive range of policies including those on infection control, consent and safeguarding. All staff were up to date with their mandatory training, but there was no formal clinical or managerial supervision. Staff's access to annual performance appraisals and development opportunities had been poor, but was improving. Records we sampled on SystmOne (the electronic clinical information system) were very good, but we found care planning for prisoners with complex needs was underdeveloped.
- 2.50** Prisoners had easy access to health services and most we spoke to were very positive about access to and the quality of health services. In our survey more than the comparator said the overall quality was good.

- 2.51** The environment was pleasant and generally clean, but some rooms, including those in the dentistry suite, required refurbishment to meet infection control standards (see also section on dentistry). The small number of clinical rooms available severely restricted the service and a second team member was sometimes in a room carrying out administrative tasks during a consultation, which was inappropriate. There was no booking-in area and prisoners regularly interrupted clinical sessions because they were unsure what to do.
- 2.52** All health staff were trained in life support and had good access to appropriate well checked emergency equipment. Sufficient custodial staff who were trained in first aid were always on duty and access to defibrillators and oxygen out of hours was good.
- 2.53** Health staff were clearly identifiable and we observed excellent interactions with prisoners. All new arrivals received comprehensive written information about health services. Formal clinics and support services for older prisoners were not in place but were being developed. Older prisoners had good access to most community screening programmes and the lack of bowel cancer screening was being addressed. Access to mobility aids and specialist support was reasonable.
- 2.54** The prison had no literature or posters advising prisoners how to complain and the general prison complaints process was used, which was not confidential. However the responses to complaints we sampled were courteous, prompt and addressed all the issues raised.
- 2.55** Overall the amount and range of health promotion literature in the health centre and across the prison was too limited. The health promotion action team no longer met and Hollesley Bay lacked a whole prison approach. Prisoners had good access to smoking cessation, condoms, immunisations, vaccinations and screening for blood-borne viruses.

Recommendations

- 2.56** **All staff should have regular managerial and clinical supervision, as well as appropriate continuing professional development underpinned by a current performance appraisal.**
- 2.57** **There should be sufficient clinical rooms to provide a comprehensive service and all areas, including the dental suite, should comply with infection control guidelines.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.58** Prisoners should be able to book in for their appointments.
- 2.59** Those with complex needs should have an evidence-based care plan.
- 2.60** The prison should establish a well publicised confidential complaints system.
- 2.61** Prisoners should have access to an appropriate range of health promotion information overseen by an active prison-wide health promotion action group.

Good practice

- 2.62** *The availability of custodial staff who were trained in first aid and who had good access to appropriate equipment meant prisoners could receive prompt emergency care.*

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.63** Nurses saw all new arrivals promptly for an assessment in reception and made appropriate referrals. The reception health care room was very small and lacked privacy. Nurses had no access to SystemOne, which meant they could not check information they received against clinical records; transferring the paper-based assessment onto SystemOne was time consuming. A secondary health screening was not completed but was being developed.
- 2.64** Prisoners submitted an application or attended the medical centre to request services. They could attend nurse drop-in clinics three times a day. The nurse assessments we observed were very good, but there were no triage algorithms to support decision-making for less experienced staff.
- 2.65** The range of primary care services available was appropriate. Waiting times for the GP and out-of-hours GP provision were short, but for the optician and dentist they were excessive (see section on dentistry). There had been no optician clinic for two months because no holiday or sickness cover was provided. Nurses with specialist training provided lifelong conditions clinics, but they did not run regularly (see section on governance arrangements). Custody and health staff worked collaboratively to keep non-attendance rates low.
- 2.66** Referrals to secondary services were well managed and access was very good. Appointments were never cancelled on security grounds.

Recommendations

- 2.67** **Triage algorithms should be available to ensure decisions made are consistent and appropriate.**
- 2.68** **Prisoners should have timely access to optician and dental services.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.69** Prisoners should have a private reception screening followed by a secondary health screening within 72 hours.

Pharmacy

- 2.70** Medicines were supplied promptly by Sigcare Pharmacy. A registered pharmacy technician was on site from 7am to 4.30pm Monday to Friday to check all medicines received and issue prisoners with in-possession medicines. Pharmacy dispensing errors were promptly identified, corrected and reported prior to medication being issued. Prisoners could not see a pharmacist.
- 2.71** Prescriptions were generated on SystemOne and faxed to Sigcare. Most medication was in possession and was dispensed twice a day from the dispensary in the health centre with relevant patient information leaflets. Medicines were administered to prisoners in the waiting area, which was not private, although prisoners did allow each other space when collecting medicines. The technician used a clinical room if privacy was needed.

- 2.72** Supervised medicines were administered from the integrated drug treatment system dispensary into a private area, which was commendable, but the area was locked electronically by staff when a prisoner entered, which was disproportionate (see section on substance misuse). Medicine administration was safe and respectful.
- 2.73** There was no formal in-possession policy, although practice appeared safe and consistent. In-possession risk assessments that took into account the drug and the patient were always completed and medication that carried a higher risk was dispensed every week. Spot checks of in-possession medication were completed where staffing allowed. Nurses could supply an appropriate range of medicines as special sick (immediate health treatment without an appointment) or through patient group directions (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine), but there was no special sick policy. Supplies were appropriately recorded and monitored.
- 2.74** All medicines including controlled drugs were stored well and stock was managed effectively. Up-to-date reference sources were available. Refrigerator temperatures were monitored daily, but records indicated that they were regularly out of range and the refrigerator required servicing or replacement.
- 2.75** The well attended medicines management committee met quarterly and the agenda was appropriate.

Recommendation

- 2.76 Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led counselling sessions, clinics and medication reviews.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.77** Medication should be administered in private.
- 2.78** In-possession and special sick policies should be ratified by the medicines management committee and implemented.
- 2.79** Medicines that require refrigeration should be stored in a refrigerator that is consistently within the expected temperature range.

Dentistry

- 2.80** It was unclear if the dental provision met the needs of the population as the recent health needs assessment had not included dental health. Weymouth Dental Practice provided six dental sessions a month. During our inspection prisoners were waiting up to 11 weeks for a routine appointment, which was too long. Appointments were allocated based on prisoners' needs and those in pain were prioritised. The consultation observed and clinical records sampled were very good. Oral health promotion was provided.
- 2.81** The dental surgery was good and included a separate decontamination room. However, cleaning standards were inadequate and the decontamination room flooring needed replacement (see section on governance arrangements, recommendation 2.57). All dental equipment was appropriately maintained and dental waste was disposed of professionally.

Recommendation

2.82 The dental service should be informed by an up-to-date needs assessment.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.83** Working relationships between prison and mental health staff were effective. Discipline staff had not received regular mental health awareness training since 2010, but Care UK planned to provide training later in the year.
- 2.84** Care UK took over the provision of integrated mental health services in May 2014. Two learning disability and mental health nurses provided several clinics every week depending on the demand. A consultant psychiatrist attended the prison every month. Administration support, clinical psychology and a clinical team leader was being recruited.
- 2.85** In our survey fewer prisoners than the comparator or than previously reported emotional well being or mental health problems. Mental health screening took place at reception. There was an open referral system. The team completed a comprehensive assessment and agreed care plans with patients. Counselling was available through the Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust and the chaplaincy. There was a lack of self-help materials, although the prison was exploring the possibility of providing them on prescription.
- 2.86** During our inspection the team was supporting 22 patients, 18 of whom had severe and enduring mental health problems and were appropriately supported using the care programme approach (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness). Clinical records and the team's liaison with other prison departments and community services were very good. Prisoners we spoke to were very positive about the support they received.
- 2.87** No-one had been transferred to community mental health facilities or to closed prison conditions due to mental health problems in 2014 up to the inspection.

Recommendation

2.88 Custodial staff should receive regular mental health awareness training.

Housekeeping point

2.89 Prisoners should have access to an appropriate range of effective guided self-help resources.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

2.90 *Portion sizes were generous, but many prisoners complained about the quality of food and chose not to collect meals from the servery. Self-catering facilities were inadequate and consultation arrangements were not sufficiently effective.*

2.91 In our survey 37% of prisoners said the food was good or very good. This was better than at our previous full inspection and similar to comparator prisons, but many prisoners said that although portions were generous, the quality was poor and the menu monotonous.

2.92 The four-week menu cycle included five portions of fruit and vegetables a day. It was reviewed every six months following a prisoner survey and discussions with a small group of prisoner catering representatives, who met with catering managers every month. Some changes were made as a result, but other concerns were ongoing and required more attention. Managers or wing representatives did not use the food comments books available on each wing to collect views and there were ongoing concerns about special and medical diets.

2.93 Prisoners could eat together on most wings, but many chose not to collect meals from the servery and preferred to cook for themselves using the small domestic microwaves and toasters available on each wing. The self-catering facilities were inadequate; many prisoners were serving long periods in custody and would have benefited from developing their cooking skills. Most wings had only one microwave, which caused tension between different groups of prisoners when certain food products, particularly pork, were cooked. However, prisoners were offered produce from the prison's gardens when it was not used in the kitchen. The temperature of meals was not always tested or correctly recorded.

