

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Coldingley

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

2 - 12 April 2013

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 of terms on our website at:
http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf

Crown copyright 2013

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:
hmiprison.enquiries@hmiprison.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prison>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor, Ashley House
Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Methodology	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	45
Section 4. Resettlement	53
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	61
Section 6. Appendices	69
Appendix I: Inspection team	69
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	70
Appendix III: Prison population profile	79
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	82

Introduction

Coldingley is a category C training prison on the outskirts of London, holding just over 500 adult male prisoners. The establishment has long had a reputation as an industrial prison providing a full regime of activity and industry. At previous inspections we have praised the institution. At this inspection the prison was just coming out of a competitive bid process and was also awaiting the appointment of a new governor. We found generally reasonable outcomes but identified some significant issues that required attention and improvement.

We found Coldingley to be a safe prison. Prisoners reported that they felt safe and in our survey most indicators of delinquent or violent behaviour were relatively positive. There was little self-harm, and prisoners in crisis were well cared for. Security was applied proportionately, and prisoners who needed support for drug and alcohol problems talked positively about this. Force was used infrequently and the use of segregation had reduced, although the facility and regime needed improvement.

Our principal criticisms at Coldingley focused on respect. Accommodation was in a poor condition, made worse by the continued use of the antiquated, inefficient and degrading 'night san system' - controlling prisoner access to toilets at night through a call queuing and computerised unlock arrangement. The outcome was that men had to wait extended periods to use toilets, and often used buckets instead.

The staff-prisoner relationships we observed were reasonable, but our survey and the comments of many prisoners suggested they could and should be improved. Some prisoners saw the staff as dismissive. These negative views were worse among minority groups, and diversity work in general was very poor. Health services were appreciated by prisoners and had improved since our last inspection. The quality of food was poor and the cleanliness of the kitchen was unacceptable.

The provision of education, work and activity was reasonably good, with some excellent workshops and high quality skills acquisition for some prisoners. Added to this, the provision of vocational training had improved and there was a clear vision for further development. That said, provision lacked cohesion and was not up to our high expectations of an industrial prison. It was particularly hard to understand why prisoners doing some highly skilled work were unable to obtain qualifications that could have helped them find work on release. This was a missed opportunity. Attendance at education was often poor, teaching variable and individual planning weak. More needed to be done to develop resettlement work opportunities in the community.

Resettlement services generally were good. Offender management was well managed and most prisoners appeared to be engaged. There was a reasonable assessment of need and good use of prisoner peer supporters to assist resettlement, although there was no specialist support for some resettlement pathways. There was some use of release on temporary licence to support prisoners' family ties, but the small category D unit seemed to lack any specific purpose.

There is a need for both local managers and NOMS to ensure that Coldingley becomes a more respectful institution and focuses on its primary purpose of equipping prisoners for a purposeful life on release. The provision and integration of work, training and resettlement is a clear priority, but despite having a good foundation to build on, Coldingley is still some way short of the standard of excellence to which it should aspire.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Coldingley is a category C working prison for adult males, holding mostly long-term, including life-sentenced, prisoners.

Prison status

Public

Region

Greater London

Number held

512

Certified normal accommodation

494

Operational capacity

513

Date of last full inspection

7 – 11 June 2010

Brief history

Coldingley was opened in 1969 as a category B industrial training prison. It changed role to a category C prison in 1993. A new unit, E wing, was opened in 2009.

Short description of residential units

The original four wings, A–D, hold 91 prisoners each, mainly in single cells. None of these cells has integral sanitation. E wing has 115 single and eight double cells with integral sanitation. F wing, located in the old health care unit, is an enhanced wing. The 10 occupants are able to leave their double cells to use communal toilets as needed.

Name of governor

Jo Simms (acting)

Escort contractor

SERCO and GEOAmey

Health service commissioner and provider

Virgin Care

Learning and skills provider

A4E

Independent Monitoring Board chair

John Tilbury

Methodology

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, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

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.

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 criteria 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.

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.

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 checked 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.

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.

About this report

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. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.

Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.

Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only quote statistically significant¹ comparisons between establishments and their comparators in the main body of the report.

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 First days arrangements were reasonably effective. There was little violence and most prisoners reported feeling safe, although a significant number felt victimised by staff. Prisoners at risk of self-harm were generally well cared for. Security was well managed and effective. Fewer prisoners were segregated than at the last inspection, but the regime was limited. Adjudications were conducted fairly. Use of force was low. Substance use services had improved and were good. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were good.
- S2 At the last inspection in June 2010 we found that HMP Coldingley was good against this healthy prison test. We made 31 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection, we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, six had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.
- S3 Few prisoners had travelled more than an hour to the prison and most reported positively on escort arrangements. Vehicles that we inspected were clean and carried adequate sanitary equipment and refreshments. Prisoners transferring out of Coldingley did not always have enough notice of the move.
- S4 Prisoners described a swift reception process and appropriate searching procedures, but many were critical of their overall treatment by staff. Personal interviews were conducted in privacy and first-day interviews with staff and insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) usefully prepared prisoners for their time at the prison. Not all new arrivals were subject to enhanced first night observations. Induction was informative but prisoners could wait up to six days before receiving induction. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at the last inspection said that induction covered all necessary information.
- S5 Prisoners told us that Coldingley was safe. The numbers of fights and assaults was low relative to similar prisons. 'Learning lesson' investigations were high quality and led to meaningful actions. Effective weekly multidisciplinary meetings were held to identify and manage risk and potential violence. However, in our survey, about a third of prisoners said they had been subject to insulting remarks by staff, and this was especially the case for black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners.
- S6 There had been 24 self-harm incidents in the previous six months, lower than in other category C prisons. Those at risk of self-harm were generally well cared for. ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documentation was good, but attendance at case reviews was not sufficiently multidisciplinary. The mental health in-reach team provided excellent support for at-risk prisoners. Not all night staff were first aid trained or knew how to access or use defibrillators. The Samaritan cordless telephones were a welcome development but their availability was not well advertised. The safer cell was austere and there was evidence that strip-clothing may have been used there inappropriately.
- S7 Procedural security was well managed and there was a good flow of information into the security department. There was good analysis of intelligence to inform effective risk management systems. The security committee was properly constructed and meetings were well attended. Supply reduction measures were appropriate and the average mandatory drug

testing rate for 2012-2013 was less than the target of 8%. On the whole, security procedures were proportionate and did not interfere with prisoners' access to a full regime.

- S8 The use of segregation had reduced substantially since the last inspection but the regime for the significant number of longer-stay prisoners remained poor. Staff were respectful to prisoners but case management and reintegration planning were not adequately developed. Communal areas were clean but some cells were grubby and had dirty toilets. The exercise yards were particularly stark, and the overall environment was dark and dreary.
- S9 Incidents involving the use of force were relatively infrequent and written accounts from staff gave assurances that force was a last resort. Governance arrangements were reasonable but the analysis of information to help identify trends and patterns was weak.
- S10 Most records of hearings that we sampled showed that adjudication proceedings were conducted fairly and that punishments were appropriate and consistent. However, a few appeared rushed, with little to indicate that the prisoner had properly engaged with the process. Some charges were minor and would have been better dealt with informally.
- S11 The incentives and earned privileges scheme was operated consistently across the prison. There was a reasonable difference between the levels and the regime for the very small number of prisoners on the basic level included association in the evening. There was evidence that the scheme was properly administered by residential managers but prisoner perceptions of fairness were generally poor.
- S12 Our survey and discussions with prisoners indicated that support for drug and alcohol problems was good. Services had improved since the previous inspection. The intensive drug treatment service team was now fully established and there was an emphasis on reducing dependence, although Subutex was not available in line with a flexible prescribing approach. The CARATs team (counselling, assessment, referral, advice and through care) offered a wide range of support and the RAPt (Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust) programme was excellent.

Respect

- S13 The night sanitation system was degrading and most of the residential units were in poor condition. Staff-prisoner relationships were reasonable overall, but black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners were especially negative about staff. We saw evidence of some good personal officer work. Diversity management was weak and facilities for diverse groups of prisoners were inadequate. Faith provision was good. Many responses to complaints did not deal with underlying issues. Health services were good and had improved since the last inspection. Standards of cleanliness in the kitchen were poor and prisoners were very critical of the food. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good.
- S14 At the last inspection in June 2010, we found that HMP Coldingley was reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 46 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, and 25 had not been achieved.
- S15 The automated cell unlock system remained degrading and had a significant impact on prisoners' experience of life at Coldingley. Prisoners could wait for long periods before being allowed to go to the toilet, and the system had recently failed completely; more prisoners

- than usual had been forced to use buckets as a result. Despite efforts to keep them clean, most of the old wings were in poor condition. The toilets and showers needed refurbishment, and we saw a lot of rubbish outside windows on our arrival. The application system worked well despite a lack of management oversight. Telephone access had improved, with additional telephones on the older wings.
- S16 Most of the staff-prisoner interactions that we saw were reasonable. However, in our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said that most staff treated them with respect and a number reported dismissive behaviour. There had been no effective or sustained work to investigate the particularly poor perceptions of black and minority ethnic or Muslim prisoners that we highlighted at our previous inspection. We saw examples of some very good personal officer work in contact records, but entries were irregular and some focused excessively on wing behaviour rather than progression and resettlement.
- S17 Diversity provision was poor and lacked consistent leadership and management. The diversity and equality action team did not meet regularly and there was little evidence of actions being followed up. The two prisoner diversity orderlies tried to assist prisoners but lacked adequate staff support. Discrimination incident report forms were freely available and the overall quality of investigations and responses was reasonable. There was not enough race and diversity training for staff.
- S18 In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners were significantly more negative about a range of issues than white prisoners. There were no groups for prisoners with protected characteristics to help to identify and meet their specific needs. Support for foreign nationals was inadequate and links to the UK Border Agency were minimal. Staff did not generally know about interpretation services that were available. Prisoners with disabilities were under-identified and care plans for older and disabled prisoners were sparse and often out of date. Initiatives for older prisoners had resulted in some improvements to quality of life. There was no specific support for gay or bisexual prisoners. There was a significant and under-identified group of Travellers, and no services for them. The chaplaincy was prominent in the daily life of the prison. Faith and chaplaincy facilities were good.
- S19 The two legal services officers provided a limited but useful service. They had not been trained and their role required further development. Legal text books in the library were not easily available. Facilities for legal visitors were adequate.
- S20 Responses to complaints were generally prompt but often superficial and regularly failed to address the issues raised. Complaint forms were readily available on the wings. Complaints were monitored by a wide range of indicators but outcomes and trends over time were not.
- S21 There had been improvements in health services since our last inspection and prisoners were generally positive about the quality of health care. The service was well managed and the team had an appropriate skill mix. Access to the GP and nurse clinics was good but waiting times to see the dentist and optician were excessive at 11 to 12 weeks. The health care centre was clean, with a good range of rooms for treatment and consultation, but the lift for disabled prisoners was often not working. Health care facilities in reception were good and all prisoners were screened appropriately. Pharmacy services and the quality of dental care were impressive. Mental health services were effective and patients had ready access to the in-reach team, a forensic psychiatrist and counselling services.
- S22 Prisoners reported very negatively on the quality of food. Meals were served too early at around 11.45am for lunch and 4.45pm for the evening meal, and even earlier at weekends. The kitchen was dirty and old food residue was clearly visible on equipment when we inspected. The cleanliness of food trolleys was similarly poor. Consultation processes were limited. The canteen provided an adequate service.

Purposeful activity

- S23 Time out of cell was reasonable, though association was too often cancelled. Leadership and management of activities lacked focus. Prisoners undertook challenging and fulfilling work in very well equipped workshops. Good work skills were developed, but many prisoners could not obtain qualifications to reflect this. Although it was still limited, vocational training had increased. Education was not used to capacity and the quality of teaching was variable. The library had restricted opening times and limited book stock. PE provision was generally good. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- S24 At the last inspection in June 2010, we found that HMP Coldingley was reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, and eight had not been achieved.
- S25 Most prisoners had about 9.5 hours out of cell from Monday to Thursday. However, this reduced to about four hours for the small but significant number of unemployed prisoners or those not required for work on a particular day, who were unnecessarily locked in their cells. Association and exercise were offered every day but association in the evening had been cancelled on a number of occasions.
- S26 Senior managers had an established vision for developing learning and skills, but overall management of activities lacked cohesion. There were some partnerships with commercial organisations, but more were needed to support work skills training. Quality improvement procedures were under-developed. Self-assessment was embedded but it was over-reliant on the education provider and did not evaluate or analyse training activities sufficiently.
- S27 There were enough activity places for the population. The range of vocational training had improved but needed further development. There was a good range of activities leading to useful work skills. Workshops were well resourced with modern industrial standard equipment. Attendance at education during the week of the inspection was poor. Labour allocation processes were well understood and consistently applied. Initial advice and guidance was given at induction by the National Careers Service and a training plan was provided for most prisoners. However, they did not receive appropriate training in manual handling before allocation to workshops.
- S28 The quality of teaching and learning was variable, and some was poor. Prisoners were not always fully engaged in education but coaching in workshops and vocational training was good. The quality of teaching accommodation was good and well maintained. Individual learning plans were poor and in many cases target setting was weak.
- S29 Success rates for prisoners undertaking education, employability or personal and social development programmes had improved over the previous three years. They were particularly good in the short social and personal development qualifications, horticulture, welding, physical education, BICS (British Institute of Cleaning Services) and PICTA (Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy). Most prisoners demonstrated high standards of work across most areas, and excellent skills in welding, horticulture and engineering. However, this skills development was poorly reflected in the qualifications available to prisoners.
- S30 The library was small and underused, and opening times were very restricted. The range of books and most other resources was limited and much of the stock was old. There were no newspapers or magazines. Links with education were underdeveloped and the only activity

dedicated to the promotion of reading was the monthly book club attended by five prisoners, which had recently started.

- S31 PE was well managed by highly qualified and knowledgeable staff. Access to recreational PE was good with an appropriate range of activities for older prisoners. There were suitable areas for the gym and cardiovascular and weight training. There was no access to outside sports facilities.

Resettlement

S32 Strategic management of resettlement needed improvement and offending behaviour needs were not well identified. There was reasonable use of release on temporary licence (ROTL), but not for community work placements. The offender management unit was effective. There was not enough provision for lifers. Public protection work was good. The management of Category D prisoners lacked strategic direction. There was some good prisoner-led resettlement pathway support, but a lack of specialist provision or training. Some visitors had to wait for long periods before coming into the visits hall. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

S33 At the last inspection in June 2010, we found that HMP Coldingley was reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 19 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

S34 The resettlement policy was based on a needs assessment, but did not make effective use of OASys (offender assessment system) data to inform resettlement pathway provision. The monthly resettlement meeting was not driving progress in the prison, despite robust pathway action plans and leads. In the previous six months, about 40 prisoners had undertaken ROTL for maintaining family ties and town visits. However, there were no community work placements. Almost a third of home detention curfew boards in the previous six months had been held beyond the prisoner's eligibility date. There was little monitoring of resettlement outcomes in terms of pathway discharge information.