Recommendation

2.94 **Self-catering facilities should be improved, particularly for prisoners on long or indeterminate sentences.**

Housekeeping point

2.95 Food temperatures should be taken at the point of service and accurately recorded.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their diverse needs, and can do so safely.

2.96 *Prisoners were positive about the range of goods available to purchase, and delivery arrangements were effective. Prisoners had to pay an administrative charge for catalogue orders.*

2.97 In our survey prisoners were more positive than in comparator prisons about the range of goods available to purchase. However, black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive than the white population. Consultation usually took place every three months to agree changes to the product list, but the last opportunity had been six months prior to our inspection.

2.98 Arrangements for the delivery of weekly purchases were relaxed and efficient and prisoners were positive about the service. Managers had noted that Hollesley Bay had more incomplete or incorrect orders than other prisons in the area and were working with the regional distribution centre to try to reduce this. When necessary, refunds were issued promptly. A good range of catalogues was available, but an administration fee was charged.

Recommendation

2.99 **There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders.**

Housekeeping point

2.100 Canteen meetings should always take place when there is an opportunity to alter the product list.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁴

3.1 *Prisoners could spend up to 16 hours a day out of their rooms, which was excellent. With the exception of the Bosmere unit, association areas and activities were very good. Unit gardens were excellent.*

3.2 Prisoners were never locked in their rooms but had to be in their units from 8pm. They were expected to be in their rooms from 11pm until 7am. This meant they could spend up to 16 hours a day out of their rooms, which was excellent. Except for those in the Bosmere unit, prisoners had access to a wide range of activities. Association areas were spacious, light and very clean. Gardens immediately outside the units were particularly attractive and the gardens in the Samforde unit were outstanding. The association facilities in the Bosmere unit were much poorer than in other units with only one pool table for 80 men (see main recommendation S37).

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after their sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.

3.3 *The overall effectiveness and management of learning, skills and work were outstanding. The governor and senior prison managers demonstrated a strong commitment to support prisoners' learning and skills development to ensure that a high proportion became 'job ready'. Partnership working was excellent and led to excellent training, skills development and work opportunities. The education provision focused on developing prisoners' employability and work skills and a very good range of well resourced vocational training opportunities was offered. Sufficient purposeful activities and work places were available to occupy all prisoners. A significant proportion of the population worked outside the prison. The excellent range of education provision offered a wide range of activities from entry level to level 3. English and mathematics were very well integrated into vocational training and work. Overall education and vocational achievements were outstanding. The library provided a very good, accessible service.*

3.4 *Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

⁴ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

<i>Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Outstanding</i>
<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Outstanding</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision:</i>	<i>Outstanding</i>
<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Outstanding</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.5** The management of learning and skills and work and the Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision was outstanding. The governor and senior management team created an excellent environment in which to prepare prisoners for release and employment. Managers set high standards and learners benefited from high quality, very well resourced training and work areas. Attendance rates in all learning and skills activities were very high. The education and vocational training provision provided by A4e was outstanding.
- 3.6** Excellent partnership working ensured prisoners had outstanding support and very good progression opportunities both in the community and within the prison. Communication between all partners was clear and effective. The prison cluster head of learning and skills provided effective support and advice to the prison in the management of learning and skills.
- 3.7** Quality assurance arrangements included all partners and were focused on improvement. A well considered quality calendar identified baselines to ensure all partners operated to the prison's requirements. Quarterly quality improvement group meetings dynamically monitored learners' and partners' performance, identifying and implementing timely improvements. The vast majority of observations of teaching and learning were accurate and detailed, and followed up with structured professional development that supported further improvement. However, a small minority of observations paid insufficient attention to learning or the promotion of difference and diversity.
- 3.8** The self-assessment process was rigorous, included all aspects of learning and skills and provided a very accurate assessment. Feedback from learners and data on retention and success and achievement were used particularly effectively to analyse and monitor performance and improve the provision.

Housekeeping point

- 3.9** The prison should ensure that all observations focus on learning and on how trainers promote diversity and difference in their training.

Provision of activities

- 3.10** The prison offered an excellent range of full-time work and activity places, which met the needs of the population. Around 25% were involved in off-site work and community activity.

⁵ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

The range of work in the prison frequently provided prisoners with the opportunity to progress to community volunteering or paid work. For example, prisoners started working in prison kitchens, progressing to the training kitchen, staff mess and then into work with local caterers and hotels. Other work, such as in recycling, buildings and site maintenance and household management in the accommodation units, prepared prisoners well to take on more responsibility as peer mentors or orderlies in education, training or work.

- 3.11** A comprehensive needs analysis was used well to focus education on skills provision for release and employment. English and mathematics were integrated very well into all business, employability, information and communications technology (ICT) and vocational training courses. Courses from entry level to level 3 provided those arriving from training prisons with excellent progression routes. During employability courses, learners honed their skills in well managed practice interviews that developed their confidence.
- 3.12** Learners had excellent opportunities to acquire national vocational qualifications at levels 2 and 3 and to progress into work outside the prison. They took vocational training courses in construction trades such as plastering, brickwork, painting and decorating and plumbing. Training and qualifications were also available in the well-equipped motor vehicle training facility, the kitchens, gym, restaurant and gardens. In the workshops, prisoners spent their first week working towards an introductory unit in a particular trade. Tutors used this time very well to assess prisoners' aptitude, previous experience, motivation and support needs before enrolling them onto the qualification.
- 3.13** Induction was particularly effective. Prisoners received a very clear briefing on the courses, training and work available. Initial diagnostic skills assessments in English and mathematics were completed promptly and effectively to determine prisoners' training and support needs. Clear learning and training goals were negotiated by careers service staff and agreed with the prisoner, based on the prisoner's release date and aspirations for employment on release.
- 3.14** Arrangements for the allocation of prisoners to work and training were exceptionally well managed. Actions identified at induction or during subsequent reviews as well as release dates were critical determining factors. Waiting lists for training courses were minimal and prisoners were always matched to suitable employment.
- 3.15** Attention to health and safety was thorough. Prisoners completed a comprehensive induction to workshops, although, manual handling training took place in the gym rather than in the context of work.

Quality of provision

- 3.16** Teaching, learning and assessment in education and vocational training programmes were outstanding. Teachers and trainers had high expectations of their learners and encouraged them to develop new skills and confidence. Training was precisely planned, interactive and involved learners through a wide variety of activities. Tutors focused on confidence-building to develop the skills learners needed for sustainable employment.
- 3.17** Coaching and individual support from confident, capable tutors and trainers prompted learners to be more inquisitive and to study outside the classroom. Practical demonstrations were stimulating and used questions very well to challenge learners to solve problems and to have the confidence to make mistakes. Assessments were well managed and had clear criteria that learners understood. Feedback enabled them to understand what they had achieved and how they could improve. However, in a small number of the most recently developed courses, activities and tasks did not always challenge more able learners.

- 3.18** Training in the workshops was outstanding. Learners were motivated and able to work independently. They developed helpful work-related skills and attributes such as self-confidence and improved communication skills. Tutors provided helpful support and guidance and encouraged learners to develop a wide range of trade skills to enhance their employability. Workshops were equipped to industry standards and tutors and learners ensured health and safety practices were observed. Excellent use was made of support staff, orderlies and peer mentors in workshops and classrooms; all received detailed briefings on their role. In a minority of sessions, tutors did not discuss diversity or encourage prisoners to consider alternative ways of living and working.
- 3.19** Tutors deployed effective strategies to investigate and test prisoners' English and mathematics skills during training. For example, in building workshops, ratios were discussed when mixing mortar, and geometry used to establish the circumference of an arch support. Learners were coached to use appropriate technical language when writing a quotation.
- 3.20** Effective initial assessments that identified learners' starting points and support needs led to comprehensive additional support. Staff conducted effective monthly reviews to modify learning targets and support. Individual learning plans were used well to record achievable but challenging targets. Reviews of progress were frequent and helpful. However, in a small minority of cases, tutors did not always correct grammatical mistakes in learners' written work to support their development of English. Learners studying with external organisations had good access to computers and support from prison and education staff.
- 3.21** Behaviour and attendance in all training was exemplary. Relationships between prisoners and staff were appropriately respectful and courteous. In training workshops, learners were focused and worked with high levels of accuracy and minimal supervision.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.22** Learners' achievement of qualifications was outstanding. Retention rates were very high on all courses. Almost every prisoner who started a course in education, vocational training or a prison-run course went on to gain the qualification. Most learners developed an excellent range of personal, social and employment skills. Many were able to take responsibility for others as supervisors and mentors.
- 3.23** Only a small number of learners below level 1 completed English and mathematics qualifications as most already held them. However, prisoners did progress from below level 1 to complete qualifications at higher levels in vocational skills and in English and mathematics. For example, those who took ICT could progress from entry level to a diploma at level 3.
- 3.24** Learners' practical and theory work was excellent. Many applied everyday mathematics and English well in their project work. Learners spoke enthusiastically about what they had learnt and felt well prepared for self-employment on release. On the business course learners used spreadsheets to manage financial information and establish business plans for their self-employment on release. Those completing the painting course decorated areas around the prison to a high standard; others working in the community received accolades from employers. Construction learners refurbished a derelict bungalow to provide additional accommodation for other prisoners.

Library

- 3.25** The library was well furnished and maintained and very welcoming. Prisoners had good access: the library was open during the day and in the evenings on weekdays and in the morning at weekends. A high proportion of the population, just under 90%, used it.
- 3.26** The library stock was good and included an extensive range of DVDs, and a good range of fiction, non-fiction, easy-reads, audio books, legal texts, resources related to the prison's vocational training, and relevant Prison Service Instructions. All resources were referenced well and newspapers, magazines, and books in 18 languages, provided material for the diverse population. Access to resources through inter-library loan arrangements was good.
- 3.27** Several successful initiatives encouraged prisoners to communicate with their families (see section on children, families and contact with the outside world). Authors and writers frequently visited the library to discuss their work which linked in well with the Six Book Challenge reading scheme. Effective links with the gym, education and health care departments ensured library initiatives complemented prison activities and training.
- 3.28** Orderlies received good training in library systems, but could not acquire a qualification. Data on usage informed new library initiatives and daily operations. Frequent prisoner surveys ensured the range of newspapers, magazines and books met the population's needs.

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in physical education in safe and decent surroundings.

3.29 *Prisoners had good access to an excellent range of structured, recreational and accredited activities in a well-equipped and well maintained physical training facility. Healthy living, diet and fitness were included in the gym induction and reinforced through gym activities. Team working between gym and health care staff was good.*

- 3.30** All prisoners, including those who worked offsite during the day, had good access to the gym. Its use was well monitored and recorded, identifying around 60% of the population as regular visitors.
- 3.31** Activities included vocational and recreational training and a variety of team sports. A wide range of classes, games, circuit training and coaching activities took place in the sports hall. Inter-unit football competitions involved the selection of a prison side to play against local community teams. Prisoners valued the cardiovascular area and modular weight training facilities and used them extensively during recreational sessions, despite the removal of all free weights from the prison, which encouraged prisoners to work on general and cardiovascular fitness, rather than on heavy lifting. Specific activities were available for those who were over 40 or overweight, or who were recuperating from injury or had been prescribed physical exercise (PE) for health reasons.
- 3.32** A high quality rolling programme of vocational training enabled prisoners to gain instructor and leadership qualifications at levels 1 and 2. Prisoners completing these courses obtained employment as orderlies, so they could gain work experience. Several had progressed to working in the community on licence. Prisoners undertook theory work in a small but well appointed classroom.

- 3.33** PE was well managed and effectively promoted to all prisoners at induction. Induction provided information on using the gym equipment, first aid and manual handling. Health and wellbeing was addressed during induction and further endorsed through an additional healthy living course. All prisoners completed a pre-exercise questionnaire to ensure they were fit enough to participate and health care staff were informed of any health concerns.
- 3.34** Physical education instructors were enthusiastic and appropriately qualified. Facilities were well maintained, changing areas clean and showers good.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival at the prison.

Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need.

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *The overall ethos of the prison was to support resettlement work and prisoners were very positive about the opportunities available. Published release on temporary licence (ROTL) information did not reflect all recent national changes. ROTL was used extensively but some processes needed to be more effectively managed. Appropriate attention was paid to high risk cases.*

- 4.2** The overall ethos of the prison was to support resettlement work. In our survey prisoners were positive about being given greater responsibility than in closed conditions and 70%, more than the comparator, said they had done something to reduce their likelihood of re-offending.
- 4.3** The resettlement policy described the work of the team, the pathway services available and detailed the ROTL process (see paragraph 4.6). The reducing reoffending development plan was based on an up-to-date needs assessment and explained resettlement provision, including development targets. However, there was scope to use the needs analysis and exit survey information to develop additional targets, for example, in children and families work and services to support victims of abuse (see section on children, families and contact with the outside world, paragraph 4.47 and additional resettlement services). The plan did not say how the specific needs of particular groups of prisoners would be met.
- 4.4** Monthly resettlement meetings involved representatives from partnership agencies but not prisoners. Not all resettlement pathways were discussed and it was unclear how some targets were monitored. Case conferences enabled staff to pool ideas to support prisoners with specific issues.
- 4.5** Locating both the resettlement team and partnership agencies in the resettlement unit promoted effective communication. Prisoners could visit the unit on a drop-in basis to obtain information from a variety of knowledgeable resettlement orderlies (see also section on offender management).
- 4.6** The resettlement team set up, managed and monitored paid and voluntary work places for prisoners using ROTL, which was used extensively; 16771 licences were granted between February 2014 and August 2014. ROTL for work placements and volunteering through Community Service Volunteers was well managed. ROTL failures (where prisoners fail to return to the prison after their release) were low. The ROTL policy had failed to implement recent national changes, although it was updated during the inspection (see main recommendation S38).
- 4.7** Prisoners could go anywhere within a 40-mile radius on resettlement day release, and although discussed at ROTL boards, they did not have to produce a detailed plan for the day. It was inappropriate that they could be collected by any one of up to 10 approved individuals.

- 4.8** Offender assessment system (OASys) documents and sentence plans were not automatically comprehensively reviewed when a prisoner arrived (see section on offender management).
- 4.9** ROTL information on high risk prisoners was suitably detailed and included comments from offender managers about individual risk factors, as well as some insightful recommendations from psychology case file reviews. The violent and sex offenders register was used to inform risk assessments and was updated appropriately. We observed a well attended and effectively managed ROTL board.

Housekeeping point

- 4.10** The needs analysis and prisoner discharge information should be used to develop additional targets for service delivery.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners have a sentence plan based on an individual assessment of risk and need, which is regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody. Prisoners, together with all relevant staff, are involved in drawing up and reviewing plans.

4.11 *The offender management unit (OMU) was not sufficiently effective. OASys documents and sentence plans were not routinely reviewed on arrival. All prisoners were allocated to an offender supervisor (OS). There were good links between the OMU and work allocation, and prisoners could speak to an OS during weekly drop-in sessions without having to submit a written application to their named supervisor. Public protection arrangements were robust. In some cases it was unclear what the reasons were for returning prisoners to closed conditions and prisoners were routinely re-categorised. Although there were no specific services, prisoners serving indeterminate sentences were generally positive about the opportunities available.*

- 4.12** The OMU consisted of a manager, six prison OSs, one seconded probation OS and 11 case administrators. The offender management policy described staff's roles and the tasks they were required to undertake; however, these expectations could not currently be met.
- 4.13** There were nine staff vacancies; training for staff was inadequate and some staff lacked experience and confidence; only the seconded probation officer received formal casework supervision, despite all supervisors managing high risk prisoners. Prison OSs had to fulfil operational as well as offender management duties and from June to August 2014, about 40% of their working hours were diverted away from the OMU as a result of redeployment. As a result, OSs could not maintain regular contact with their caseload or keep up to date with all assessments.
- 4.14** The offender management and resettlement functions were managed separately. There was evidence of joint work between the teams, but some tension was evident and there were few joint staff meetings to address concerns.

- 4.15** All 12 cases sampled contained OASys documents and sentence plans. All documents except for one were good, closely linking key factors associated with prisoners' likelihood of reoffending and their risk of harm; risk of serious harm analysis was thorough and timely in all the required cases. However, many sentence plan objectives were imprecise and did not focus on outcomes.
- 4.16** OASys assessments were not reviewed when prisoners arrived at the prison; the only action taken was to insert a ROTL objective into the sentence plan (see main recommendation S38). The probation officer held some planning boards for high risk and indeterminate sentence prisoners on her caseload but other OSs did not. Telephone conferencing was often used and the lack of a video link hindered effective offender management work.
- 4.17** All prisoners were allocated to a motivated OS and in our survey, more prisoners than the comparator (89% against 80%) reported having a named supervisor. However, fewer than the comparator said their supervisor was working with them to achieve their sentence plans (44% compared with 51%). Prisoners were also less positive than the comparator about the help they received from offender managers to meet sentence plan targets.
- 4.18** There was no expectation of any planned formal case management meetings between OSs and prisoners. OSs told us that they did not have time to record details of any formal or informal meetings and in most cases (83%), there was no evidence of any face-to-face contact between supervisors and prisoners.
- 4.19** However, links between OMU staff and activity allocation processes were good and an OS attended weekly allocations meetings. Prisoners could speak in person to an OS at weekly lunchtime wing drop-in sessions and a duty supervisor liaised on a daily basis with the offender management prison orderly based in the resettlement unit where prisoners' queries could be answered (see section on resettlement). It was possible that these opportunities meant prisoners could have questions about issues such as ROTL or home detention curfew (HDC) answered more promptly than if they had to make a written application to the OMU.
- 4.20** Between February and August 2014, 87 prisoners had received approval for HDC (83%) out of 106 applications; 78% were released either on their HDC eligibility date or within seven days. Many prisoners were within their eligibility date when they arrived but the sending establishments had failed to start the HDC application process; from March to August 2014, 25% of all new prisoners were within their eligibility date when they arrived and OMU staff worked hard to process them, enabling 86% to receive approval and be released on time.