S35 Offender management was reasonably good. In our survey, most prisoners said they had a sentence plan and could achieve their targets. The large number of lifers were more negative. After their initial meeting with the lifer manager and their offender supervisors, they could only attend one lifer forum every six months, and it was hard to see the purpose of this. Every prisoner had an OASys, and out-of-scope cases were managed by personal officers through a custody plan. We saw some good personal officer notes relating to custody objectives. OASys assessments were usually timely and of a good standard. Risk management plans were reasonably good. Out-of-scope cases were appropriately transferred to probation staff if risks increased.

S36 There were about 30 category D prisoners, but some had chosen to stay at Coldingley. The average time for transfer was reasonable at 52 days. Risk assessments were thorough and took into account information from a range of sources. The small Category D unit on F wing lacked strategic purpose and direction.

S37 There was a public protection coordinator and public protection work was good. There was a high number of MAPPAs (multi-agency public protection arrangements) and nominals (individuals targeted for legitimate security reasons), and there were robust systems to

identify and inform relevant departments of prisoners subject to public protection measures. Public protection meetings were well attended and addressed key issues.

- S38 Resettlement needs were appropriately identified in a questionnaire undertaken by an orderly in induction, and again six weeks before discharge. Pathway provision was variable, and in our survey most prisoners reported being unaware of available help. Prisoner orderlies provided advice and support for some pathways, but there was no specialist training for officers or orderlies dealing with resettlement needs.
- S39 There was a well organised prisoner-led housing advice service, but no longer any specialist support from Shelter. The housing advice orderlies worked with a significant number of prisoners and were supported by designated staff. There was no specialist finance, benefit or debt provision, although education staff ran a budget management course, and prisoners were assisted to open bank accounts.
- S40 Health care arrangements for the discharge of patients were good and planning started three weeks before release. Support for prisoners being released with substance use problems had improved, with good links to drug intervention programme teams and appropriate access to community clinical management.
- S41 Although visits sessions started on time, some visitors could wait for long periods before coming into the visits hall and missed some of their visiting time as a result. The visits hall itself was clean, but many of the chairs looked dirty. We observed some very good interactions between staff and visitors. There was a visitors' waiting room outside the prison, but it was not an effective visitors' centre. The understanding family relationships course had been completed by very few prisoners, and there was nobody to deliver it at the time of inspection. Storybook Dads (a charity which enables prisoners to record a story for their children) was inappropriately restricted to prisoners who undertook the creative writing course. There were regular family days but only for enhanced prisoners, and they had to pay a substantial contribution to attend.
- S42 RAPt (Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust) and the healthy relationships programme were the only accredited offending behaviour programmes, and some victim awareness need was met by the Sycamore Tree programme. The crime diversion scheme was a very good initiative which provided an impressive service to the community, as well as purposeful and challenging work for a few prisoners.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S43 **Concern:** The night sanitation system remained degrading. It had a significant negative impact on prisoners' general experience of life at Coldingley.
- Recommendation: Prisoners should be able to use toilet facilities 24 hours a day, without undue delay.**
- S44 **Concern:** Diversity provision was poor and lacked leadership and management. Little had been done to assess or address the needs of prisoners with protected characteristics.
- Recommendation: Diversity provision should be robustly managed in line with a clear strategy. The needs of prisoners with protected characteristics should be identified and met, and the negative perceptions of particular groups should be investigated and acted on.**

S45 **Concern:** Although the modern workshops allowed prisoners to develop good work skills, this was not reflected in the qualifications that were available to them. This was a missed opportunity to enhance prisoners' employability on release.

Recommendation: There should be a range of qualifications that accredit the specific vocational skills obtained by prisoners, including higher level qualifications for specialised work.

Section 1. Safety

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1** Prisoners were positive about escorting arrangements and we found no evidence of prolonged waits to enter the prison. Efficient liaison with the escort contractor had removed concerns about reception opening times.
- 1.2** Survey results and responses from prisoner groups were generally positive about experiences of escort procedures. Most prisoners arriving at Coldingley travelled relatively short distances. There was efficient liaison with the escort contractor, GEOAmev, who informed the prison when escort vehicles were within 30 minutes of the prison. This ensured that staff were available to meet prisoners on arrival, and to start reception procedures or locate prisoners on the induction wing following basic safety interviews.
- 1.3** Prisoners were not given enough notice of transfer and we saw one prisoner being transferred to open conditions with only an hour's notice. Vehicles that we observed were clean and in good order and carried the necessary sanitary equipment and refreshments.

Housekeeping point

- 1.4** Prisoners should be given sufficient notice of transfer to be able to contact their families, subject to security considerations.

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** Reception procedures were thorough and few prisoners spent long periods in reception. A number of prisoners were critical of their treatment by staff. First night arrangements had improved and induction was reasonably effective but started too late for some prisoners.
- 1.6** In our survey, 65% of prisoners against the comparator of 72% said they were treated well by staff and, in our groups, prisoners spoke of being treated disrespectfully by reception staff. We were unable to confirm this during the inspection and the sample of 15 of the most

recent 50 arrivals whom we spoke to individually reported reasonable and efficient treatment by staff.

- I.7** Records showed that very few prisoners remained in reception for over two hours after arrival. Searching and interview procedures were thorough and appropriately managed, with sufficient privacy. The environment was clean and tidy and notices in waiting rooms displayed useful information about the prison. Televisions had been installed but had not been included in the digital upgrade and so remained unused. The two reception orderlies were trained Listeners (prisoners selected and trained to support those at risk of self-harm) and provided newcomers with a drink and the opportunity to raise any concerns. Reception grocery and smokers' packs were available for prisoners and more were supplied if needed until the first delivery of goods from the prison shop.
- I.8** First day and first night arrangements were generally good. All prisoners had a safety screening interview, a briefing by staff and a further briefing by prisoner peer supporters. Prisoners were offered the opportunity to shower and to use the office telephone to call relatives.
- I.9** Access to stored property was good and there were very few outstanding requests for access. Property could be handed in for newly arrived prisoners on one visit up to the local 'in-possession' allowance, and a further hand-in was allowed after six months.
- I.10** Most arriving prisoners were located on C wing where a first-night check sheet had been introduced to record initial contact by night staff and additional observations. This was not replicated on the other wings, including the drug treatment wing, where new prisoners were occasionally located.
- I.11** Induction started on the Monday after arrival and some prisoners could wait up to six days to receive important information on regime services and routines. Additional induction sessions were run when there was a large number of new arrivals, but this was rare. Induction was predominantly delivered by a prisoner orderly, appropriately supplemented by sessions from key departments. Sessions were timetabled across three days and prisoners were not locked up for lengthy periods during the process. A comprehensive booklet explaining the regime and available services was issued to prisoners. In our survey, 88% of prisoners said they had undergone induction but only 68% said it covered all necessary information. There was an induction room but we observed induction sessions being delivered in an association room because wing staff had not prepared the dedicated room.

Recommendation

- I.12** **Prisoners should receive a full induction promptly after arrival.**

Housekeeping points

- I.13** The first night checking procedure should be extended to all residential units.
- I.14** The television in reception should work.
- I.15** The induction room should be prepared for use whenever necessary.

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.

- I.16** Most prisoners reported feeling safe but a significant number said they were victimised by staff. The number of fights and assaults was low. Attendance at safer custody meetings was not broad enough and safety indicators were not monitored over time to identify trends. 'Learning lesson' investigations were good. Population management meetings were effective. Anti-bullying prisoner representatives were well supported.
- I.17** Few prisoners said they felt unsafe in our groups and, in our survey, only 9% of prisoners said they currently felt unsafe against the comparator of 13%. However, 31% of prisoners said they had been victimised by staff against a category C prison comparator of 25%. Verbal insults were the main form of victimisation reported.
- I.18** There was no local safer custody policy covering violence reduction or self-harm, but the prison was relatively safe and indicators of violence were low. During 2012, there had been 16 fights, seven assaults on staff, 18 assaults on prisoners and 13 unexplained injuries.
- I.19** The safer custody team comprised a senior manager, senior officer and officer. Monthly safer custody meetings were attended by Listeners and anti-bullying representatives but attendance from other departments was poor. The security department rarely attended. Minutes suggested that issues were not discussed in detail. Separate monthly strategic safer custody meetings without prisoners had started shortly before our inspection. Minutes were not taken but action points were circulated by email.
- I.20** The monthly safer custody report was discussed at safer custody meetings. The report provided a snapshot of safety indicators but did not monitor trends over time. The 2011 anti-bullying survey had not identified major themes and had not been repeated. Safer custody 'learning lesson' investigations - conducted following self-harm incidents, assaults and fights - were thorough and generated meaningful actions. There were productive weekly population management meetings, attended by a wide range of staff from across the prison to discuss the management of at-risk and challenging prisoners.
- I.21** Bullying was managed largely through action plans and monitoring for perpetrators and victims. During 2012, 32 perpetrator intervention plans had been opened and 10 victim support plans, which was less than the previous year. Debt and ongoing feuds from outside prison were common triggers for violent incidents. It was notable that a number of prisoners were located in the segregation unit pending transfer because they felt unsafe in the main wings (see paragraph I.64).
- I.22** The nine anti-bullying representatives had job descriptions and met the violence reduction officer regularly. They told us that they felt well supported. The offenders' family helpline was promoted in the visits hall and offered visitors the opportunity to raise safety concerns. We left a message on the helpline and were called back within 40 minutes.

Recommendations

- I.23 Prisoners' perceptions of victimisation by staff should be investigated and acted on.**
- I.24 There should be a local safer custody policy.**

Housekeeping points

- I.25** Staff from across the prison, including the security department, should attend the monthly safer custody meetings.
- I.26** The monthly safer custody report should monitor trends over time.

Self-harm and suicide

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.27** The number of self-harm incidents was low. Prisoners in crisis were well cared for. ACCT (assessment, care in custody and teamwork) documentation was good but case reviews were not sufficiently multidisciplinary enough. There was good support from Samaritans and Listeners but access arrangements for Listeners required improvement. The safer cell was austere and dirty. Not all night staff were able to deal with first aid emergencies.
- I.28** Self-harm incidents were less frequent than in comparable prisons. Twelve prisoners had self-harmed a total of 24 times in the previous six months, with one prisoner self-harming seven times. There had been no self-inflicted deaths since our last inspection. The prison had acted on the recommendation of the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman following a death from natural causes in 2012. There was no self-harm policy (see recommendation I.24).
 - I.29** The three prisoners on ACCTs at the time of the inspection were well cared for. The numbers of open ACCTs had decreased from 95 in 2011 to 85 in 2012. ACCT documentation was generally good. However, the specific triggers for self-harm were not properly recorded, attendance at case reviews was not sufficiently multidisciplinary and the quality of observation entries varied. The mental health in-reach team attended many reviews and provided excellent support.
 - I.30** Prisoners had access to the Samaritans, whose number was displayed on telephones. Cordless Samaritan telephones enabled prisoners to phone from their cells at night but there were few notices promoting their use. The nine Listeners received good training and support and provided a good service. At least one Listener resided on each wing except A wing. The Listeners' suite was fit for purpose. However, in our survey, only 41% of prisoners said it was easy to speak to a Listener against the comparator of 58%, and there had been a similar drop in this survey finding since the previous inspection. The reasons for this were unclear, but Listeners told us that night staff did not always allow them access to the Listeners' suite, rather encouraging them to see prisoners in their cells. The sanitation system also had to be

suspended for them to move around during the night, which limited the time that Listeners felt they could spend with prisoners.

- I.31** Prisoners who were attempting to self-harm were located to a safer cell on E wing which was austere and dirty. It contained strip-clothing laid out on the bed, suggesting that this was used or at least considered as a matter of routine, which was inappropriate. The clothing was removed during our inspection. Not all night staff were first aid trained or knew where to find defibrillators, but they all carried anti-ligature knives.

Recommendations

- I.32** Prisoners' access to Listeners should be reviewed and any restrictions effectively addressed. At least one Listener should be located on each wing and ways to contact the Samaritans should be prominently advertised.
- I.33** Night staff should receive refresher first aid training, and sufficient first aid trained staff should be on duty at night.
- I.34** Events that could trigger a crisis should be recorded on ACCT documents, case reviews should be sufficiently multidisciplinary and observation entries should be detailed and meaningful.

Housekeeping point

- I.35** The environment in the safer cell should be therapeutic and clean.

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.36** There were good links between the prison and local authority safeguarding board, and a draft safeguarding policy and memorandum of understanding had been agreed to protect vulnerable adults.

- I.37** Screening procedures and comprehensive assessments of risk were carried out during the prisoner's first few days in the establishment; these included cell-sharing risk assessments, initial identification of disability and health care interviews.

- I.38** Protocols for staff if they became aware that an adult at risk might have been abused or injured during his time in custody were less clear. Staff we spoke to were not fully aware of formal procedures, but were focused on relevant issues and their personal responsibility to protect prisoners at risk. The safer custody manager had arranged for staff to receive awareness training.

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).

- I.39** The prison had established links with the Surrey safeguarding board to help identify the threshold at which formal adult protection protocols should be introduced. A draft safeguarding policy and memorandum of understanding had been agreed to manage vulnerable adults in need of community care services.

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.40** Procedural security was well managed and dynamic security was effective. The security committee was properly constructed, and meetings were well attended. There was good analysis of intelligence to inform effective risk management systems. On the whole, security procedures were proportionate and did not interfere with the prisoner's ability to access a full regime.

- I.41** The security department was effectively managed by an operational governor supported by security managers and trained security analysts. The condition of the fabric of the prison was adequate and we found no obvious weaknesses or anomalies in physical and procedural security. Regular checks and routine searches of perimeter fences and walls, communal areas and activities buildings took place every day.

- I.42** Risk assessments and management systems were effective and included the use of information on the prisoner's recent behaviour in custody and historic data to inform assessments. A register was in place to identify and manage risks associated with prisoners who could safely attend education areas and workshops. Although there were a few appropriate restrictions on where higher-risk prisoners could work, we saw no evidence of the prison being risk averse in terms of allocating activity spaces to prisoners. This was particularly impressive given the number of large, complex industrial workshops in the prison.

- I.43** The security department received an average of 385 security information reports (SIRs) each month which were processed and categorised by security collators and analysts. Intelligence was communicated effectively to other areas of the prison, particularly the residential areas, to enable them to make informed decisions about prisoners or to take necessary action. The security team analysed common patterns in information and monitored the progress of actions generated by SIRs.

- I.44** Data were collated into a comprehensive monthly intelligence report, which included violence reduction, disorder and control, and drug issues, and this was presented to a well constructed security committee each month. The level of support for security committee meetings was indicative of the priority given to security information and intelligence across the establishment. Monthly security objectives were agreed following appropriate consideration of intelligence.

- I.45** The prison operated a free flow system to allow supervised prisoner movement at the beginning and end of planned regime activities. Supervision was unobtrusive and prisoners walked freely to most areas. Prisoners could attend appointments at other times by using

movement slips issued on their residential unit which enabled them to walk freely from one part of the prison to another without escort.