Recommendations

- 4.21** **Formal supervision should be provided to all OSs.**
- 4.22** **Sentence planning objectives should be specific and focused on outcomes.**
- 4.23** **All prisoners should have planned case management meetings with their OS proportionate to their risk and needs. Meetings should be recorded.**

Public protection

4.24 Forty-three per cent of the population were subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA). Risk management procedures were effective and MAPPA procedures robust. A weekly meeting established the MAPPA levels of new arrivals and undertook forward planning; offender managers and MAPPA coordinators were notified. There were five prolific or priority offenders, 29 indeterminate sentence for public protection prisoners and 26 high risk determinate sentenced prisoners. Sixteen prisoners were subject to child protection measures and were monitored by the security department and the inter-departmental risk management team (IRMT). The IRMT met every other month to discuss all high risk prisoners individually and put appropriate measures in place.

Categorisation

4.25 All prisoners held at the establishment were category D and most arrangements were appropriate. However, it was inappropriate that apart from those on indeterminate sentences, prisoners returned to closed conditions were routinely re-categorised to C (closed). In one case a prisoner was re-categorised and returned to closed conditions following allegations that were subsequently found unproven. He was then reassessed for open conditions and returned to Hollesley Bay but this took several weeks. He had to wait three months before he could re-apply for ROTL after his return to open conditions.

4.26 An average of nine prisoners each month were returned to closed conditions, a similar number compared with previous years; we did not consider this excessive. However, these moves had the potential to disrupt prisoners' resettlement plans. While most decisions were clearly justified, more needed to be done to make the procedure transparent so that it was clear who had made the final decision and for what reasons.

Recommendation

4.27 **When prisoners are returned to closed conditions there should be a clear record of who made the decision and the rationale for it; re-categorisation from D to C should only take place if there is clear evidence that this is required.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

4.28 Thirty-eight prisoners were serving life sentences and 29 were on indeterminate sentences for public protection. No forums or events were held and these prisoners but a small bungalow was being refurbished to provide a 'half-way' house for those close to release. Parole dossiers were up to date and indeterminate sentence prisoners were generally positive about the resettlement support and opportunities available to them (see section on reintegration planning, drugs and alcohol).

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are addressed prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual prisoner in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

4.29 *Prisoners' resettlement needs were mostly appropriately assessed on arrival and reviewed pre-release. All men were offered accommodation on release. Support to gain employment or training on release was good. Health care discharge arrangements needed improvement, but those with the most acute needs received reasonable support. Prisoners requiring substance misuse services were referred to community services. Third sector organisations provided a good range of finance, benefit and debt advice, including help with pre-release benefits applications. Prisoners were positive about the support they received to maintain contact with family and friends, but the prison failed to address the needs of those who did not receive support from families. Temporary visits arrangements were broadly satisfactory. Offending behaviour interventions offered met prisoners' needs.*

4.30 Prisoners' reintegration needs, except for contact with children and families, were assessed on arrival during a meeting with one of the resettlement orderlies and referrals were made to service providers. OSs completed risk and needs assessments for those serving sentences of less than 12 months using the OASys basic screening tool. The National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) and Jobcentre Plus staff saw prisoners before their release to address any needs that were not being met. Prisoners' employment or education activities and accommodation were recorded on release but resettlement outcomes following release were not monitored.

4.31 The resettlement needs analysis identified the extent of trauma in the population, including bereavement, violence in the home and past abuse. Individual counselling was available but the reducing reoffending development plan did not include a target to promote the service to the 47% of prisoners in the analysis who said they were unaware of it.

Accommodation

4.32 Resettlement orderlies dealt with routine housing queries and referred complex issues to the experienced NACRO advisor in the resettlement unit. The NACRO advisor had links with a variety of accommodation providers, including supported housing schemes. Many men could only be told where they were going on the day of their release or the day before. Only five prisoners had left the prison without an address during the year; they had chosen not to accept the accommodation offered to them. The advisor also assisted in securing accommodation for HDC, and NACRO offered a one-day tenancy course.

Education, training and employment

4.33 The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Realise Futures through its agent Tribal was good. Sufficient staff were available to carry out individual interviews with all prisoners during induction. The skills action plans they produced were good, clearly and comprehensively detailing prisoners' English and mathematics skills and setting realistic goals and targets.

- 4.34** Tribal staff frequently contacted prisoners about their continuing needs during their sentence. During these sessions prisoners were encouraged to consider what could help them gain the skills they needed to hold down a job. Tribal staff participated in allocation meetings to ensure the work or training prisoners requested met their agreed resettlement needs. Working partnerships between prison and resettlement education training and employment staff were good.
- 4.35** Although there was no standalone resettlement course, prisoners developed good skills for employment and self-employment through business and IT courses.
- 4.36** The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities), which was run through a national contract, was underused and was a poor source of job information. Although all prisoners were logged onto the system at induction, very few used it outside formal sessions to find employment.

Recommendation

- 4.37** **The content and information on the virtual campus should be reviewed to ensure it is relevant for prisoners looking for work on release.**

Health care

- 4.38** All prisoners were seen the day before their release and were offered information on registering with a dentist and GP. However, prisoners and GPs did not routinely receive a discharge letter or clinical notes summary, which adversely affected continuity of care. Prisoners with complex needs received more proactive release planning. More comprehensive discharge processes were being developed.
- 4.39** A palliative and end of life policy was in place and one prisoner with palliative care needs was receiving good support. The mental health team started discharge planning early to ensure services were in place for patients with severe and enduring mental health problems.

Recommendation

- 4.40** **There should be robust discharge planning processes in place to ensure continuity of care.**

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.41** Staff from the Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) had good links with local community-based drug and alcohol services. Prisoners also had access to the national RAPt network of community-based substance use support services, which provided those who were newly released with a meet and greet service offering transport to anywhere in the country.
- 4.42** The RAPt team delivered a special 15-session, one-to-one training package designed to meet the specific needs of indeterminate sentence prisoners in recovery in open conditions. It included preparations for parole applications and eventual release.

Good practice

- 4.43** *The training package was an effective way of helping indeterminate sentence prisoners to prepare for resettlement and present evidence of progress in their recovery.*

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.44** In our survey, one in 10 prisoners said they had money worries when they arrived at the prison. An advice worker from the Money Advice Service, a voluntary organisation, attended the prison once a month to advise up to 11 prisoners on finance, benefit and debt issues. In the six months before our inspection around 40 prisoners used the service. According to our survey, more prisoners were aware of this help than at comparator prisons.
- 4.45** A worker from NACRO helped prisoners apply to open bank accounts. The support offered was excellent. Most applications were successful and about 19 prisoners were discharged each month with a new bank account. Jobcentre Plus helped prisoners to apply for benefits before discharge. The service smoothed prisoners' transition from custody to the community.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.46** In our survey, prisoners were positive about the help they received to maintain contact with their family and friends. Staff and prisoners had access to a useful collection of basic information about common concerns, such as parental rights, and personal officers often mentioned family concerns in their regular case note entries. A number of positive interventions took place across the prison, such as Storybook Dads, in which prisoners record stories for their children, and Me and My Dad, a joint project between father and child. RAPt workers could direct prisoners and their families to various community support programmes. Many prisoners benefited from temporary release to reinforce family ties and we heard about a few examples of excellent support for individuals facing specific challenges.
- 4.47** However, the overall strategic approach could have been better. Despite some valuable needs assessment and exit survey data, the action plan did not focus sufficiently on ensuring that all prisoners received family support. More work was needed to identify which groups of men had difficulties with family contact and why, and to develop imaginative strategies to promote contact. Bids to fund a family support worker had so far been unsuccessful.
- 4.48** The visits room was closed for roof repairs until spring 2015, and visits were being held in the gym. While less than ideal, the temporary arrangements were respectful and sufficient. A large outdoor area with picnic benches and refreshments was available. Prisoners could play with their children in a small crèche. The visitors' centre was adequate, but some aspects, such as visitor feedback systems, required more management attention. Two well received family days had been held in August 2014. There were no plans to hold any again until summer 2015.
- 4.49** We were unable to observe visits during our inspection, but prisoners were generally positive about the environment, the booking arrangements and the treatment of their visitors.

Recommendation

- 4.50** The prison should develop a strategic action plan that aims to ensure all prisoners have the opportunity to stay in contact with family and friends.