- I.46** Three prisoners were on closed visits at the time of inspection, relating to suspicion of abuse of the visiting procedure. Six visitors were banned, and these bans had been reviewed monthly by the security committee.
- I.47** There was an effective drug supply reduction strategy with assertive security management and good sharing of intelligence with the police. In the full year to the end of March 2013, the mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was 7.64% against a target of 8%. Attempts to import new psycho-active substances - commonly enhanced forms of cannabis - were a constant challenge. The loss of a passive drug dog had increased opportunities for adverse activity and this had coincided with a surge in MDT positive results in August 2012 to 19.23%. An effective action plan in September 2012, which included borrowing a passive drug dog and using police passive drug dogs on the entry road to the prison, had brought the situation under control. The pain management clinic had substantially reduced the number of divertible prescribed medications in the prison.

Incentives and earned privileges³

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.48** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme operated consistently across the prison. There was a reasonable differential between levels and the regime for the very small number of prisoners on basic included evening association. There was evidence that the scheme was appropriately administered by residential managers, although many prisoners felt that the scheme was not applied fairly.
- I.49** The incentives and earned privileges policy described the three incentive levels, basic, standard and enhanced; how prisoners could progress, and the standards of expected behaviour. Copies of the policy were available to prisoners on induction and on all residential wings.
- I.50** At the time of our inspection, 39% of prisoners were on the standard regime, 61% enhanced and less than 1% on basic. Prisoners on basic received a case review every seven days. They could attend purposeful activity and visits, and use the telephone during the evening. The scheme offered differentials such as in access to private cash and computer games, which were reasonable.
- I.51** Documents that we examined showed that the scheme was implemented consistently across the residential units, and prisoners were given warning notices when appropriate. Despite this, prisoners had negative perceptions of the scheme: in our survey, 50% said that they had been treated fairly by the scheme against the comparator of 55%.

³ In the 2010 report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

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.52 Most records of hearings that we sampled showed that they were conducted fairly and that punishment was appropriate and consistent, but a few appeared rushed. Some charges were minor and could have been better dealt with informally. Incidents involving the use of force were reasonably infrequent and written accounts from staff gave assurance that it was used as a last resort. Governance arrangements were reasonable but the analysis of information to help identify trends and patterns was weak. The use of segregation had greatly reduced since the last inspection but the regime for the significant number of longer-stay prisoners remained poor. Staff interacted respectfully with prisoners but case management and reintegration planning were not effective enough. The environment was dark and dreary.

Disciplinary procedures

- I.53** The number of formal adjudications was fairly high at an average of 75 a month, an increase of about 24 a month compared to the last inspection. Most records of hearings that we examined showed that proceedings were conducted fairly and that punishments were appropriate and consistent. However, a few appeared rushed and did not give assurance that charges were thoroughly investigated or that prisoners were given the opportunity to give their version of events. Some charges were petty and could have been dealt with less formally.
- I.54** Adjudication standardisation meetings took place quarterly and attendance by adjudicating governors was good. Monthly statistics on the number and nature of adjudications were presented for analysis and results of proven offences were communicated to managers to identify trends and deal with problem areas as they arose.

The use of force

- I.55** Incidents involving the use of force were not excessive at about 51 in the six months from October 2012 to March 2013. About 31% of these reflected the routine handcuffing of prisoners relocating to the segregation unit, regardless of their compliance. About 20% of all incidents were planned and 80% were spontaneous, similar to the previous inspection.
- I.56** Monitoring arrangements were reasonable, with links to the security committee and the senior management team. Incidents were discussed at the monthly security committee meetings. A senior governor quality checked all associated documentation. Information on the nature of the incident, its location, the ethnicity and age of the prisoner was collated each month, but analysis to identify and address emerging patterns and trends was underdeveloped.
- I.57** There was no evidence that force was used unnecessarily or as a first resort. Intervention was well organised and carried out, and documentation was generally completed appropriately. Proper authority was recorded and senior staff supervised most incidents. Examined documentation suggested that force was only justified when it was reasonable in the circumstances and was proportionate to the incident.

Recommendations

- I.58** All prisoners should be given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events relating to the charge, and all charges should be fully investigated.
- I.59** Data on the use of force, such as ethnicity, location, reasons for use and staff involved, should be monitored for emerging patterns and trends, and appropriate action taken to address identified issues.
- I.60** Handcuffs should only be used when escorting prisoners to the segregation unit if an active risk assessment supports their use.

Segregation

- I.61** The segregation unit was situated along a secure corridor near the residential wings. There were 11 cells and no special accommodation. Living conditions were mixed. Communal landings were clean but the environment was dark and cramped with little natural light. Cells were reasonably clean and adequately furnished but some were grubby and in-cell toilets were dirty. The two exercise yards were grim and resembled cages, and there was a lack of activity space for longer-stay prisoners.
- I.62** Prisoners arriving on the unit were searched thoroughly and respectfully. They were rarely strip-searched and only following an assessment of risk, authorised by a senior officer.
- I.63** The use of segregation remained significant but had declined since the last inspection. There had been about 90 separate cases of segregation in the six months before the inspection, a reduction of about 25 cases a month. The routine practice of segregating prisoners before adjudication had ceased: this had accounted for about a third of the number at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.64** A number of prisoners used segregation as a route out of the prison, usually because they felt unsafe. In the previous six months, more than half the segregated prisoners had refused to locate on other wings, and most of these had been transferred to other category C prisons. At the time of inspection, there were four prisoners on the unit, all waiting to be transferred to other prisons.
- I.65** The average length of stay in segregation was about 14 days but individual cases were significantly longer. For example, 25% remained segregated for over three weeks and 12% had been segregated for between 30 and 60 days. Reviews of longer-stay prisoners were timely and well attended, but formal planning to return them to normal location was not well developed and there was no individual care planning. There was some evidence of staff supporting prisoners as best they could but resources were limited and the regime was poor.
- I.66** The daily activity programme included only about an hour each day for prisoners to use telephones and showers and exercise. Exercise was limited to 30 minutes a day. We were told that education staff attended segregation every weekday but we could see no evidence of this. In reality, prisoners spent nearly all the day locked in their cells with nothing meaningful to do.
- I.67** Strategic oversight of the unit had recently improved and the segregation monitoring and review group had begun to meet quarterly to discuss broad managerial issues. The analysis of information for emerging trends and patterns had not been developed and attendance at meetings was poor.

Recommendations

- I.68** Care plans should be raised for all prisoners relocating to the segregation unit for their own protection, with an emphasis on reintegrating them to mainstream location.
- I.69** All prisoners in the segregation unit should receive at least one hour in the open air every day.
- I.70** The regime for longer-stay prisoners should be improved and should include purposeful activity and time out of cell.

Housekeeping point

- I.71** The analysis of information to identify trends and patterns should be developed.

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.72** Support for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems was good. Services had improved since the previous inspection, with an emphasis on reducing dependence. Not all clinical options were available and the mandatory drug testing environment was not fit for purpose.
- I.73** In our survey, 32% of prisoners said they had a problem with drugs on entry to Coldingley against the comparator of 23%. Peer support workers provided outreach during induction and ongoing encouragement. Prisoners described a good quality service.
 - I.74** CARAT (counselling, assessment, referral, advice and through care) workers saw all new prisoners and the IDTS (integrated drug treatment system) staff saw those with clinical needs; they were appropriately qualified and worked within national guidelines. Medicines were administered individually behind a closed door. Subutex (an opiate substitute) was not available, even if it was clinically indicated, contrary to national guidelines. There was a mental health nurse with a special interest in patients with dual diagnosis. Smoking cessation support was available from the IDTS team.
 - I.75** The MDT (mandatory drug testing) suite was well staffed but, despite refurbishment, it was not fit for purpose. The three holding rooms were cold and so small that tall people could not stand in them. The main area was congested and the urinal was in the administration area of the suite. There was no privacy screen between the urinal and the door to the main corridor and no toilet. Routine administration and testing were done on the same porous work surface so that there was a constant risk of contamination by urine. All prisoners testing positive were referred to CARATs. Few prisoners refused to take a test; those who did were reported for adjudication. Penalties had been appropriately adjusted since our last inspection so that refusal offered no advantage.
 - I.76** Services were out to tender at the time of the inspection. There were strategies for substance misuse and alcohol services based on a needs analysis and underpinned by action

plans. Monthly drug strategy meetings were well attended and reported against strategic targets.

- I.77** In our survey, 83% of prisoners said there was good support for drug problems against the comparator of 64%. They had access to a range of CARATs courses, some of which were accredited, and rapid entry to the RAPt (Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust) programme on E wing, where they stayed for prolonged periods following completion of the programme to ensure that change was embedded. There was a positive atmosphere on the unit with good staff-prisoner relationships and attitudes. Prisoners were very positive about the benefits of the programme. During 2012-2013, CARATs exceeded key performance targets with 105 new initial assessments (target 80), 134 care plans opened (target 80) and 79 release plans (target 72). A dedicated worker offered prisoners with alcohol problems individual and group intervention work. Several self-help groups, such as Alcoholics or Narcotics Anonymous, visited the prison each week to offer support to prisoners.
- I.78** Psychosocial interventions were well integrated with clinical treatment through multidisciplinary case reviews. Individual packages of care met needs appropriately. During the six months to the end of March 2013, 114 patients had been in clinical treatment, of whom 32 were on maintenance and 82 on reducing regimes, which was appropriate. There was an active approach to compact-based drug testing. There had been 954 tests in the same six-month period, of which six were positive with only 2-3% refusals.

Recommendations

- I.79** **Mandatory drug testing facilities should be relocated and made fit for purpose.**
- I.80** **Clinically indicated medications should be available to prisoners in line with national guidance.**

Good practice

- I.81** *The excellent RAPt rehabilitation programme was well managed and delivered effective treatment to participants, who valued its transforming effect.*

Section 2. Respect

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

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 Wings A to D were cramped and communal areas were in poor condition. Many toilet areas were in a very poor state. Cages outside windows were dirty and decrepit. The automated sanitation system remained degrading. Conditions on E wing were better. The application system was effective despite the lack of management scrutiny. The number of telephones had increased since our last inspection. Laundry facilities on wings were adequate but not all prisoners were supplied with enough clean bedding. Prisoners had difficulty getting cleaning materials. Prisoners had difficulty accessing stored property.

2.2 On wings A to D, prisoners were held in single cells apart from one double cell on each landing. Landings and cells were cramped. Despite efforts to keep them clean, communal areas and showers were in poor condition and in need of refurbishment. Some toilet areas had been refurbished but most were in a very poor state. A programme to replace cages outside windows had begun but many were rusting, decrepit and filthy. Litter thrown from windows was strewn around the older blocks, although much of it was removed during our inspection. There was no in-cell sanitation or drinking water. An automated unlock system was used for the toilet. By pressing a button prisoners were held in a queue until they were unlocked one by one for a maximum of eight minutes. Prisoners under the age of 60 could use the toilet three times during the night; there were no restrictions for older prisoners. The system failed completely on the Saturday before our inspection and prisoners were issued with buckets, which was degrading. Prolonged waits for the toilet were a regular feature and had an impact on prisoners' general experience of life in the prison. Some prisoners had thrown urine or faeces out of cell windows rather than keep them in their cells (see main recommendation S43). Most prisoners reported they could have a shower every day, but there was queuing at peak times, and, as at the last inspection, the number of showers appeared insufficient to meet the need.

2.3 Conditions on E wing were better, with 115 prisoners held in single cells and 16 in double cells. All cells had integral sanitation. Two cells were adapted for wheelchair users and provided a good environment. The wing was clean and well lit. All prisoners had courtesy keys to their cells. F wing contained five cells, each with two D-category prisoners. Prisoners shared a lounge and pool table. The strategic purpose of the unit in the resettlement of prisoners was unclear (see recommendation 4.23).

2.4 In our survey, 61% of prisoners against the comparator of 71% said that it was quiet enough for them to relax or sleep at night time, with loud music being a common complaint. Sixty-nine per cent said they received cell cleaning materials every week against the comparator of 74% and 78% at the previous inspection. We met some prisoners who were forced to clean

their cells with mops that were also used to clean toilet areas. Staff told us that additional cleaning materials had been purchased but not yet distributed.

- 2.5** The applications system worked well. Prisoners completed applications in triplicate and retained one copy. Managers did not monitor the effectiveness or efficiency of the system but two-thirds of prisoners in our survey said they were dealt with fairly.
- 2.6** Access to telephones had improved since our last inspection. As well as telephones on the ground floor of the older units, telephones had been added to the first and second floor landings. Prisoners' families could use the 'email a prisoner' scheme.
- 2.7** Laundry facilities on the wings had improved since our last inspection. Each wing had its own laundry staffed by a laundry worker. In our survey, two-thirds of prisoners compared to only half at our last inspection said they were offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week. Sheets and bedding were laundered off site and prisoners in our groups complained that bedding did not always come back clean. Fewer prisoners (62%) than the comparator (81%) said that they received clean sheets every week.
- 2.8** Prisoners had difficulty accessing stored property. In our survey, only 15% of prisoners against the comparator of 28% said they could normally get their stored property if they needed to. Unlike other category C prisons, friends and family could bring property to the prison, albeit only during a 28-day period once every six months.

Recommendations

- 2.9** The old metal cages outside cell windows on A to D wings should be removed or replaced and kept in a good state of repair.
- 2.10** The old toilet recesses and showers on A to D wings should be refurbished and well maintained.
- 2.11** There should be sufficient showers for the population.
- 2.12** Residential units should be quiet enough in the evenings and at night to enable relaxation and sleep. Staff should consistently challenge prisoners who play loud music.

Housekeeping points

- 2.13** Prisoners should have access to cell cleaning materials, clean sheets and bedding every week.
- 2.14** Managers should ensure that prisoners can easily access their stored property.

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.

- 2.15** Staff-prisoner relationships were reasonable, but many prisoners complained of dismissive treatment, particularly some of the minority groups. Personal officer work was generally good but sometimes inconsistent.
- 2.16** We observed mostly relaxed and appropriate staff-prisoner interactions. However, in our survey, 71% of prisoners against the comparator of 78% said that most staff treated them with respect. Responses were worse than the comparator across the range of questions on relationships. A number of prisoners reported dismissive or uncaring behaviour. With few exceptions, most staff now addressed prisoners politely in written and verbal communications.
- 2.17** The perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners were especially negative in terms of respectful treatment. There had not been any effective or sustained work to investigate this, although we had highlighted this in our previous inspection (see main recommendation S44 and diversity and equality section).
- 2.18** We saw examples of very good personal officer work in contact records, demonstrating a focus on family contact, progression and resettlement. However, many personal officer entries were irregular and too many focused on wing behaviour. In our survey, only 56% of prisoners, against a comparator of 64%, said they found their personal officers helpful. Management checks were regular and had motivated some improvements.
- 2.19** Although consultation through the prisoner council had led to some changes, too many issues were rolled over from meeting to meeting without resolution. Minutes reflected little detailed discussion.