Housekeeping point

- 4.51** The visitors' centre should be more closely managed.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.52** Many prisoners had undertaken relevant programmes prior to arriving at the prison and some could complete programmes in the community on ROTL. Five Sycamore Tree victim awareness course were run annually for up to 20 men each time. RAPt staff provided drug and alcohol awareness courses (see section on substance misuse).

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The reference number at the end of each recommendation, housekeeping point or example of good practice refers to its paragraph location in the main report.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 The Bosmere unit should be upgraded or replaced with permanent accommodation. (S37)
- 5.2 OASYs and ROTL procedures should be sufficiently rigorous to ensure risks to the public are effectively managed. (S38)

Recommendation

To NOMS

Reintegration planning

- 5.3 The content and information on the virtual campus should be reviewed to ensure it is relevant for prisoners looking for work on release. (4.37)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.4 A court video link should be available. (1.3)

Early days in custody

- 5.5 Prisoners should receive a private first night interview with a member of staff. (1.10)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.6 The prison should investigate prisoners' perceptions about safety and address any concerns raised. (1.17)

Safeguarding

- 5.7 The safeguarding adults framework document should be finalised and staff should understand safeguarding procedures for adults at risk. (1.25)

Discipline

- 5.8 Decisions to use handcuffs should be based on an individual risk assessment. (1.45)

Substance misuse

- 5.9** The drug strategy action plan should be updated, inform developments and detail lines of accountability. (1.53)
- 5.10** The controlled drugs administration room should be more welcoming and security arrangements should be in line with what is required in open conditions. (1.54)

Residential units

- 5.11** The shower areas in the Stow unit should be refurbished. (2.7)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.12** Staff and personal officers in the Bosmere unit should check on and interact with prisoners in their care. (2.15)

Equality and diversity

- 5.13** The EAT should investigate when monitoring data consistently suggests inequitable outcomes for minority groups. (2.24)
- 5.14** The prison should routinely consult prisoners in the protected groups to ensure their concerns and needs are identified, and where possible, addressed. (2.25)
- 5.15** Suitable adapted accommodation should be available for prisoners with disabilities. (2.33)

Health services

- 5.16** All staff should have regular managerial and clinical supervision, as well as appropriate continuing professional development underpinned by a current performance appraisal. (2.56)
- 5.17** There should be sufficient clinical rooms to provide a comprehensive service and all areas, including the dental suite, should comply with infection control guidelines. (2.57)
- 5.18** Triage algorithms should be available to ensure decisions made are consistent and appropriate. (2.67)
- 5.19** Prisoners should have timely access to optician and dental services. (2.68)
- 5.20** Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led counselling sessions, clinics and medication reviews. (2.76)
- 5.21** The dental service should be informed by an up-to-date needs assessment. (2.82)
- 5.22** Custodial staff should receive regular mental health awareness training. (2.88)

Catering

- 5.23** Self-catering facilities should be improved, particularly for prisoners on long or indeterminate sentences. (2.94)

Purchases

5.24 There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders. (2.99)

Offender management and planning

5.25 Formal supervision should be provided to all OSs. (4.21)

5.26 Sentence planning objectives should be specific and focused on outcomes. (4.22)

5.27 All prisoners should have planned case management meetings with their OS proportionate to their risk and needs. Meetings should be recorded. (4.23)

5.28 When prisoners are returned to closed conditions there should be a clear record of who made the decision and the rationale for it; re-categorisation from D to C should only take place if there is clear evidence that this is required. (4.27)

Reintegration planning

5.29 There should be robust discharge planning processes in place to ensure continuity of care. (4.40)

5.30 The prison should develop a strategic action plan that aims to ensure all prisoners have the opportunity to stay in contact with family and friends. (4.50)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escort and transfers

5.31 Prisoners should be informed of their transfer in advance and provided with information about the prison. (1.4)

Security

5.32 Action in response to IRs should be taken promptly. (1.35)

Discipline

5.33 The adjudications committee should meet every six months. (1.43)

Residential units

5.34 Sheets from the clothing and exchange store should be clean and in good condition. (2.8)

Complaints

5.35 Replies to complaints should be legible. (2.41)

Health services

5.36 Prisoners should be able to book in for their appointments. (2.58)

- 5.37** Those with complex needs should have an evidence-based care plan. (2.59)
- 5.38** The prison should establish a well publicised confidential complaints system. (2.60)
- 5.39** Prisoners should have access to an appropriate range of health promotion information overseen by an active prison-wide health promotion action group. (2.61)
- 5.40** Prisoners should have a private reception screening followed by a secondary health screening within 72 hours. (2.69)
- 5.41** Medication should be administered in private. (2.77)
- 5.42** In-possession and special sick policies should be ratified by the medicines management committee and implemented. (2.78)
- 5.43** Medicines that require refrigeration should be stored in a refrigerator that is consistently within the expected temperature range. (2.79)
- 5.44** Prisoners should have access to an appropriate range of effective guided self-help resources. (2.89)

Catering

- 5.45** Food temperatures should be taken at the point of service and accurately recorded. (2.95)

Purchases

- 5.46** Canteen meetings should always take place when there is an opportunity to alter the product list. (2.100)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.47** The prison should ensure that all observations focus on learning and on how trainers promote diversity and difference in their training. (3.9)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.48** The needs analysis and prisoner discharge information should be used to develop additional targets for service delivery. (4.10)

Reintegration planning

- 5.49** The visitors' centre should be more closely managed. (4.51)

Examples of good practice

- 5.50** The availability of custodial staff who were trained in first aid and who had good access to appropriate equipment meant prisoners could receive prompt emergency care. (2.62)
- 5.51** The training package was an effective way of helping indeterminate sentence prisoners to prepare for resettlement and present evidence of progress in their recovery. (4.43)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Gary Boughen	Inspector
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Gemma Quayle	Research officer
Helen Ranns	Research officer
Alissa Redmond	Research officer
Colette Daoud	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Majella Pearce	Health services inspector
Peter Gibbs	Pharmacist
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Jai Sharda	Ofsted inspector
Shahram Safavi	Ofsted inspector
Ian Simpkins	Offender management inspector
Sue McGrath	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

Please note: the following figures were supplied by the establishment and any errors are the establishment's own.

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	14	412	99.1
Recall		4	0.9
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand			
Civil prisoners			
Detainees			
Total	14	416	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced			
Less than 6 months		3	0.7
6 months to less than 12 months	1	6	1.6
12 months to less than 2 years		22	5.1
2 years to less than 4 years	3	69	16.7
4 years to less than 10 years	9	222	53.8
10 years and over (not life)		34	7.9
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	1	30	7.2
Life		30	7.0
Total	14	416	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:		
Under 21 years	14	3.3
21 years to 29 years	139	32.3
30 years to 39 years	121	28.1
40 years to 49 years	79	18.4
50 years to 59 years	56	13
60 years to 69 years	19	4.4
70 plus years	2	0.5
Please state maximum age here:	76	
Total	430	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	14	406	97.7
Foreign nationals		10	2.3
Total	14	416	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B			
Category C			
Category D	14	416	100
Other			
Total	14	416	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	7	244	58.3
Irish		5	1.2
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		10	2.3
Other white		11	2.5
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean		9	2.1
White and black African	1	2	0.7
White and Asian		2	0.5
Other mixed		8	1.9
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	1	10	2.5
Pakistani	2	8	2.3
Bangladeshi	1	4	1.2
Chinese		1	0.2
Other Asian		9	2.1
Black or black British			
Caribbean	1	53	12.6
African	1	19	4.7
Other black		16	3.7
Other ethnic group			
Arab			
Other ethnic group		5	1.2
Not stated			
Total	14	416	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England	1	110	25.8
Roman Catholic	3	60	14.7
Other Christian denominations	1	63	14.9
Muslim	5	48	12.3
Sikh	1	5	1.4
Hindu		3	0.7
Buddhist		12	2.8
Jewish		4	0.9
Other		10	2.3
No religion	3	101	24.2
Total	14	416	100

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)		8	1.9
Total		8	1.9

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	4	0.9%	51	11.9
1 month to 3 months	3	0.7%	104	24.2
3 months to 6 months	6	1.4%	83	19.3
6 months to 1 year	1	0.2%	110	25.6
1 year to 2 years			62	14.4
2 years to 4 years			6	1.4
4 years or more				
Total	14	3.3%	416	96.7

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/ restrictions).	7	169	40.9
Total	7	169	40.9

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month				
1 month to 3 months				
3 months to 6 months				
6 months to 1 year				
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total				

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person			
Sexual offences			
Burglary			
Robbery			
Theft and handling			
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences			
Other offences			
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded /holding warrant			
Total			

Nomis states that the information regarding Main Offence is 'currently unavailable'.

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the prisoner population was carried out for this inspection. The results of this survey formed part of the evidence base for the inspection.

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment⁶. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who do not read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 26 August 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Hollesley Bay was 430. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 215 prisoners.

We received a total of 157 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 73%. Twelve respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 25 questionnaires were not returned and 21 were returned blank.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Hollesley Bay.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

⁶ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes an 80% response rate (70% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant⁷ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data have been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Hollesley Bay in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other male open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open male prisons since April 2011.
- The current survey responses from HMP Hollesley Bay in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Hollesley Bay in 2009.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

⁷ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

Section I: About You

In order for us to ensure that everyone is treated equally within this prison, we ask that you fill in the following information about yourself. This will allow us to look at the answers provided by different groups of people in order to detect discrimination and to investigate whether there are equal opportunities for everyone across all areas of prison life. Your responses to these questions will remain both anonymous and confidential.

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	43 (28%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	46 (29%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	29 (19%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	26 (17%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	2 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?	
	<i>Yes</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>No</i>	147 (99%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	26 (17%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	84 (54%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Life</i>	5 (3%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)	
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>No</i>	153 (99%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	155 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	154 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	95 (62%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 1 (1%)
	White - Irish	2 (1%)	Asian or Asian British - other
	White – other.....	4 (3%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean 5 (3%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	17 (11%)	Mixed race - white and black African... 2 (1%)
	Black or black British - African	6 (4%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 1 (1%)
	Black or black British - other	1 (1%)	Mixed race - other
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	6 (4%)	Arab
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	6 (4%)	Other ethnic group..... 5 (3%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		8 (5%)
	No.....		143 (95%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	39 (25%)	Hindu
	Church of England	49 (32%)	Jewish
	Catholic	25 (16%)	Muslim
	Protestant.....	1 (1%)	Sikh
	Other Christian denomination	7 (5%)	Other
	Buddhist.....	5 (3%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		152 (99%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		1 (1%)
	Bisexual.....		1 (1%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)		
	Yes		13 (8%)
	No.....		144 (92%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes		12 (8%)
	No.....		144 (92%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		93 (59%)
	No.....		64 (41%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		81 (52%)
	No.....		75 (48%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than 2 hours	63 (40%)
	2 hours or longer	87 (56%)
	Don't remember	6 (4%)

Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	63 (40%)
	Yes	70 (45%)
	No.....	20 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	63 (40%)
	Yes	8 (5%)
	No.....	81 (52%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	109 (70%)
	No.....	41 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (4%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	128 (82%)
	No.....	23 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	58 (37%)
	<i>Well</i>	71 (45%)
	<i>Neither</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>Badly</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	136 (87%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	142 (90%)
	No.....	15 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	148 (94%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	140 (90%)
	No	12 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	80 (51%)
	Well.....	60 (38%)
	Neither.....	12 (8%)
	Badly.....	3 (2%)
	Very badly.....	1 (1%)
	Don't remember.....	1 (1%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of property.....	15 (10%)
	Housing problems.....	18 (12%)
	Contacting employers.....	0 (0%)
	Contacting family.....	4 (3%)
	Childcare.....	1 (1%)
	Money worries.....	15 (10%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	2 (1%)
	Physical health.....	9 (6%)
	Mental health.....	4 (3%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	1 (1%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	6 (4%)
	Other.....	2 (1%)
	Did not have any problems.....	102 (67%)
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	25 (16%)
	No.....	29 (19%)
	Did not have any problems.....	102 (65%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco.....	112 (74%)
	A shower.....	85 (56%)
	A free telephone call.....	90 (59%)
	Something to eat.....	96 (63%)
	PIN phone credit.....	127 (84%)
	Toiletries/ basic items.....	75 (49%)
	Did not receive anything.....	6 (4%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain.....	125 (81%)
	Someone from health services.....	125 (81%)
	A Listener/Samaritans.....	85 (55%)
	Prison shop/ canteen.....	84 (54%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	8 (5%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you.....	120 (79%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	91 (60%)
	How to make routine requests (applications).....	108 (71%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	105 (69%)
	Health services.....	125 (82%)
	Chaplaincy.....	122 (80%)
	Not offered any information.....	7 (5%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes.....	145 (94%)
	No.....	8 (5%)
	Don't remember.....	2 (1%)

Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	143 (92%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Yes</i>	118 (77%)
	<i>No</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (5%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	91 (60%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	25 (16%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	36 (24%)	53 (35%)	12 (8%)	14(9%)	2 (1%)	33 (22%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	23 (18%)	31 (24%)	11 (9%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	58 (46%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					58 (38%)	
	<i>Yes</i>					28 (18%)	
	<i>No</i>					67 (44%)	
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	<i>Yes</i>					74 (48%)	
	<i>No</i>					7 (5%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>					72 (47%)	
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	149 (98%)	2 (1%)	1(1%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	56 (38%)	65 (44%)	26 (18%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	115 (76%)	31 (20%)	6 (4%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	109 (74%)	35 (24%)	4 (3%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	71 (48%)	11(7%)	66 (45%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	<i>Very good</i>					14 (9%)	
	<i>Good</i>					43 (28%)	
	<i>Neither</i>					35 (23%)	
	<i>Bad</i>					31 (20%)	
	<i>Very bad</i>					30 (20%)	
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>					5 (3%)	
	<i>Yes</i>					99 (66%)	
	<i>No</i>					46 (31%)	

Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes	93 (60%)
	No.....	3 (2%)
	Don't know	58 (38%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	98 (64%)
	No.....	12 (8%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	43 (28%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	113 (74%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	30 (20%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend	28 (19%)
	Very easy.....	70 (46%)
	Easy	22 (15%)
	Neither	2 (1%)
	Difficult.....	2 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	7 (5%)
	Don't know	20 (13%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	132 (87%)
	No	6 (4%)
	Don't know	14 (9%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option).	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	26 (18%) 103 (71%) 17 (12%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	26 (19%) 85 (62%) 26 (19%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	81 (53%)
	No	11 (7%)
	Don't know	60 (39%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option).	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	99 (67%) 30 (20%) 18 (12%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	99 (72%) 28 (20%) 11 (8%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	21 (16%)
	No.....	112 (84%)

Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	47 (33%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	23 (16%)
	<i>Easy</i>	27 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i>	37 (26%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	2 (1%)

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	125 (84%)
	<i>No</i>	23 (16%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	120 (81%)
	<i>No</i>	28 (19%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	81 (54%)
	<i>No</i>	68 (46%)
Q6.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>Never</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	49 (32%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	33 (22%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	14 (9%)
Q6.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	75 (50%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	46 (31%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (9%)
Q6.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	62 (42%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	40 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	5 (3%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	29 (19%)
	<i>No</i>	121 (81%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>No</i>	138 (91%)

Q7.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	121 (84%)
	Everywhere	7 (5%)
	Association areas	4 (3%)
	Reception area	1 (1%)
	At the gym	1 (1%)
	In an exercise yard	2 (1%)
	At work.....	4 (3%)
	During movement.....	1 (1%)
	At education	0 (0%)
	At meal times.....	4 (3%)
	At health services.....	3 (2%)
	Visits area.....	1 (1%)
	In wing showers	4 (3%)
	In gym showers	1 (1%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	5 (3%)
	On your landing/wing	10 (7%)
	In your cell.....	4 (3%)
	At religious services.....	1 (1%)
Q7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	17 (11%)
	No.....	133 (89%)
Q7.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	9 (6%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	3 (2%)
	Sexual abuse	0 (0%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	13 (9%)
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	2 (1%)
	Medication.....	2 (1%)
	Debt	2 (1%)
	Drugs.....	1 (1%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	2 (1%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	2 (1%)
	Your nationality	3 (2%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	2 (1%)
	You are from a traveller community	0 (0%)
	Your sexual orientation	1 (1%)
	Your age.....	1 (1%)
	You have a disability.....	2 (1%)
	You were new here.....	5 (3%)
	Your offence/ crime	0 (0%)
	Gang related issues.....	3 (2%)
Q7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	29 (20%)
	No.....	116 (80%)

Q7.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	10 (7%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	13 (9%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)

Q7.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?

<i>Not been victimised</i>	110 (76%)
<i>Yes</i>	6 (4%)
<i>No</i>	28 (19%)

Section 8: Health services**Q8.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	20 (13%)	42 (28%)	47 (32%)	18 (12%)	16 (11%)	6 (4%)
The nurse	16 (11%)	67 (45%)	51 (34%)	9 (6%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)
The dentist	41 (28%)	18 (12%)	19 (13%)	17 (11%)	34 (23%)	19 (13%)

Q8.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	28 (19%)	45 (30%)	46 (31%)	16 (11%)	9 (6%)	5 (3%)
The nurse	22 (15%)	57 (39%)	40 (27%)	14 (10%)	8 (5%)	5 (3%)
The dentist	53 (37%)	20 (14%)	34 (24%)	16 (11%)	10 (7%)	11 (8%)

Q8.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

<i>Not been</i>	16 (11%)
<i>Very good</i>	40 (27%)
<i>Good</i>	56 (38%)
<i>Neither</i>	19 (13%)
<i>Bad</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Very bad</i>	9 (6%)

Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?