Recommendation

- 2.20** **Personal officers should speak to prisoners regularly, provide support and help them to achieve their resettlement targets.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.21** Action points from prisoner council meetings should be swiftly and rigorously followed up.

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 characteristic⁴ 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.

⁴ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

2.22 The diversity policy was comprehensive and should have guided appropriate actions to support diversity. Management had been inconsistent and poorly focused, and the delivery of the diversity policy had been poor and in some areas non-existent. Specific consultation arrangements for minority groups were inadequate and there was little support for prisoners with protected characteristics, with the exception of prisoner diversity orderlies and some recent older prisoner forums.

Strategic management

- 2.23** The diversity policy was comprehensive. It outlined the prison's legislative responsibilities and local procedures to support diversity, including identifying and supporting prisoners with protected characteristics. At the time of the inspection, delivery of the strategy was poor and successive changes in key personnel had resulted in many of the previously well established and managed procedures ceasing to operate.
- 2.24** Bimonthly diversity team meetings chaired by the governor or deputy governor were reasonably well attended, but did not always run according to the schedule, with long periods between meetings or two in quick succession. Some elements of diversity were not considered and there was little evidence of any directive action.
- 2.25** Consultation with prisoners was poor; we could find no evidence of investigation of the poor perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners highlighted at our last inspection (see main recommendation S44). Even recent prisoner representative meetings had been so poorly attended that they had been abandoned. We were told that there had been a Gypsy-Traveller group but this had not run for some time and we were unable to locate any minutes.
- 2.26** Monthly monitoring was restricted to race and there was no analysis of access to services or regime for any other minority groups. Action points were identified from the monitoring, but we were unable to identify any resulting actions in the minutes of subsequent meetings.
- 2.27** Discrimination incident report forms were freely available. The quality of investigations and responses was reasonably good overall. In one case the actions taken in response to admitted inappropriate language from a member of staff were not robust and appeared dismissive. Prisoners questioned the integrity of the system as a result.
- 2.28** The chaplaincy ran faith awareness training. Staff training was otherwise limited to the 'Challenge it Change it' programme.
- 2.29** Each wing had a nominated diversity representative and two paid diversity orderlies worked out of an office in the A to D corridor. The orderlies offered a drop-in service to prisoners and, although untrained, they provided a useful conduit to the diversity administration worker who referred issues to managers as appropriate. The orderlies said that they had previously received effective support but this had now ceased. The wing representatives had no formal function and were primarily used to pass information to the diversity orderlies.

Recommendations

- 2.30** **The diversity meeting should take place regularly and should consider all elements of diversity.**

- 2.31 All areas of diversity should be monitored and data should be examined by the diversity and race equality action team to identify patterns and trends; action should be taken to address evidence of imbalance.**
- 2.32 Staff should receive training in all aspects of diversity.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.33** Robust action should be taken to address discrimination incident reports that are shown to be justified.

Protected characteristics

- 2.34** Identification of and support for prisoners with protected characteristics was almost non-existent. With the exception of a recently initiated focus group for older prisoners, there had been no recent consideration of any other groups. Black and minority ethnic prisoners comprised approximately 39% of the population, and generally reported more negatively than white prisoners in our survey.
- 2.35** Services for the 31 foreign nationals held were very limited and we found evidence of reluctance to facilitate the provision of services. There was a foreign national policy, but it did not reflect practice or provision. Foreign national prisoners were identified by the diversity administration officer, but their entitlements were not communicated to them effectively and there was a poor uptake. A free telephone call to families abroad was usually only allowed if the prisoner had received no domestic visits during the previous month. There was very little material in other languages, although a list of multilingual staff and prisoners was available to staff via P-Nomis (Prison Service IT system). The prison had a contract with an external interpretation and translation service but many staff were unaware of this and we did not see any evidence of its use. Contact with the UK Border Agency was minimal and there was no independent immigration advice service. Very few books in other languages were held in the library and there had been no consideration of the demographics of the population to inform provision.
- 2.36** In our survey, prisoners with disabilities responded more negatively across a range of issues including problems on arrival, the IEP scheme, victimisation, feeling safe and mental health issues. There was little support for such prisoners and personal emergency evacuation procedures were haphazard and inconsistently managed. Links between the disability liaison officer and identified lead nurse were poor and information sharing was inadequate. There were two adapted cells on E wing with wheelchair access: they were large and well equipped, with wide doors, grip rails and a wet area, but the wash basins remained too small. Lifts had been installed on E wing and in the central area between the old wings to enable access to health care, offender management unit and the chapel.
- 2.37** About 12% of the population was aged over 50, with the oldest being 73. Retirement pay was reasonable, but retired prisoners still had to pay for their televisions. The recently introduced older prisoners' group offered some support and some issues raised there had led to adjustments to the regime to improve the experience of older prisoners. The over-50s gym sessions were popular for more active prisoners, but there was little for less able prisoners.
- 2.38** There was no identification of gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners and no identified support.

Recommendations

- 2.39** Older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities should be identified on reception and there should be effective liaison between health care and the disability/older prisoners liaison officer to ensure that appropriate levels of support are provided.
- 2.40** All foreign national prisoners should be offered a free telephone call each month to keep in touch with family abroad.
- 2.41** Retired prisoners should not be charged for their television.

Housekeeping points

- 2.42** The adapted cells on E wing should have larger wash basins.
- 2.43** Staff should be able to locate personal emergency and evacuation plans easily.

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.

- 2.44** The chaplaincy was well integrated into the daily life of the prison. Faith services and facilities were good.
- 2.45** The chaplaincy met the religious needs of the population. Services were very good, regular activities took place in the three well-equipped faith areas and a full calendar of religious festivals was recognised and celebrated.
- 2.46** The chaplaincy was well represented in a range of areas, including security, safety, diversity and offender management meetings where appropriate. Bereavement services and the prison visitors' scheme were managed and run by the chaplaincy.

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.

- 2.47** The number of complaints had reduced since our last inspection. Complaints were not monitored by outcome or over time. Replies were generally timely but often superficial and failed to address the issue raised.

- 2.48** Complaints boxes and forms were located on each wing. We submitted a test complaint and were contacted two days later. In the six months before our inspection, 571 complaints had been submitted, compared with 718 over the same period at our last inspection.
- 2.49** In our survey, 32% of prisoners against the comparator of 39% said that complaints were dealt with quickly. Despite this, most complaints that we examined and the prisons own figures showed that replies were timely. However, notwithstanding scrutiny by a governor, replies were often superficial and dismissive and failed to address the issues raised.
- 2.50** Complaints were monitored by various indicators but trends over time and outcomes were not analysed. A monthly report was produced and reviewed by the governor but was not a standing agenda item at the senior management team meeting.
- 2.51** While there were notices promoting the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO), prisoners who submitted a stage two complaint were not systematically advised of their right to appeal to the PPO.

Recommendation

- 2.52** **Replies to complaints should be thorough and polite and should address the issues raised.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.53** Analysis of complaints should include monitoring of trends and outcomes over time.
- 2.54** Replies to stage two complaints should include information on how to complain to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman.

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.

- 2.55** Legal services were helpful but limited. Access to legal books in the library was poor. Arrangements for legal visits were reasonably good. Some prisoners were able to use Ministry of Justice laptops.

- 2.56** The two legal services officers provided a helpful but limited service. They did not have allocated facility time, formal training or dedicated office space. Access to legal text books and Prison Service Instructions was poor. In our survey, fewer prisoners (39%) than the comparator (44%) said that it was easy to get legal books in the library. Some legal text books were on display, but the most important ones were only available on request and we did not see any notices publicising their availability.
- 2.57** Solicitors told us they could communicate and book visits with prisoners easily. Legal visits were permitted two mornings a week, which was appropriate for the population. There were two rooms in the visits hall for private consultation but solicitors usually consulted

with prisoners in the open hall. The small number of legal visits which took place concurrently in such a large room meant confidentiality could be maintained. In our survey, 40% of prisoners said that mail from solicitors had been opened compared with 50% at the previous inspection.

- 2.58** Three prisoners had been allowed 'access to justice' laptops to help them work on their legal cases, and the waiting list was reviewed every three months. After a legal challenge, a prisoner had been allowed to burn evidence on to a CD for his solicitor.

Recommendation

- 2.59** **The legal services officers should be trained and allocated time to provide an appropriate service to all prisoners.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.60** Prisoners should be able to consult up-to-date and relevant legal text books and Prison Service Instructions in the library.

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.

- 2.61** Prisoners received a very good level of health care and they were very satisfied with the quality of care. They generally had easy access to services, including specialist staff trained to meet the requirements of the population, but there were delays in seeing the dentist and optician. Pharmacy services were very good and a high level of dental care was delivered. Primary and secondary mental health care was delivered to a good standard.

Governance arrangements

- 2.62** Commissioning had very recently changed to the NHS Commissioning Board; most services were provided by Virgin Care and Surrey and Borders Primary Care Trust provided secondary mental health services. The governor was well informed of the changes and continued to have a working relationship with the health care manager through the partnership board. The health care manager regularly attended senior management team meetings. Prisoners were generally positive about the quality of health care services but they were not happy with the waiting times to see the dentist and optician. The health care centre was located on the first floor of one of the wings and consisted of several clean, well decorated rooms suited to the care and treatment of patients. Access was good but we were told that the lift used by prisoners with disabilities was often not working.
- 2.63** The health needs assessment had been reviewed in 2012 and had been used to develop services appropriate to the population. The effective health care manager was supported by three senior nurses and there was one vacancy for a lead clinical nurse practitioner to

provide further enhancement to the service. The team of general and mental health nurses with support workers provided a good skill mix and range of services to meet the health care needs of prisoners.

- 2.64** Health care services were available throughout the week during the day, with a more limited service at weekends. The senior nurses divided their responsibilities to ensure that specialist needs were met, including the care of older prisoners. The health care manager monitored the training and development of staff and kept staff in date for mandatory elements. Staff were kept well informed of changes in health care policy. Clinical supervision was delivered informally on a group basis and this needed development, including the keeping of records.
- 2.65** Six GPs from a local practice delivered a clinic each weekday and out-of-hours cover was provided by the same service as the local community. Pharmacy services were provided by Virgin Care UK and prescriptions were made up in the pharmacy at High Down Prison and delivered to Coldingley daily. Pharmacy services were managed by health care staff, supported by a pharmacist and a pharmacy technician who visited each week on separate days. Dental care was delivered by a dentist and dental nurses from the community dental service who also provided holiday cover for the dentist. Four dental sessions were delivered each week, with an additional session when the waiting list was high. Electronic clinical records were maintained on SystmOne and the sample that we examined were well written and demonstrated patient involvement. Clinical records had been archived and stored appropriately, but recent paper records were kept in the administration office with no lockable cupboards. The office was small and poorly designed and located. Emergency resuscitation equipment was located in the health care centre and in E wing treatment room. Automated external defibrillators (AEDs) were located with the equipment and with discipline staff in the gym. Twenty-nine prison staff were in date for first aid training and three gym staff were trained in the use of the AED. Records of checks of equipment were well maintained.
- 2.66** A health care consultative meeting was held monthly with representatives from each wing; minutes of meetings were distributed across the prison. A token system had just started with patients grading the level of care they had received. One prisoner acted as coordinator for the patient advisory liaison service which helped to alleviate patients' concerns before they escalated to a formal complaint. There was an average of two complaints each month which were dealt with effectively and sensitively. A health promotion strategy was supported by an action plan to improve the health of prisoners and prevent disease. Health care and health promotion information was distributed in communal areas but very limited information was available on the wings.

Recommendation

- 2.67 Prisoners should have access to health care and health promotion information in a range of languages.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.68** All clinical supervision should be recorded.
- 2.69** The lift should be in consistent working order to enable access for prisoners with disabilities.
- 2.70** All clinical records should be stored in accordance with Caldicott guidelines (overseeing use and confidentiality of personal health information) and the Data Protection Act.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.71** A comprehensive health care screen was carried out in reception. A dedicated health care room was now available but it was not secured by a health care suite key. Health care information was provided for prisoners but only in English. Prisoners were able to see a nurse at the start of the day for a fitness to work clinic or at a triage clinic later in the day. In addition, a health care application could be submitted and prisoners were allocated to the appropriate clinic. A GP could be seen for routine appointments, usually within five days.
- 2.72** Prisoners on the segregation unit were seen every day by nursing staff and three times a week by a GP. Prisoners could also be seen by the mental health team when required. Relationships with staff on the unit were good. Health promotion services were satisfactory and there was a good range of screening and vaccination services and visiting specialist clinics. Health care staff worked well with gym staff to promote healthy lifestyles. Prisoners could obtain condoms from health care staff. Prisoners needing hospital appointments had two escort opportunities each weekday and the health care administrator was responsible for their efficient management. Cancellations through lack of escorts were very rare and relationships with the local hospital were very good.

Housekeeping point

- 2.73** The health care reception room should be secured with a health care suite key.

Pharmacy

- 2.74** Most prescribed medicines were given in possession on a named patient basis, at three medicine administration times from the pharmacy room in health care. Consideration was given to patient confidentiality and queues were orderly. The pharmacy was open from 8.30am to 5pm, with the last medicines administered at around 4.30pm. Twenty-four hour nursing care was not available and special consideration had to be given to patients requiring a dose of medication at night. There were good auditing procedures.
- 2.75** SystemOne (electronic case records) was used to create prescriptions and record the administration of medicines. Prisoners could ask to see the pharmacist, and medicine use review clinics were carried out weekly. The pharmacist was a prescriber specialising in minor ailments and skin conditions and could provide associated specialist advice and/or prescriptions where needed. The turnaround from prescribing to receipt of medicines by the patient was timely and efficient. The pharmacist and technician routinely checked the scanned prescriptions against the originals for accuracy.
- 2.76** The pharmacy team and GPs had recently worked together to reduce the number of patients receiving potent analgesics such as Pregabalin and Gabapentin from 80 patients to about 25. Medicine administration times had become more manageable as a result and the associated threat of diversion and bullying reduced.
- 2.77** Medicines and therapeutics committee meetings were held quarterly and there was a formulary in place which was adhered to. Stock, including controlled drug stock, was well managed with good procedures, but only methadone was audited each week. Other controlled drug stock was audited less frequently. The controlled drug cabinet in health care was screwed rather than bolted to the wall.

Housekeeping points

- 2.78** All controlled drug stock should be audited each week.
- 2.79** The controlled drug cabinets should be bolted to the wall.

Dentistry

- 2.80** Dental care and treatment was provided in one large surgery with an annex room for decontamination of instruments. The surgery was clean and well equipped but the decontamination room needed more storage cupboards to keep the work surfaces clear. Prisoners were very complimentary about the quality of care provided but waiting times for routine appointments were excessive. At the time of our inspection there were over 200 patients on the waiting list, with the longest waiting 11 weeks. Prisoners needing urgent dental care were seen quickly. Patients whom we observed were treated sensitively and their privacy was respected. The dentist and dental nurse provided them with appropriate information for their continued care. Emergency resuscitation equipment was shared with the health care centre and the dental surgery had its own supply of oxygen and dental emergency drugs. Dental health records were maintained on SystemOne.

Recommendation

- 2.81** Prisoners should have timely access to dental services.

Housekeeping point

- 2.82** Equipment should be stored appropriately to ensure the control of infection.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.83** Mental health care was provided by two mental health nurses on the primary care team and by a small in-reach team who were available each weekday. The secondary care caseload comprised about 12 patients each for the three in-reach nurses. Prisoners reported positively on the level and speed of care. Cases were managed in a multidisciplinary way and there were regular meetings with relevant prison departments, including a daily review of prisoners considered at greatest risk of developing mental health problems. Patients could see a psychiatrist, psychologist and counsellors. The in-reach team was able to refer patients to a learning disability nurse who offered assessments to four local prisons. Patients requiring transfer to secure mental health units were moved very quickly, although this was rarely required. Mental health awareness training had been provided for the staff of the segregation unit but this was not delivered more widely across the prison.

Recommendation

- 2.84** Mental health awareness training should be available to all prison staff.

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.

- 2.85** Prisoners were very critical of the quality of food in our survey, groups and discussions throughout the inspection. The kitchen was dirty and food trolleys were in a poor state. Meals were served too early and there was not enough opportunity to dine in association.
- 2.86** In our survey, 25% of prisoners said that the food was good or very good, a significant drop from 43% at the previous inspection. This was even worse for black and minority ethnic prisoners at only 14%. Prisoners in our groups told us that the kitchen was dirty, that meals were often served early and that portions were small and overcooked, with meals carbohydrate based and mostly potato, rice or pasta and often a combination of these. We saw meals that confirmed most of these reports.
- 2.87** We found the kitchen to be shabby with discoloration on walls, poor flooring and food trolleys in a poor state of repair. Of greater concern was the cleanliness of the area. Floors were dirty, food storage and preparation equipment had food baked on and trolleys used to transport meals to E wing were dirty.
- 2.88** The four-week cycle of meals included a healthy option and symbols next to food choices assisted prisoners with low literacy skills to select food items. Around 27 prisoners worked in the kitchen and, although they received basic food hygiene training, there were no opportunities to gain accredited qualifications.
- 2.89** Meals were served too early with lunch starting at 11.45am and dinner at 4.35pm. At weekends tea was scheduled at 4.30pm but we were told it was often served even earlier. The very meagre breakfast packs were issued the evening before and were often eaten during the evening. They consisted of 100g of cereal, a milk carton, tea bags and a sugar sachet. Ready access to fresh water was limited to E and F wings because of the lack of integral sanitation elsewhere.
- 2.90** Dining in association was rushed to meet the regime timetable on the older A to D wings and did not happen on the newer E wing. Consultation arrangements had not led to tangible progress.

Recommendations

- 2.91** There should be regular, thorough management oversight of the kitchen to ensure that appropriate levels of cleanliness are maintained.
- 2.92** The quality of food and balance of meals should be improved.
- 2.93** There should be effective catering and shop consultation arrangements that actively address the negative reports of prisoners.
- 2.94** Prisoners should be able to gain accredited qualifications in food preparation.
- 2.95** The quality and quantity of breakfast items should be improved.

2.96 Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm.

2.97 Prisoners on E wing should be allowed to dine in association.

Housekeeping point

2.98 Food trolleys should be repaired and appropriately maintained.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.99 The prison shop worked efficiently and the range of goods was adequate. Consultation with prisoners was ineffective.

2.100 The prison shop worked efficiently: orders were placed on Tuesday and delivered on Friday afternoon. Although prisoners arriving after Monday could wait up to 10 days for their first order, they were able to request more than one reception pack until delivery of their first order (see section on first days in custody).

2.101 In our survey, 32% of respondents said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods, against the comparator of 45% and 44% at Coldingley in 2010. The survey results from black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were especially poor. There was no meeting to discuss canteen, and consultation was limited to a brief item at the prisoner council meeting (see recommendation 2.93).

2.102 There was a satisfactory range of catalogues and prisoners could order newspapers and magazines through the library.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

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.⁵

3.1 Most prisoners had about 9.5 hours out of cell on Monday to Thursday and about seven hours on Fridays. The small but significant number of unemployed prisoners or prisoners on temporary work restrictions only had about four hours, while a small number of prisoners on F wing were permanently unlocked. At a roll check during the morning and afternoon of the core day, about 18% of the population were locked in their cells.

3.2 The published activity schedule for the core day indicated that a fully employed prisoner had just over 9.5 hours out of cell from Monday to Thursday and about seven hours on Friday and at the weekend.

3.3 Most prisoners had been assigned to an activity and, on the whole, unlock times were adhered to with little slippage caused by late unlocking. However, evening association was sometimes cancelled, for example from January to the end of March evening association had been cancelled on at least 12 occasions because of staff shortages.

3.4 We calculated that the actual time most prisoners spent out of their cells was eight to nine hours from Monday to Thursday and about seven hours on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. A few prisoners who remained at work during the lunch period and prisoners on F wing who were unlocked during the whole working day had about 10.5 hours out of cell.

3.5 The small number of prisoners who were temporarily unemployed or not required because of temporary work restrictions had only four hours unlocked on a weekday.

3.6 During roll checks in the morning and afternoons of the core day, we found that 18% of the population was locked in their cells.

Recommendations

3.7 Prisoners should spend at least 10 hours a day out of their cells.

3.8 Association should not be cancelled.

3.9 Prisoners should not routinely be locked in their cells if they are not required for work.

⁵ 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.

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.

- 3.10** There was clear strategic direction for learning and skills, but the overall management of activities required improvement. The self-assessment process had identified many of the areas for improvement. Data were collated but not used effectively to inform self-assessment or to manage learning and skills provision across the prison. There were sufficient places for the whole population to participate in work, education or training. A good range of work was provided for skilled and unskilled prisoners. Workshops provided a good working environment and were up to date and well resourced, with some commercial contract work. The range of education programmes was satisfactory and provided some progression to higher levels of training. The quality of teaching and learning varied from good in practical sessions to poor in some classroom sessions. Achievements were good, particularly in vocational, practical and employability training. A number of learning sessions were disrupted by poor attendance, unscheduled activities, inappropriate behaviour and language.
- 3.11** Ofsted⁶ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: | requires improvement |
| Quality of learning and skills and work provision: | requires improvement |
| Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: | requires improvement |

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.12** There was a clear strategic vision for the development of further training and work across the prison. The new OLASS (Offenders' Learning and Skills Services) contractor (A4e) had been appointed in November 2012. Communications between the prison and the contractor were good, but the prison's responsibility for monitoring the contract and coordinating all aspects of learning and skills was not being fulfilled. The overall management of learning and skills required improvement.
- 3.13** The range of education provision was adequate for the needs of most prisoners, but there was insufficient vocational training and English language support. Good partnerships had been established with a few commercial organisations to provide work, but more were needed to secure steady work. The qualifications gained by prisoners were too generic and did not accredit specific work skills or recognise transferable workplace skills.
- 3.14** The self-assessment report relied on information from the education contractor, with no evaluation of the provision. The full range of related activities across the prison was not

⁶ 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>.

included. The quality improvement plan identified some key areas for improvement, but many recommendations from the previous inspection had not been addressed. Staff recognised that they needed to make better use of data to inform decisions and measure the progress and impact of improvements. The observation of teaching, learning and assessment demonstrated a good understanding of staff performance by the education provider, but this was not used by the prison to monitor improvements in teaching and learning. During the inspection week, attendance was low: on average 72% of learners enrolled in education attended lessons; most arrived on time.

Recommendations

- 3.15 A greater range of commercial partnerships should be established to provide more work opportunities in the prison and employment opportunities on release.**
- 3.16 Self-assessment of learning and skills and work should be undertaken across the prison, which evaluates all learning and skills activities and involves staff at all levels in developing actions for improvement.**
- 3.17 A comprehensive strategy to improve attendance should be implemented to ensure that all education places are used.**

Provision of activities

- 3.18** There were sufficient work places and 90% of prisoners were employed. Workshops were very well resourced, spacious and clean. In engineering, prisoners produced heavy prison gates and cell doors using industry standard welding and cutting equipment. In the metal fabrication area prisoners operated highly sophisticated computer controlled sheet metal presses. Prisoners designed complex metal pressings using industry standard 3D computer aided design programmes. Sign-making workshops were well equipped with specialist machinery and industry standard publisher software on high specification printing machines typically found in commercial operations.
- 3.19** Only 40% of the prison population participated in formal education compared with 55% at the previous inspection. The range of education programmes remained adequate and included literacy, functional skills in English and mathematics at levels 1 and 2, information communications technology (ICT) at levels 1 and 2, computer aided design and a range of employability programmes. There were 82 full-time and 50 part-time places, but at the time of the inspection only 60% of places were occupied. There was no discrete provision of English for speakers of other languages, although a few prisoners needed it.
- 3.20** The range of qualifications offered to prisoners was narrow. In the engineering, sign and print workshops, some prisoners worked towards the generic performing manufacturing operations qualifications at levels 1 and 2, but specific or transferable workplace skills which most prisoners developed were not recognised. Vocational training was only available in cleaning, ICT, gym work, and new welding and horticulture programmes. The good range of more general employability skills that most prisoners developed were not recognised (see main recommendation S45).
- 3.21** The induction programme was lengthy and included useful advice and guidance from the National Careers Service (NCS). The NCS responded flexibly to prisoners requiring advice and offered more than three sessions if requested. Interviews with prisoners were professional and constructive. However, the prison did not promote or prioritise the NCS

effectively and prisoners were often late or failed to turn up to appointments. Most prisoners found induction boring and excessively long. Induction did not prepare prisoners appropriately for work activities and did not include first aid or manual handling training.

- 3.22** The process for allocating prisoners to work was appropriate. Very few prisoners were on waiting lists. The security clearance process worked well and did not inhibit allocation to work. Staff met weekly to fill vacancies, discuss prisoner applications, review targets in sentence plans and assess the impact of prisoners' changing personal circumstances.

Housekeeping point

- 3.23** The prison should promote the National Careers Service more effectively and prisoners should be supported and encouraged to attend appointments with them.

Quality of provision

- 3.24** The quality of teaching and learning was variable. In the better lessons, tutors provided learners with a good mix of activities which ensured that they remained motivated and engaged. A few tutors encouraged learners to participate in activities which ensured that they remained focused and productive for most of the lesson. In some lessons, learners confidently used learning technology and participated in debates. In the poorer lessons, concepts were not well explained and confused learners, who became frustrated and bored and disrupted the lesson. Far too many sessions were led by tutors who instructed learners in a didactic way instead of involving them. In a few lessons, inappropriate behaviour, language, spelling and grammar errors went unchallenged by tutors.
- 3.25** Individual learning plans (ILPs) were not used effectively to promote learning in education and vocational training. There were significant variations in the way that tutors used them and some did not use them at all. Many plans did not have long-term objectives and contained inappropriate and unchallenging short-term targets. ILPs did not record the acquisition of skills or progress towards achieving essential employability skills such as numeracy, literacy, communication skills, team work, ICT or work skills. Tutors focused on qualifications, relying heavily on practising mock examination papers instead of identifying and meeting individual learning needs. Little work was done on computers and photocopied exercise sheets were widely used. Few tutors offered useful feedback to motivate and accelerate learners' progress. Training and coaching in workshops and gym were good; sessions were well planned, and health and safety was frequently and thoroughly reinforced.
- 3.26** The needs of learners with entry level English language skills were not met. They attended education full time but could only attend a few language sessions and often could not understand the other education courses that they attended for the rest of the day. A small group of prisoners delivered Toe by Toe (mentoring to support prisoners' reading development), but progress of the learners and the effectiveness of the programme were not adequately monitored. Twenty-two learners taking Open University and distance learning courses could use the computer suite twice a week and received limited support from the education provider; most were making slow progress.

Recommendations

- 3.27** **Challenging targets should be established for the development of essential skills such as English and mathematics, and the needs of those with limited English skills should be met.**

- 3.28** The quality of teaching and learning should be improved by ensuring that tutors develop good teaching techniques. Learning should be monitored by the application of challenging criteria to teaching and learning observations.
- 3.29** Individual learning plans should be used effectively to plan, monitor and review the learning and skills developed by each learner as well as the achievement of units or qualifications.
- 3.30** Greater support and access to resources should be offered to Open University and distance learning learners.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.31** Pass rates for learners in education and employability and personal and social development programmes had improved over the previous three years. They were particularly high in the short personal and social development courses, sports coaching, horticulture and welding and cleaning and PICTA courses (Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy). They were very high in English and mathematics functional skills, but over half the learners had previously completed qualifications at the same level. Since the start of the new OLASS contract, pass rates in functional mathematics, employability and ICT courses had dropped to around 30%. Learners on all vocational training programmes made good progress. Many learners on PICTA courses completed qualifications to level 4, having started at level 1. Progress made by learners towards their planned qualifications was variable. A few were making good progress in English and bookkeeping skills, but too many were progressing slowly, particularly in functional numeracy skills.
- 3.32** There were no discernible differences in achievement for most groups of learners. However, the success rates of 13 learners identified as having disabilities remained low and this difference in achievement had not been identified by the prison.

Recommendations

- 3.33** The progress that learners make towards the achievement of their qualifications should be monitored and addressed as necessary.
- 3.34** The difference in achievement by different groups of learners should be analysed and rectified.

Library

- 3.35** The library was small and underused. It was open for most of the day but only accessible for very short periods by prisoners who were at work. It was not open at weekends. In our survey, the number of prisoners using the library at least once a week had decreased from 58% to 51% since the previous inspection. The number of prisoners from black or minority ethnic backgrounds or with a disability who used the library each week had reduced significantly in the last two years. The library was not promoted at induction.
- 3.36** The range of books was very limited and they were old. The selection of quick read, audio books and material in foreign languages was very poor. The range of vocational training books was very small, and some were over 30 years old. There were no newspapers or specific interest magazines. Prison Service Orders and legal reference books were available but not well promoted. Links with education, vocational training and work were poor, and

the library was not used to promote learning. The only activity was a monthly book club attended by five prisoners. Two orderlies supported the newly appointed, qualified librarian, but they could not achieve a qualification.

Recommendations

- 3.37** The opening times of the library should be changed to ensure that prisoners can use it more regularly.
- 3.38** The range of material available in the library should be updated to meet the needs and interests of prisoners.

Housekeeping point

- 3.39** More activities to promote reading should be organised.

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.

3.40 A reasonable range of indoor activities and physical training facilities were accessible to prisoners. All prisoners could use the gym at least five times a fortnight. The range of vocational training programmes was very good and achievement rates for qualifications were high. The induction to the gym was not sufficiently broad. No structured training took place out of doors.

3.41 PE was well managed and effectively promoted, providing a satisfactory range of recreational and structured physical training programmes. Accredited training included gym instructor courses at level 2 with supplementary courses in circuit training and spinning. Prisoners completing training courses were employed as gym orderlies and helped PE staff to run additional training courses.