<i>Yes</i>	66 (44%)
<i>No</i>	85 (56%)

Q8.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?

<i>Not taking medication</i>	85 (56%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	55 (36%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	8 (5%)
<i>No</i>	3 (2%)

Q8.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	14 (9%)
	No.....	135 (91%)
Q8.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff.)	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems.....</i>	135 (91%)
	Yes	6 (4%)
	No.....	8 (5%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	12 (8%)
	No.....	138 (92%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	13 (9%)
	No.....	137 (91%)
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	28 (19%)
	Easy	18 (12%)
	Neither	4 (3%)
	Difficult.....	2 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	2 (1%)
	Don't know	97 (64%)
Q9.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	17 (11%)
	Easy	16 (11%)
	Neither	8 (5%)
	Difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	4 (3%)
	Don't know	103 (68%)
Q9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	2 (1%)
	No.....	149 (99%)
Q9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	3 (2%)
	No.....	148 (98%)
Q9.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	135 (92%)
	Yes	9 (6%)
	No.....	3 (2%)
Q9.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....</i>	137 (93%)
	Yes	8 (5%)
	No.....	3 (2%)

Q9.9 Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	134 (91%)
Yes.....	12 (8%)
No.....	2 (1%)

Section 10: Activities**Q10.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	9(6%)	73 (50%)	54 (37%)	4 (3%)	6 (4%)	1(1%)
Vocational or skills training	25 (17%)	44 (30%)	61 (42%)	8 (6%)	7(5%)	0 (0%)
Education (including basic skills)	28 (19%)	48 (33%)	59 (41%)	5 (3%)	5 (3%)	0(0%)
Offending behaviour programmes	60 (42%)	28 (20%)	33 (23%)	10 (7%)	9 (6%)	3 (2%)

Q10.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	30 (21%)
Prison job.....	89 (63%)
Vocational or skills training.....	28 (20%)
Education (including basic skills).....	23 (16%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	9 (6%)

Q10.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?

	<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Prison job	11 (8%)	63 (48%)	47 (36%)	10 (8%)
Vocational or skills training	27 (24%)	61 (55%)	15 (14%)	8 (7%)
Education (including basic skills)	30 (27%)	58 (52%)	15 (14%)	8 (7%)
Offending behaviour programmes	36 (34%)	44 (42%)	17 (16%)	9 (8%)

Q10.4 How often do you usually go to the library?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	14 (9%)
<i>Never</i>	16 (11%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	51 (34%)
<i>About once a week</i>	38 (26%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	29 (20%)

Q10.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

<i>Don't use it</i>	30 (20%)
Yes.....	83 (56%)
No.....	36 (24%)

Q10.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	17 (12%)
0.....	24 (16%)
1 to 2.....	21 (14%)
3 to 5.....	62 (42%)
More than 5.....	23 (16%)

Q10.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	11 (8%)
0.....	10 (7%)
1 to 2.....	38 (26%)
3 to 5.....	37 (26%)
More than 5.....	48 (33%)

Q10.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>0</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	102 (71%)

Q10.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	31 (21%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	75 (51%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (7%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	87 (59%)
	<i>No</i>	60 (41%)
Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (10%)
	<i>No</i>	134 (90%)
Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	142 (95%)
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>Easy</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	29 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	44 (30%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (3%)

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Yes</i>	136 (92%)
	<i>No</i>	12 (8%)
Q12.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/ NA</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>No contact</i>	26 (18%)
	<i>Letter</i>	43 (29%)
	<i>Phone</i>	69 (47%)
	<i>Visit</i>	37 (25%)

Q12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	132 (89%)
	No.....	16 (11%)
Q12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Yes	126 (85%)
	No.....	23 (15%)
Q12.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (16%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	52 (35%)
	<i>Involved</i>	45 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	11 (7%)
Q12.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (17%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	42 (30%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	51 (37%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	31 (22%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	24 (17%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	14 (10%)
Q12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (17%)
	Yes	93 (67%)
	No.....	8 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	15 (11%)
Q12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (17%)
	Yes	18 (13%)
	No.....	82 (60%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (10%)
Q12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	23 (16%)
	Yes	45 (31%)
	No.....	49 (34%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	27 (19%)
Q12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	8 (6%)
	No.....	73 (51%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	63 (44%)
Q12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes	52 (36%)
	No.....	92 (64%)

Q12.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	55 (39%)	53 (38%)	33 (23%)
Accommodation	66 (48%)	41 (30%)	31 (22%)
Benefits	55 (41%)	49 (36%)	31 (23%)
Finances	64 (47%)	39 (29%)	32 (24%)
Education	68 (52%)	39 (30%)	25 (19%)
Drugs and alcohol	76 (58%)	34 (26%)	21 (16%)

Q12.13 Have you been provided with information on the following? (please tick all that apply to you.)

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	113 (78%)	31 (22%)
Resettlement overnight release	107 (78%)	30 (22%)

Q12.14 Have you had access to the following? (please tick all that apply to you.)

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	78 (55%)	63 (45%)
Resettlement overnight release	79 (56%)	61 (44%)
Special purpose leave	47 (38%)	78 (62%)

Q12.15 Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release?

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here	49 (34%)	95 (66%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom e.t.c.)	52 (36%)	92 (64%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	123 (87%)	19 (13%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	37 (26%)	103 (74%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	44 (31%)	100 (69%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	99 (70%)	43 (30%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Hollesley Bay 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		157	1866	157	99
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2%	0%	2%	11%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	3%	1%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	4%	4%	14%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	12%	6%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	1%	3%	1%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	34%	28%	34%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	4%	5%	
1.1	Are you Muslim?	9%	13%	9%	8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	3%	1%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	12%	8%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	7%	8%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	59%	52%	59%	48%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	52%	53%	52%	45%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	56%	46%	56%	45%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	75%	81%	75%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	11%	9%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	70%	67%	70%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	82%	84%	82%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	82%	76%	82%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	87%	80%	87%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	12%	14%	12%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	91%	93%	91%	92%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	94%	67%	94%	67%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	86%	90%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	89%	78%	89%	81%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	33%	43%	33%	40%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	10%	9%	10%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	12%	8%	12%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	2%	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	3%	12%	3%	13%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	1%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	10%	11%	10%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	1%	5%	1%	7%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	6%	8%	6%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	3%	5%	3%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	2%	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	4%	11%	4%	5%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	47%	43%	47%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	74%	59%	74%	33%
3.6	A shower?	56%	38%	56%	79%
3.6	A free telephone call?	59%	44%	59%	52%
3.6	Something to eat?	63%	52%	63%	82%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	84%	54%	84%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	49%	39%	49%	
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	81%	54%	81%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	81%	73%	81%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	55%	37%	55%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	54%	25%	54%	54%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	79%	64%	79%	72%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	60%	44%	60%	62%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.8	How to make routine requests?	71%	54%	71%	82%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	69%	56%	69%	79%
3.8	Health services?	82%	63%	82%	86%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	80%	54%	80%	79%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	94%	89%	94%	97%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	96%	95%	96%	97%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	80%	72%	80%	80%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	86%	85%	86%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	59%	66%	59%	69%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	43%	53%	43%	48%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	18%	27%	18%	20%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	48%	49%	48%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	98%	98%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	38%	77%	38%	82%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76%	65%	76%	87%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	74%	78%	74%	77%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	48%	44%	48%	52%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	37%	39%	37%	27%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	66%	47%	66%	58%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	60%	60%	60%	57%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	54%	64%	64%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	74%	66%	74%	65%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	61%	54%	61%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	86%	87%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	86%	72%	86%	88%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	77%	62%	77%	83%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	52%	53%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	63%	42%	63%	55%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	72%	44%	72%	75%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	16%	17%	16%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	35%	36%	35%	47%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	85%	74%	85%	87%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	81%	74%	81%	87%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	54%	26%	54%	
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	31%	16%	31%	18%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	89%	69%	89%	83%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	78%	68%	78%	71%
SECTION 7: Safety					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	19%	19%	19%	9%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	8%	9%	4%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	11%	15%	11%	4%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	6%	6%	6%	2%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%	2%	1%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	9%	9%	
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	2%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	1%	2%	
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	2%	3%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	1%	2%	
SECTION 7: Safety continued					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	20%	21%	20%	17%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	8%	7%	5%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	10%	9%	
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	2%	3%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	3%	2%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	3%	1%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	17%	24%	17%	28%
SECTION 8: Health services					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	60%	51%	60%	69%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	79%	71%	79%	84%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	25%	27%	25%	34%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
8.2	The doctor?	75%	66%	75%	69%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.2	The nurse?	78%	74%	78%	87%
8.2	The dentist?	59%	54%	59%	61%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	73%	62%	73%	72%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	44%	45%	44%	30%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	96%	98%	96%	
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	9%	14%	9%	16%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	42%	55%	42%	
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	8%	11%	8%	7%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	9%	11%	9%	9%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	30%	36%	30%	24%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	22%	23%	22%	
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	1%	3%	1%	1%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	2%	2%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	76%	75%	76%	
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	83%	73%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	87%	91%	87%	75%
SECTION 10: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
10.1	A prison job?	86%	76%	86%	
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	72%	55%	72%	
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	74%	71%	74%	
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	43%	32%	43%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.2	A prison job?	63%	73%	63%	72%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	20%	18%	20%	13%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	16%	23%	16%	21%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	6%	5%	6%	3%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	92%	94%	92%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	53%	46%	53%	
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	76%	81%	76%	
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	73%	64%	73%	
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	73%	85%	73%	
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	72%	64%	72%	
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	66%	70%	66%	
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	63%	47%	63%	
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	45%	56%	45%	47%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	56%	64%	56%	
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	58%	53%	58%	57%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	59%	78%	59%	37%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	71%	80%	71%	84%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	51%	55%	51%	39%
SECTION 11: Friends and family					
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	59%	53%	59%	61%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	10%	22%	10%	24%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	5%	14%	5%	7%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	28%	38%	28%	
SECTION 12: Preparation for release					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	92%	93%	92%	
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	20%	16%	20%	
12.2	Contact by letter?	33%	41%	33%	
12.2	Contact by phone?	53%	59%	53%	
12.2	Contact by visit?	28%	41%	28%	
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	89%	80%	89%	
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	85%	76%	85%	77%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	78%	72%	78%	71%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Hollesley Bay 2014	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
12.6	nobody?	36%	31%	36%	
12.6	Offender supervisor?	44%	51%	44%	
12.6	Offender manager?	27%	40%	27%	
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	21%	19%	21%	
12.6	Staff from other departments?	12%	22%	12%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	80%	74%	80%	83%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	16%	13%	16%	
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	37%	49%	37%	
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	7%	6%	
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	36%	31%	36%	38%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
12.12	Employment?	62%	54%	62%	
12.12	Accommodation?	57%	52%	57%	
12.12	Benefits?	61%	50%	61%	
12.12	Finances?	55%	43%	55%	
12.12	Education?	61%	54%	61%	
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	62%	59%	62%	
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	79%	76%	79%	
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	78%	74%	78%	
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.14	Resettlement day release?	55%	65%	55%	
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	56%	57%	56%	
12.14	Special purpose leave?	38%	34%	38%	
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	34%	25%	34%	20%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	36%	28%	36%	26%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	87%	80%	87%	75%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	26%	19%	26%	16%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	31%	47%	31%	22%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	70%	60%	70%	62%

Diversity analysis



Key Question Responses (ethnicity)HMP Hollesley Bay 2014

Prisoner survey responses(missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		53	101
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	26%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	11%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	67%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	85%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	85%	88%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	92%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	83%	92%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	37%	31%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	81%	80%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	97%	92%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	99%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	57%	62%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	99%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	35%	39%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	49%	74%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	62%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	62%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	75%	75%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	57%
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	86%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	73%	85%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	26%	33%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	88%	91%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	19%	20%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	8%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	12%	11%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	6%	10%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	36%	13%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	7%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	52%	65%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	74%	82%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	43%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	14%	7%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	33%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	62%	62%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	17%	22%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	23%	13%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	6%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	36%	49%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	65%	53%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	54%	62%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	72%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	43%	57%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	10%	10%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	4%
Have you been provided with information on the following:			
12.12	Resettlement day release?	79%	80%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	82%	78%
Have you had access to the following:			
12.13	Resettlement day release?	62%	53%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	64%	54%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	46%	35%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:			
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	40%	32%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	44%	33%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	87%	87%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	32%	24%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	22%	35%

Diversity analysis



Key Question Responses (age - over 50)HMP Hollesley Bay 2014

Prisoner survey responses(missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		35	121
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	28%	36%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	3%	11%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	7%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	12%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	57%	60%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	85%	81%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	97%	84%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	92%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	95%	88%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	40%	31%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	83%	80%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	92%	94%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	97%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	68%	57%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	49%	34%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	80%	62%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	66%	59%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	85%	58%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	97%	67%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	85%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	73%	47%
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	91%	82%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	85%	80%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	38%	29%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	91%	89%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	28%	17%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	8%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	12%	11%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	12%	8%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	3%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	3%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	15%	22%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	12%	8%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	4%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	68%	58%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	88%	77%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	74%	35%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	12%	9%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	31%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	68%	61%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	20%	20%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	15%	17%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	6%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	46%	45%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	29%	67%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	53%	61%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	67%	73%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	34%	57%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	5%	12%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	3%	5%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	88%	75%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	87%	76%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	60%	54%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	66%	54%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	45%	36%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	47%	30%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	41%	35%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	88%	86%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	22%	28%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	38%	28%

Wing analysis



Prisoner survey responses (wing analysis) HMP Hollesley Bay 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question). Please note: where there are apparently large differences, which are not indicated as statistically significant, this is likely to be due to chance.

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		22	135
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	5%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.	41%	33%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	18%	8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	8%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	60%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	50%	52%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	57%	56%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	86%	74%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	0%	10%
2.4	Was the van clean?	50%	73%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	87%	81%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	95%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	87%	87%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	13%	12%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	90%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	95%	94%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	87%	90%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	38%	32%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	9%	10%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	24%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	5%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	9%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	0%	7%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	0%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	5%	4%
For those with problems:			
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	14%	52%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:			
3.6	Tobacco?	80%	73%
3.6	A shower?	50%	57%
3.6	A free telephone call?	66%	58%
3.6	Something to eat?	55%	64%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	91%	83%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	60%	48%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	75%	81%
3.7	Someone from health services?	70%	82%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	40%	57%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	46%	56%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	70%	80%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	40%	63%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	55%	74%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	55%	71%
3.8	Health services?	70%	84%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	70%	82%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	100%	93%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	97%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	79%	80%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	91%	85%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	57%	60%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	45%	42%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	9%	20%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	35%	50%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	5%	44%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	53%	79%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	47%	78%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	52%	47%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14%	41%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	57%	67%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	57%	61%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	64%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	62%	76%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	57%	62%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	72%	89%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	75%	87%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	66%	78%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	55%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	50%	64%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	79%	71%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	10%	39%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff			
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	80%	85%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	58%	85%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	30%	58%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	28%	32%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	86%	90%
	For those with a personal officer:		
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	65%	80%
SECTION 7: Safety			
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	19%	20%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	9%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	14%	11%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	6%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	2%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	9%
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	4%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
SECTION 7: Safety continued			
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	19%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	6%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	9%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	18%	18%
SECTION 8: Health services			
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	67%	59%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	86%	78%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	28%	24%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
8.2	The doctor?	75%	75%
8.2	The nurse?	85%	77%
8.2	The dentist?	69%	58%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	73%	73%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	38%	45%
	For those currently taking medication:		
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	86%	97%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	0%	11%
	For those who have problems:		
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	42%	42%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol			
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	9%	8%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	5%	9%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	19%	32%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%	23%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	1%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	2%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	100%	73%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	73%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
9.9	Was the support helpful?	100%	86%
SECTION 10: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
10.1	A prison job?	91%	86%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	76%	72%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	73%	74%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	42%	43%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
10.2	A prison job?	72%	61%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	19%	20%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	24%	15%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	14%	5%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	94%	91%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	39%	55%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	70%	77%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	50%	76%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	73%	73%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	53%	74%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	66%	66%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	41%	67%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	45%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	53%	56%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	72%	56%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	66%	58%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	72%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	62%	50%
SECTION 11: Friends and family			
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	46%	62%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	9%	10%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	5%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	14%	30%
SECTION 12: Preparation for release			
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	100%	91%
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:		
12.2	No contact?	35%	17%
12.2	Contact by letter?	6%	38%
12.2	Contact by phone?	50%	54%
12.2	Contact by visit?	15%	31%
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	86%	90%
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	91%	84%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	69%	79%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Bosmere Wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
12.6	nobody?	25%	38%
12.6	Offender supervisor?	43%	44%
12.6	Offender manager?	25%	27%
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	7%	23%
12.6	Staff from other departments?	18%	11%
For those with a sentence plan:			
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	65%	83%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	30%	14%
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	41%	37%
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	6%
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	40%	36%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:			
12.12	Employment?	46%	65%
12.12	Accommodation?	37%	61%
12.12	Benefits?	47%	64%
12.12	Finances?	19%	61%
12.12	Education?	42%	63%
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	79%	60%
Have you been provided with information on the following:			
12.13	Resettlement day release?	73%	79%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	77%	78%
Have you had access to the following:			
12.14	Resettlement day release?	42%	58%
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	50%	58%
12.14	Special purpose leave?	17%	41%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:			
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	21%	36%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	21%	39%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	90%	86%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	21%	27%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	20%	32%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	55%	72%