3.42 All prisoners completed an appropriate induction to the gym which included a pre-activity readiness questionnaire and an introduction to the equipment. Healthy living, diet, nutrition, manual handling and first aid training were not included in induction. Clear, well managed records enabled gym staff to monitor completed inductions effectively and to identify prisoners deemed fit to participate in activities by health care. Monitoring of gym users was thorough and well recorded, and 62% of the population regularly used the gym. All prisoners could use the gym at least five times in a two-week period.

3.43 Indoor facilities were satisfactory with a good variety of activities that were well promoted. Wing orderlies promoted courses and activities by word of mouth, but there were no gym notice boards on the wings. Facilities were well used, clean and welcoming and the showers were much improved. A small sports hall was heavily used for games and coaching activities, but dangerous head-high protrusions from the walls needed to be padded or removed. A well-equipped classroom was used for training and there was a useful treatment room to aid recovery from injury. A cardiovascular area and modular weight training and Olympic weight training facilities were heavily used during recreational sessions. However, there was no

succession plan for the maintenance and replacement of the expensive cardiovascular and modular weight training equipment. Prisoners could still not use the outdoor sports field.

- 3.44** PE staff were enthusiastic and very well qualified. Activity sessions and remedial training were organised for prisoners over 50. A defibrillator should be located in the gym.

Recommendations

- 3.45** **Dangerous protrusions on the sports hall walls should be removed and safety padding put in place.**

- 3.46** **Prisoners should be able to use an appropriate outdoor sports field.**

Housekeeping points

- 3.47** A budgeted succession plan for the replacement of cardiovascular and modular weight training equipment should be implemented.

- 3.48** A defibrillator should be located in the gym and staff should be trained in its use.

Section 4. Resettlement

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

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 resettlement policy was based on a needs assessment, but did not make effective use of OASys (offender assessment system) data to identify the offending behaviour needs of different groups of prisoners. The monthly resettlement meeting did not drive progress in the prison and attendance was sometimes poor. Good use was made of release on temporary licence (ROTL) to support family ties but there were no community work placements. Almost a third of home detention curfew (HDC) boards had been held after the eligibility date. Risk assessments for ROTL and HDC were robust. There was little monitoring of resettlement outcomes.
- 4.2** The resettlement policy was based on a needs assessment which was updated each year. However, most information in the needs assessment was acquired through prisoner surveys, and insufficient use was made of OASys data to identify the offending behaviour needs of the population or to inform resettlement pathway provision. For example, the policy failed to identify the needs of life- and indeterminate-sentenced for public protection prisoners (IPP) who made up a significant proportion of the population.
- 4.3** The monthly resettlement meeting was not driving progress in the prison and minutes indicated little detailed discussion of pathway provision despite the existence of robust pathway action plans and leads. Attendance by relevant departments was poor at times, particularly health care who had attended only once in the previous six months.
- 4.4** Good use was made of ROTL to support family ties; in the previous six months 39 prisoners had been granted ROTL on 232 occasions for family purposes and town visits. However, there were no community work placements and gardening immediately outside the prison provided the only opportunity for ROTL work. Over the previous six months, 69 home detention curfew boards had been convened but almost a third of these had been held beyond the eligibility date, a few by some weeks. Risk assessments for ROTL and HDC were robust and an appropriate range of information was considered, including from external offender managers.
- 4.5** Apart from data on key performance targets, there was little monitoring of pathway discharge information to identify resettlement outcomes, and it was difficult to determine the effectiveness of pathway provision.

Recommendations

- 4.6** The resettlement policy should address the needs of all prisoners, including minority groups, and should be based on a needs assessment which uses OASys data to inform pathway provision.
- 4.7** Release on temporary licence should be used to facilitate community work placements for appropriate prisoners.
- 4.8** Home detention curfew boards should be timely.
- 4.9** Resettlement outcomes for prisoners following release should be monitored and incorporated into the resettlement strategy.

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.

4.10 Offender management was reasonably good. All prisoners were subject to sentence planning. OASys assessments were undertaken in a timely fashion and were of a good standard. In-scope prisoners were managed by the offender management unit (OMU), and out-of-scope prisoners by personal officers through a custody plan⁷. Risk management plans were reasonably good. There was evidence of out-of-scope cases being transferred to probation staff where risk levels had risen. Non-probation offender supervisors did not receive case supervision. External offender managers engaged well. Public protection arrangements were good. There were 32 category D prisoners and transfer time to open conditions was reasonable at 52 days. The category D unit lacked strategic direction. There was a manager for IPP prisoners, but they were not sufficiently provided for.

4.11 Offender management was reasonably good. In our survey, 84% of prisoners said they had a sentence plan against the national comparator of 73%, and 70% said they could achieve their sentence plan targets against 56% at the last inspection. The OMU had a senior probation officer, a deputy and a head of unit and it was well staffed, with eight prison and three probation offender supervisor posts, although some were vacant. There were five case administrators. Offender supervisors had undertaken managing indeterminate sentence and risk training and OASys training, and two had undertaken the more recently developed NOMS offender supervisor training. The unit was in the process of moving to a hub system and co-location with the public protection, IPP and custody managers.

4.12 At the time of the inspection, 178 prisoners were in scope for offender management. Eighty-four lifer prisoners were managed by the OMU and only one prisoner was serving a sentence of less than 12 months. All prisoners were subject to sentence planning. The prison estimated that it received 12 to 14 prisoners a month with no, or an out-of-date, OASys. However, a timely assessment was undertaken by an offender supervisor, and 17 were

⁷ In-scope prisoners are serving more than 12 months and are subject to offender management arrangements. Out-of-scope prisoners are not.

outstanding at the time of inspection. The assessments that we looked at were of a good standard and the head of the OMU quality assured a 10% random sample every month.

- 4.13** All lifer prisoners and 15 of the IPPs were managed by probation offender supervisors, and the rest of the in-scope prisoners by prison offender supervisors. In our survey, 61% of respondents said they had a named offender supervisor in the prison against the comparator of 68%. However, out-of-scope prisoners were managed by personal officers through a custody plan. We saw some good entries on NOMIS by personal officers which demonstrated detailed discussions with prisoners on custody objectives (see staff-prisoner relationships section).
- 4.14** Risk management plans were reasonably good and reflected the OASys appropriately, although some were formulaic. There was evidence of out-of-scope cases being transferred to probation staff where risk levels had risen. Good oversight of the regularity of contact with prisoners was maintained. Probation staff received regular case management supervision, but prison offender supervisors did not, despite managing some high-risk and complex cases.
- 4.15** External offender managers engaged well with sentence planning boards, often by video link, although this sometimes needed persistent chasing by offender supervisors. Relevant departments did not consistently attend sentence planning boards for out-of-scope prisoners but submitted reports instead, and offender supervisors were furnished with sufficient information. Minutes of meetings were stored on a local shared drive. The quality of records by offender supervisors was clear and timely.

Recommendation

- 4.16 All offender supervisors should receive case management supervision.**

Public protection

- 4.17** A senior officer managed public protection well, but there was no cover for the role when the manager was absent, apart from the administrator.
- 4.18** A detailed public protection policy issued in October 2012 covered work related to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA), sex offenders, harassment and safeguarding children. There were robust systems to identify public protection issues, involving reception staff, the night orderly officer and the public protection manager. At the time of the inspection, there were 40 level one, 39 level two and two level three MAPPA prisoners and a further 249 MAPPA nominals. The four prisoners subject to monitoring arrangements had had the arrangements explained to them by the public protection manager. Two members of staff were trained to use the violent and sexual offenders register (ViSOR) which held details of 105 prisoners.
- 4.19** A monthly multidisciplinary risk management meeting chaired by the head of the OMU discussed MAPPA and other high-risk prisoners, and prisoners being considered for parole, HDC and ROTL where there were particular concerns. Prisoners within six months of their release date were routinely discussed. Police and probation services were only informed of release dates four months in advance, but MAPPA guidance released in 2012 required notification of release dates of determinate sentenced prisoners no later than eight months before release. Attendance at the meetings was generally good. A high number of cases were presented at each meeting, limiting the amount of discussion. We were not able to observe a

meeting, but the minutes indicated that the meeting was focused on risk management and was fit for purpose.

Recommendation

- 4.20 There should be clear arrangements to cover the absence of the public protection manager.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.21 External agencies should be informed of prisoner release dates in line with MAPPA guidance.**

Categorisation

- 4.22** At the time of the inspection, there were 32 category D prisoners, nine of whom were awaiting transfer. The remainder had asked to stay at Coldingley. Between October 2012 and 28 March 2013, 63 prisoners had been transferred to open prisons with an average transfer time of 52 days, which was reasonable. Re-categorisation risk assessments were thorough and considered information from a range of sources, including offender managers. F wing was a small category D unit housing 10 prisoners but it lacked strategic direction: prisoners accommodated there did not work in the community and there was no focus on developing basic life skills. For example, the unit had a self-contained kitchen but no cooker to enable prisoners to learn to cook for themselves.

Recommendation

- 4.23 The strategic purpose of F wing should be clarified and should inform the prison resettlement strategy.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.24** A considerable number of lifers and IPPs were held, 84 and 51 respectively at the time of the inspection. A senior officer designated the indeterminate-sentenced prisoner (ISP) manager met all new ISP prisoners and their offender supervisor soon after arrival. In our lifer focus group, the prisoners described feeling as if they were 'treading water' with many having achieved all their sentence plan objectives. They felt there was little understanding of their specific needs and most said they were unaware there was an ISP manager. ISP forums were held monthly in rotation on each wing, which meant that prisoners could only attend one forum every six months. Minutes were taken by a lifer orderly but it was difficult to determine the purpose of the meeting from the minutes. There were no other forums or events specifically for ISP prisoners.

Recommendation

- 4.25 Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be able to spend their time in custody purposefully. They should be able to attend regular consultation meetings with a clear purpose and outcomes.**

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.

4.26 Resettlement needs were identified during induction and six weeks before discharge, but pathway provision was variable. There was no specialist resettlement training for officers or orderlies. There was a well organised prisoner-led housing advice service, but no finance, benefit or debt provision or employability course. Health care discharge arrangements were good. There was integrated pre-release care planning for prisoners with substance use problems. Some visitors waited for long periods before being admitted to the visits room and the visitors' centre was not adequately developed. The family relationships course was not being delivered and Storybook Dads was inappropriately linked to a creative writing course. Family days were for enhanced prisoners only. There were few accredited offending behaviour programmes. The Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme was delivered. The crime diversion scheme was an impressive community support initiative.

4.27 Resettlement needs were identified in a questionnaire organised by an orderly during induction, and then again six weeks before discharge. However, pathway provision was variable. In our survey, prisoner awareness of available support was low across a number of pathways, with 29% aware of accommodation support and 29% benefits against respective comparators of 40% and 41%. Prisoner orderlies provided advice and support for some pathways, but there was no specialist training for officers or orderlies addressing resettlement needs.

Recommendation

4.28 Specialist training should be provided for officers and orderlies dealing with resettlement needs.

Housekeeping point

4.29 Services available to help with resettlement needs should be more effectively promoted to prisoners.

Accommodation

4.30 There was a well organised prisoner-led housing advice service but there was no longer any specialist support from Shelter. Two resettlement officers supported the work of two orderlies by making appointments for them to see prisoners and using the internet to research information. The orderlies arranged first and second night accommodation, submitted names for housing lists, and wrote letters to councils, utility companies and landlords. The letters we viewed were good quality. The orderlies recorded the assistance they were giving prisoners on a computer database, and this information was copied to the resettlement officers. During the previous two months, they had assisted 45 prisoners. During 2012 to 2013, 224 prisoners had been released into settled accommodation representing 93% against a target of 85%.

- 4.31** One of the orderlies was being helped by the resettlement officers to apply for ROTL to work with Citizen's Advice. We were told that the latter was viewing the proposal positively.

Education, training and employment

- 4.32** There was still no formal employability course and the prison did not provide a structured pre-release or business start-up course. There was an expectation that the new virtual campus would provide facilities such as job search, CV writing and dealing with disclosure. The education provider delivered a few courses, including budgeting, preparation for work and business enterprise. Good employment related skills were delivered in the gym and workshops.
- 4.33** During 2012 to 2013, 52 prisoners had been engaged in education or training on release, representing 21% against a target of 10%. A further 64 prisoners had been released with employment secured, an achievement of 26% against a target of 13.5%.

Recommendation

- 4.34** **A pre-release employability course should be introduced.**

Health care

- 4.35** Arrangements for the discharge of patients were good and planning started three weeks before release. The care programme approach (delivery of community mental health services to individuals diagnosed with a mental illness) was used for prisoners with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care and end-of-life programmes were available but rarely required.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36** In our survey, 58% of prisoners said they knew who could help them with drug and alcohol issues prior to release against the comparator of 46%. Integrated pre-release care planning was arranged by prison departments and community drug intervention teams, and prescribing regimes were continued as appropriate. The difficulty in accessing community residential programmes that we previously reported had been resolved. The drugs strategy team delivered an unusually active programme of health promotion in schools and community centres.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37** Work on this pathway was underdeveloped and there was no specialist finance, benefit or debt provision. The pathway action plan was limited, although work was in progress with HM Revenue and Customs to develop workshops on tax and national insurance for prisoners intending to take up self employment on release.
- 4.38** A money management course was delivered by education, and 51 prisoners had completed this in the previous year. The Unlock (National Association of Reformed Offenders) scheme helped prisoners to open a bank account on release with a high street bank and 36 prisoners had done so in the previous year.

Recommendation

- 4.39 Prisoners should have access to specialist finance, benefit and debt advice and support.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.40** Visits took place every afternoon except Tuesday, and on Wednesday and Sunday mornings. Only enhanced prisoners had visits on Wednesdays. Prisoners on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme had two visits a month, those on standard level had three and those on enhanced level four. Visits could be booked by telephone or by email. There were no facilities for visitors to book their next visit while at the prison.
- 4.41** The newly-built visitors' centre adjacent to the main prison gate was in reality a large waiting room with no trained staff to offer advice and guidance to visitors and no information displayed or available for visitors to take away.
- 4.42** The main visits hall was reasonably large and brightly decorated. It could accommodate up to 32 prisoners. Seating was informally arranged and helped to create a relaxed environment. Some chairs needed cleaning and some were old and worn. There was a well equipped children's play area, and a snack bar. There were still no toilets for prisoners, who had to terminate their visit if they needed to use the facilities. Relationships between staff and visitors were particularly good and supervising officers were friendly and respectful. Procedures for searching and interacting with children were carried out sensitively. Although visits sessions were punctual and prisoners arrived in the visits room on time, some visitors were delayed for up to an hour before being admitted to the visits hall and were unable to have a full two-hour visit. A visitors' survey had been undertaken in 2012 and an action plan produced to address concerns. Action points concerning visits starting late were marked as completed when the issue had evidently not been resolved.
- 4.43** An 'understanding family relationships' course was available, although only 13 prisoners had taken it in the previous 12 months and at the time of inspection nobody was available to deliver it. Storybook Dads was also available as an integral part of a creative writing course, which inappropriately excluded prisoners with literacy needs. The number of family days had increased to six a year, but they were restricted to enhanced prisoners only who were required to pay £7.50 towards the cost, a sizeable contribution from their weekly wage.

Recommendations

- 4.44 Visitors should be admitted to the visits room punctually to allow a full two-hour visit.**
- 4.45 Prisoners should be able to use the toilet without terminating their visits.**
- 4.46 The visitors' centre should be developed to provide visitors with an appropriate service.**

Housekeeping points

- 4.47** Visitors should be able to book their next visit while at the prison.
- 4.48** The chairs in the visiting room should be cleaned.

- 4.49 Storybook Dads should be available to all prisoners.
- 4.50 Family days should be available to prisoners irrespective of their incentives and earned privileges status, subject to risk assessment, and there should be no charge to participate.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.51 RAPt and the healthy relationship programme (HRP) were the only accredited offending behaviour programmes which had been completed by 65 and 15 prisoners respectively in the previous year. There was a waiting list of 26 prisoners for the high intensity HRP course and 10 for the moderate intensity course. The Sycamore Tree programme met some victim awareness need: three courses had been delivered during the previous year with 20 prisoners attending each course and an estimated retention rate of 97%. The prison was taking part in a joint NOMS/Cambridge University study to evaluate the success of the course.
- 4.52 If prisoners had outstanding offending behaviour needs, they were transferred to other prisons to complete relevant courses, but it was unclear how many had done this as records were not kept.
- 4.53 The crime diversion scheme (CDS) employed seven prisoners full time and two as volunteers to deliver a programme designed to deter young people from offending. The prisoners, who were trained, were accompanied by CDS staff and were able to gain good skills. Pro-social modelling and personal testimonies were important elements of the programme. The scheme was an impressive community support initiative, which had worked with over 500 children aged between 13 and 17 over the previous year, most of whom had been referred by youth offending teams. A recent evaluation report had been positive.

Recommendation

- 4.54 **Prisoners should be able to undertake appropriate accredited offending behaviour programmes or they should be expeditiously moved to other establishments for this purpose.**

Good practice

- 4.55 *The crime diversion scheme provided meaningful work and skills development for a small number of prisoners, making a commendable contribution to the local community.*

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report, or in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1** Prisoners should be able to use toilet facilities 24 hours a day, without undue delay. (S43)
- 5.2** Diversity provision should be robustly managed in line with a clear strategy. The needs of prisoners with protected characteristics should be identified and met, and the negative perceptions of particular groups should be investigated and acted on. (S44)
- 5.3** There should be a range of qualifications that accredit the specific vocational skills obtained by prisoners, including higher level qualifications for specialist work. (S45)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.4** Prisoners should receive a full induction promptly after arrival. (1.12)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.5** Prisoners' perceptions of victimisation by staff should be investigated and acted on. (1.23)
- 5.6** There should be a local safer custody policy. (1.24)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.7** Prisoners' access to Listeners should be reviewed and any restrictions effectively addressed. At least one Listener should be located on each wing and ways to contact the Samaritans should be prominently advertised. (1.32)
- 5.8** Night staff should receive refresher first aid training, and sufficient first aid trained staff should be on duty at night. (1.33)
- 5.9** Events that could trigger a crisis should be recorded on ACCT documents, case reviews should be sufficiently multidisciplinary and observation entries should be detailed and meaningful. (1.34)

Discipline

- 5.10** All prisoners should be given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events relating to the charge, and all charges should be fully investigated. (1.58)

- 5.11** Data on the use of force, such as ethnicity, location, reasons for use and staff involved, should be monitored for emerging patterns and trends, and appropriate action taken to address identified issues. (1.59, repeated recommendation 7.27)
- 5.12** Handcuffs should only be used when escorting prisoners to the segregation unit if an active risk assessment supports their use. (1.60, repeated recommendation 7.26)
- 5.13** Care plans should be raised for all prisoners relocating to the segregation unit for their own protection, with an emphasis on reintegrating them to mainstream location. (1.68, repeated recommendation 7.30)
- 5.14** All prisoners in the segregation unit should receive at least one hour in the open air every day. (1.69)
- 5.15** The regime for longer-stay prisoners should be improved and should include purposeful activity and time out of cell. (1.70)

Substance misuse

- 5.16** Mandatory drug testing facilities should be relocated. (1.79)
- 5.17** Clinically indicated medications should be available to prisoners in line with national guidance. (1.80)

Residential units

- 5.18** The old metal cages outside cell windows on A to D wings should be removed or replaced and kept in a good state of repair. (2.9)
- 5.19** The old toilet recesses and showers on A to D wings should be refurbished and well maintained. (2.10)
- 5.20** There should be sufficient showers for the population. (2.11, repeated recommendation 2.21)
- 5.21** Residential units should be quiet enough in the evenings and at night to enable relaxation and sleep. Staff should consistently challenge prisoners who play loud music. (2.12)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.22** Personal officers should speak to prisoners regularly, provide support and help them to achieve their resettlement targets. (2.20)

Equality and diversity

- 5.23** The diversity meeting should take place regularly and should consider all elements of diversity. (2.30)
- 5.24** All areas of diversity should be monitored and data should be examined by the diversity and race equality action team to identify patterns and trends; action should be taken to address evidence of imbalance. (2.31)
- 5.25** Staff should receive training in all aspects of diversity. (2.32, repeated recommendation 4.10)

- 5.26** Older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities should be identified on reception and there should be effective liaison between health care and the disability/older prisoners liaison officer to ensure that appropriate levels of support are provided. (2.39)
- 5.27** All foreign national prisoners should be offered a free telephone call each month to keep in touch with family abroad. (2.40)
- 5.28** Retired prisoners should not be charged for their television. (2.41, repeated recommendation 4.50)

Complaints

- 5.29** Replies to complaints should be thorough and polite and should address the issues raised. (2.52)

Legal rights

- 5.30** The legal services officers should be trained and allocated time to provide an appropriate service to all prisoners. (2.59)

Health services

- 5.31** Prisoners should have access to health care and health promotion information in a range of languages. (2.67)
- 5.32** Prisoners should have timely access to dental services. (2.81)
- 5.33** Mental health awareness training should be available to all prison staff. (2.84)

Catering

- 5.34** There should be regular, thorough management oversight of the kitchen to ensure that appropriate levels of cleanliness are maintained. (2.91)
- 5.35** The quality of food and balance of meals should be improved. (2.92)
- 5.36** There should be effective catering and shop consultation arrangements that actively address the negative reports of prisoners. (2.93)
- 5.37** Prisoners should be able to gain accredited qualifications in food preparation. (2.94)
- 5.38** The quality and quantity of breakfast items should be improved. (2.95)
- 5.39** Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm. (2.96, repeated recommendation 8.9)
- 5.40** Prisoners on E wing should be allowed to dine in association. (2.97, repeated recommendation 8.10)

Time out of cell

- 5.41** Prisoners should spend at least 10 hours a day out of their cells. (3.7, repeated recommendation 6.43)

- 5.42** Association should not be cancelled. (3.8)
- 5.43** Prisoners should not routinely be locked in their cells if they are not required for work. (3.9)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.44** A greater range of commercial partnerships should be established to provide more work opportunities in the prison and employment opportunities on release. (3.15)
- 5.45** Self-assessment of learning and skills and work should be undertaken across the prison, which evaluates all learning and skills activities and involves staff at all levels in developing actions for improvement. (3.16)
- 5.46** A comprehensive strategy to improve attendance should be implemented to ensure that all education places are used. (3.17)
- 5.47** Challenging targets should be established for the development of essential skills such as English and mathematics, and the needs of those with limited English skills should be met. (3.27)
- 5.48** The quality of teaching and learning should be improved by ensuring that tutors develop good teaching techniques. Learning should be monitored by the application of challenging criteria to teaching and learning observations. (3.28)
- 5.49** Individual learning plans should be used effectively to plan, monitor and review the learning and skills developed by each learner as well as the achievement of units or qualifications. (3.29)
- 5.50** Greater support and access to resources should be offered to Open University and distance learning learners. (3.30)
- 5.51** The progress that learners make towards the achievement of their qualifications should be monitored and addressed as necessary. (3.33)
- 5.52** The difference in achievement by different groups of learners should be analysed and rectified. (3.34)
- 5.53** The opening times of the library should be changed to ensure that prisoners can use it more regularly. (3.37)
- 5.54** The range of material available in the library should be updated to meet the needs and interests of prisoners. (3.38)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.55** Dangerous protrusions on the sports hall walls should be removed and safety padding put in place. (3.45)
- 5.56** Prisoners should be able to use an appropriate outdoor sports field. (3.46)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.57** The resettlement policy should address the needs of all prisoners, including minority groups, and should be based on a needs assessment which uses OASys data to inform pathway provision. (4.6)
- 5.58** Release on temporary licence should be used to facilitate community work placements for appropriate prisoners. (4.7)
- 5.59** Home detention curfew boards should be timely. (4.8)
- 5.60** Resettlement outcomes for prisoners following release should be monitored and incorporated into the resettlement strategy. (4.9)

Offender management and planning

- 5.61** All offender supervisors should receive case management supervision. (4.16)
- 5.62** There should be clear arrangements to cover the absence of the public protection manager. (4.20, repeated recommendation 9.41)
- 5.63** The strategic purpose of F wing should be clarified and should inform the prison resettlement strategy. (4.23)
- 5.64** Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be able to spend their time in custody purposefully. They should be able to attend regular consultation meetings with a clear purpose and outcomes. (4.25)

Reintegration planning

- 5.65** Specialist training should be provided for officers and orderlies dealing with resettlement needs. (4.28)
- 5.66** A pre-release employability course should be introduced. (4.34)
- 5.67** Prisoners should have access to specialist finance, benefit and debt advice and support. (4.39)
- 5.68** Visitors should be admitted to the visits room punctually to allow a full two-hour visit. (4.44)
- 5.69** Prisoners should be able to use the toilet without terminating their visits. (4.45)
- 5.70** The visitors' centre should be developed to provide visitors with an appropriate service. (4.46)
- 5.71** Prisoners should be able to undertake appropriate accredited offending behaviour programmes or they should be expeditiously moved to other establishments for this purpose. (4.54)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.72** Prisoners should be given sufficient notice of transfer to be able to contact their families, subject to security considerations. (1.4)

Early days in custody

- 5.73** The first night checking procedure should be extended to all residential units. (1.13)
- 5.74** The television in reception should work. (1.14)
- 5.75** The induction room should be prepared for use whenever necessary. (1.15)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.76** Staff from across the prison, including the security department, should attend the monthly safer custody meetings. (1.25)
- 5.77** The monthly safer custody report should monitor trends over time. (1.26)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.78** The environment in the safer cell should be therapeutic and clean. (1.35)

Discipline

- 5.79** The analysis of information to identify trends and patterns should be developed. (1.71)

Residential units

- 5.80** Prisoners should have access to cell cleaning materials, clean sheets and bedding every week. (2.13)
- 5.81** Managers should ensure that prisoners can easily access their stored property. (2.14)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.82** Action points from prisoner council meetings should be swiftly and rigorously followed up. (2.21)

Equality and diversity

- 5.83** Robust action should be taken to address discrimination incident reports that are shown to be justified. (2.33)
- 5.84** The adapted cells on E wing should have larger wash basins. (2.42)
- 5.85** Staff should be able to locate personal emergency and evacuation plans easily. (2.43)

Complaints

- 5.86** Analysis of complaints should include monitoring of trends and outcomes over time. (2.53)
- 5.87** Replies to stage two complaints should include information on how to complain to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. (2.54)

Legal rights

- 5.88** Prisoners should be able to consult up-to-date and relevant legal text books and Prison Service Instructions in the library. (2.60)

Health services

- 5.89** All clinical supervision should be recorded. (2.68)
- 5.90** The lift should be in consistent working order to enable access for prisoners with disabilities. (2.69)
- 5.91** All clinical records should be stored in accordance with Caldicott guidelines (overseeing use and confidentiality of personal health information) and the Data Protection Act. (2.70)
- 5.92** The health care reception room should be secured with a health care suite key. (2.73)
- 5.93** All controlled drug stock should be audited each week. (2.78)
- 5.94** The controlled drug cabinets should be bolted to the wall. (2.79)
- 5.95** Equipment should be stored appropriately to ensure the control of infection. (2.82)

Catering

- 5.96** Food trolleys should be repaired and appropriately maintained. (2.98)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.97** The prison should promote the National Careers Service more effectively and prisoners should be supported and encouraged to attend appointments with them. (3.23)
- 5.98** More activities to promote reading should be organised. (3.39)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.99** A budgeted succession plan for the replacement of cardiovascular and modular weight training equipment should be implemented. (3.47)
- 5.100** A defibrillator should be located in the gym and staff should be trained in its use. (3.48)

Offender management and planning

- 5.101** External agencies should be informed of prisoner release dates in line with MAPPA guidance. (4.21)

Reintegration planning

- 5.102** Services available to help with resettlement needs should be more effectively promoted to prisoners. (4.29)
- 5.103** Visitors should be able to book their next visit while at the prison. (4.47)
- 5.104** The chairs in the visiting room should be cleaned. (4.48)
- 5.105** Storybook Dads should be available to all prisoners. (4.49)
- 5.106** Family days should be available to prisoners irrespective of their incentives and earned privileges status, subject to risk assessment, and there should be no charge to participate. (4.50)

Examples of good practice

Substance misuse

- 5.107** The excellent RAPt rehabilitation programme was well managed and delivered effective treatment to participants, who valued its transforming effect. (1.81)

Reintegration planning

- 5.108** The crime diversion scheme provided meaningful work and skills development for a small number of prisoners, making a commendable contribution to the local community. (4.55)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Hindpal Singh Bhui	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Bev Alden	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Caroline Elwood	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Annie Crowley	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Tarbuck	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Tim Brackpool	Care Quality Commission inspector
Eilean Robson	Pharmacist
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector
Alistair Pearson	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the four tests of a healthy prison. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is also provided.

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection in 2010, the new reception area had some design flaws, and there were no formal first night checks. There was an excellent prisoner-led induction. Prisoners reported feeling safe, and anti-bullying and violence reduction work was well managed. Care for those at risk of suicide or self-harm was generally good. Mobile telephone and illicit drug supply had been substantially reduced since the last full inspection, though the proportionality of security measures on the prison needed to be kept under review. There was uneven management of the segregation unit, and there were some examples of it being inappropriately used. Use of force was generally low level and well documented. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Senior managers should periodically review the regime to ensure the proportionality of security arrangements and that restrictions are equivalent to other category C prisons. (HP46)

Achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should be given toilet stops at least every two and a half hours, with additional stops when necessary. (1.5)

Achieved

Reception should be open throughout the day, and arriving prisoners should not be left waiting in vehicles because of staff meal breaks. (1.6)

No longer relevant

New arrivals should be searched in private. (1.16)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to use the reception toilet in private. (1.17)

Achieved

Reception orderlies should be trained as Insiders. (1.18)

Achieved

New arrivals should be checked at least twice during their first night, and these checks should be documented. (1.19)

Partially achieved

There should be a survey of prisoners' experiences and perceptions of bullying and violence. (3.15)

Achieved

The safer custody coordinator should analyse data for any trends in indicators of violence. (3.16)

Achieved

Staff should be trained in the violence reduction strategy, and interventions developed to challenge violent and antisocial behaviour. (3.17)

Achieved

At-risk prisoners should not be held on landings where there is controlled access to night sanitation. (3.32)

Not achieved

Night staff should carry ligature knives and receive refresher first aid training, and sufficient first aid trained staff should be on duty at night. (3.33)

Partially achieved, repeated recommendation I.33

There should be improved telephone access to the Samaritans for all prisoners during lock-up times, and ways to contact the Samaritans should be advertised. (3.34).

Partially achieved, repeated recommendation I.32

The security team should formally analyse common patterns in information received, and implement a comprehensive system of tracking and monitoring follow-up actions from security information reports. (7.8)

Achieved

New arrivals should receive written information on the operation of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, including the criteria for progression. (7.39)

Achieved

Data on adjudications should be routinely analysed, such as by wing, charge, ethnicity or reporting officer, to identify emerging patterns and trends, and such trends should be investigated and appropriate action identified to address them, where necessary. (7.22)

Achieved

The incentives and earned privileges scheme rather than adjudications should be used for relatively low level rule infringements. (7.23)

Not achieved

Adjudicators should evidence thorough investigation of all charges, whatever the prisoner's plea. (7.24)

Partially achieved

The punishment imposed following a finding of guilt in an adjudication should be proportionate to the seriousness of the charge. (7.25)

Achieved

Handcuffs should only be used when escorting prisoners to the segregation unit if an active risk assessment supports their use. (7.26)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation I.60

Data on the use of force, such as ethnicity, location, reasons for use and staff involved, should be monitored for emerging patterns and trends, and appropriate action taken to address identified issues. (7.27)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation I.59

Prisoners should only be relocated to the segregation unit pending adjudication when their continued location on their wing poses a threat to the safety of staff or other prisoners. (7.28)

Achieved

A multidisciplinary staff group, including senior managers, should routinely monitor the use of segregation. (7.29)

Partially achieved

Care plans should be raised for all prisoners relocating to the segregation unit for their own protection, with a specific emphasis on reintegrating such prisoners back on to mainstream location. (7.30)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation I.69

Prisoners should only be strip-searched on relocation to the segregation unit following an active risk assessment. All strip searches should be logged with the reasons for it recorded. (7.31)

Achieved

All prisoners in the segregation unit should receive one hour in the open air every day. (7.32)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation I.70

Medication administration procedures should ensure the prevention of medication diversion. (3.77)

Achieved

The methadone medication administration area should allow for prisoners' privacy while at the hatch. (3.78)

Achieved

Prescribing regimes for substance-dependant prisoners should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidance. (3.79)

Partially achieved

Sanctions imposed on prisoners who refuse to comply with mandatory drug testing (MDT) should ensure a suitable level of deterrent. (3.80)

Achieved

MDT facilities should be refurbished or relocated to create an adequate testing and waiting environment, and should be appropriately staffed to ensure all testing is carried out appropriately, within identified timescales and without gaps in provision. (3.81)

Partially achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection in 2010, the new accommodation on E wing had integral sanitation and provided a decent environment, but the night sanitation system on most of the other wings was degrading. Staff-prisoner relationships were mixed, and personal officer work was inconsistent. The IEP scheme was well managed. The standard of food was adequate. The overall management of diversity was good, but there were some shortcomings in responses to ethnic monitoring data. Faith provision was generally good, but the chaplaincy was understaffed. There were some weaknesses in complaints procedures. Health care facilities were good and prisoners valued the care they received. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Prisoners should have 24-hour access to toilet facilities. (HP47)

Not achieved, repeated main recommendation S43

Managers should investigate negative perceptions among black and minority ethnic prisoners and Muslims and act upon the findings. (HP48)

Not achieved, repeated main recommendation S44

Recommendations

Cells designed for single use should not be doubled. (2.16).

Not achieved

The metal cages outside cell windows on A–D wings should be removed or replaced and kept in a good state of repair. (2.17).

Partially achieved, repeated recommendation 2.9

Residential units should be sufficiently quiet in the evenings and at night to allow rest and sleep. Staff should consistently challenge prisoners who play loud music. (2.18)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.12

Telephones should be enclosed in booths wherever possible to allow for maximum privacy. (2.19)

Not achieved

There should be a toilet recess on all spurs. (2.20)

Not achieved

There should be sufficient showers for the population. (2.21)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.11

The toilet recesses and showers on A–D wings should be refurbished and well maintained. (2.22)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.10

Managers should investigate why Muslim prisoners are so negative about relationships with staff and act accordingly. (2.28)

Not achieved

Staff should address prisoners using their title or first name. (2.29)

Partly achieved

Personal officers should speak to prisoners weekly about their needs, provide support and help them to achieve their resettlement targets, and managers should routinely and rigorously check that this is recorded in history sheets. (2.34)

Partially achieved

There should be a comprehensive diversity strategy covering all strands of diversity. (4.6)

Achieved

All managers with diversity responsibilities should have sufficient allocated time for the task. (4.7)

Not achieved

Managers should identify and implement ways to engage all staff and prisoners in diversity work, including regular consultation with minority groups within the prisoner population. (4.8)

Not achieved, see main recommendation S44

Monitoring should take place across all areas of diversity. It should be examined by the DREAT for patterns and trends, and action should be taken to address any evidence of imbalance. (4.9)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.31

Staff should receive training in all aspects of diversity. (4.10)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.32

Managers should promote the use of diversity incident report forms by prisoners when they believe they have experienced discriminatory treatment. (4.23)

Achieved

All foreign national prisoners should receive the offer of a free telephone call each month to keep in touch with family abroad. (4.36)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.40

Reception staff should notify the foreign national coordinator when a prisoner with limited English arrives, and he should ensure that interpretation is used as appropriate. (4.37)

Not achieved

The adapted cells on E wing should have adequate-sized handbasins. (4.47)

Not achieved

The lift on E wing should be kept in working order. (4.48)

Achieved

Staff should be able to locate and access personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs) easily. (4.49)

Not achieved

Retired prisoners should not be charged for their television. (4.50)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.41

Staff should answer complaints and applications promptly and politely. (3.43)

Partially achieved, repeated recommendation 2.52

Prisoners' complaints should not be investigated by the person who is the subject of the complaint. (3.44)

Achieved

The monthly complaints analysis should monitor complaints by age, ethnicity, nationality and religion. (3.45)

Achieved

The legal service officers should be trained to provide an appropriate service to all prisoners and immigration detainees. (3.52)

Not achieved

The health care room in reception should provide adequate facilities for the initial screening of prisoners in privacy, have hand washing facilities, and only be accessible to health care staff. (5.6)

Partially achieved

All health care professional staff should have access to clinical supervision. (5.16)

Partially achieved

The pharmacist should visit the prison at least once a week to check the systems in operation, and provide counselling sessions, pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication reviews. (5.17)

Achieved

Records of weekly checks of resuscitation equipment should be maintained and held with the equipment, and records of daily checks of automated emergency defibrillator batteries should be maintained. (5.18)

Achieved

Prisoners should have access to health care information and health promotion material in a range of languages. (5.24)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.67

All new arrivals should have the opportunity for secondary health care screening within 72 hours of their reception screening. (5.25)

Achieved

There should be action to reduce the waiting time for a routine appointment to see a GP. (5.26)

Achieved

Written policies for special sick and out-of-hours provision should be put in place as soon as the review is completed. (5.36)

Achieved

The medicines management group should formally agree standard procedures to cover the current arrangements for pharmacy service provision and delivery of medication to prisoners. (5.37)

Achieved

Faxed prescriptions should be subject to rigorous audit, and the pharmacist should make regular visits to the prison to compare a random sample of dispensed faxes against the original prescription and the patient medication record. (5.38)

Achieved

8.14 The prices of items stocked in the shop should be comparable to those of a local store.

Achieved

8.15 The canteen meetings should be held regularly and specifically address the negative reports from black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners.

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.93

All controlled drugs should be recorded in a controlled drugs register, which should be obtained as soon as possible. (5.39)

Achieved

There should be day care services for prisoners with mental health problems who have difficulty coping on the wings. (5.48)

Partially achieved

Mental health awareness training should be provided for all prison staff. (5.49)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.84

Breakfast should be served on the morning it is to be eaten. (8.8)

Not achieved

Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm. (8.9)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.96

Prisoners on E wing should be allowed to dine in association. (8.10)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 2.97

The prices of items stocked in the shop should be comparable to those of a local store. (8.14)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

Prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.

At the last inspection in 2010, there was satisfactory overall management of learning and skills. Prisoners reported very positively on education provision, and there was good retention and achievement on most education programmes. The range of vocational training was limited. There was sufficient work for the population, but there were some missed opportunities for accreditation. The library was reasonable. The gym was good, but there was a lack of outdoor sports facilities. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

There should be more accredited vocational training to support prisoner employment needs, including higher level qualifications for specialised work. (HP49)

Achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should spend at least 10 hours a day out of their cells. (6.43)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 3.7

Strategic management, quality improvement and self-assessment processes should be further developed. (6.24)

Partially achieved

Data on participation in education and skills should be analysed to identify the participation and achievement trends of different groups, and action taken to close any gaps. (6.25)

Not achieved

Punctuality and attendance at activity sessions should be improved. (6.26)

Not achieved

Prisoners' non-accredited learning should be recognised and recorded. (6.27)

Not achieved

Participation in education should be improved. (6.28)

Not achieved

Individual learning plans should be used more rigorously to set challenging targets, including the development of non-accredited skills, be sufficiently detailed and reflect individual prisoner needs. (6.29)

Not achieved

There should be more links with external organisations to promote learning and work opportunities. (6.30)

Achieved

The library should be open at the weekend. (6.31)

Not achieved

The outdoor sports field should be made fit for use by prisoners. (6.38)

Not achieved

The showers in the PE area should be refurbished. (6.39)

Achieved**Resettlement****Prisoners are prepared for their release back into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.**

At the last inspection in 2010, the strategic management of resettlement was reasonable. The offender management unit was well managed and offender supervisors did very good work. Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments were completed relatively quickly. Sentence plans were completed to a good standard, but there was a lack of involvement from personal officers. The prison could not adequately meet the needs of a significant number of lifers and prisoners on indeterminate sentences for public protection. Public protection work was generally effective. There was some good work on the reducing reoffending pathways. The outstanding RAPt programme was the only accredited programme delivered. The visits room needed redecoration and some refurbishment, and the visits system delayed visits. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The planned new visitors' centre should be built as soon as possible. (HP50)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to access appropriate accredited offending behaviour programmes at HMP Coldingley or should be expeditiously moved to other establishments where this can occur. (HP51)

Not achieved, repeated main recommendation S45**Recommendations**

There should be an up to date regional reducing reoffending strategy, based on a comprehensive needs analysis, which is aligned with Coldingley's strategy to enable prisoners to complete sentence plan targets at relevant prisons. (9.6)

No longer relevant

Coldingley's resettlement strategy should be regularly reviewed to ensure it addresses the needs of all prisoners, including minority groups. (9.7)

Not achieved

Sentence planning meetings should be attended by all relevant staff, including personal officers, and involve the prisoner. Minutes should be thorough and distributed to relevant staff. (9.40)

Partially achieved

There should be clear arrangements to cover the absence of the public protection manager. (9.41)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 4.20

The purpose of the risk management meetings should be to focus on the assessment and management of risk of serious harm in the prison and preparation for the prisoner's release. Attendance at meetings should be improved. (9.42)

Achieved

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoner consultation meetings should be held at least quarterly, and minutes published with time bounded action points. (9.43)

Partially achieved

The prison and Shelter should collect and monitor information to enable an assessment of the effectiveness of the accommodation service, and to identify areas for improvement. (9.57)

Not achieved

A pre-release course should be introduced. (9.58)

Partially achieved

An end-of-life care pathway should be developed. (9.59)

Achieved

There should be a comprehensive annual needs analysis of the population to inform the drug and alcohol strategies and future service provision, and ensure that current provision matches need. (9.72)

Achieved

The prison should work with social services departments in its catchment area to ensure that social workers assess prisoners' suitability for community-based drug and alcohol residential rehabilitation programmes before their release, to minimise the risks of relapse and overdose on release. (9.73)

Achieved

Visits should start promptly. (9.83)

Not achieved

The visits room should be redecorated and recarpeted, and have a wide range of regularly updated notices and information leaflets. (9.84)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to use the toilet during visits without terminating their visits. (9.85)

Not achieved, repeated recommendation 4.45

A visitors' survey should be completed, analysed and acted upon as appropriate. (9.86)

Achieved

The number of family days should be increased to ensure that as many prisoners as possible can benefit. (9.87)

Achieved

Storybook Dads should be extended to enable more prisoners to access the service. (9.88)

Not achieved

Appendix III: 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	0	479	93.6
Recall	0	32	6.3
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0.0
Remand	0	0	0.0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0.0
Detainees	0	0	0.0
Other	0	1	0.2
Total		512	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	0	0.0
Less than 6 months	0	0	0.0
6 months to less than 12 months	0	1	0.2
12 months to less than 2 years	0	14	2.7
2 years to less than 4 years	0	89	17.3
4 years to less than 10 years	0	240	46.9
10 years and over (not life)	0	33	6.4
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	51	9.8
Life	0	84	16.7
Total	0	512	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	0	0.0
21 years to 29 years	176	34.4
30 years to 39 years	166	32.4
40 years to 49 years	110	21.5
50 years to 59 years	46	9.0
60 years to 69 years	13	2.5
70 plus years	1	0.2
Please state maximum age here:73		
Total	512	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	0	476	92.9
Foreign nationals	0	31	6.1
Not stated	0	5	1.0
Total	0	512	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	0	0.0
Uncategorised sentenced	0	0	0.0
Category A	0	0	0.0
Category B	0	0	0.0
Category C	0	480	93.8
Category D	0	32	6.3

Other	0	0	0.0
Total	0	512	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	0	301	58.8
Irish	0	9	1.8
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	5	1.0
Other white	0	14	2.7
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	11	2.1
White and black African	0	4	0.8
White and Asian	0	1	0.2
Other mixed	0	6	1.2
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	5	1.0
Pakistani	0	6	1.2
Bangladeshi	0	1	0.2
Chinese	0	3	0.6
Other Asian	0	12	2.3
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	73	14.3
African	0	26	5.1
Other black	0	21	4.1
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	1	0.2
Other ethnic group	0	3	0.6
Not stated	0	10	2.0
Total	0	512	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	2	0.4
Church of England	0	116	22.7
Roman Catholic	0	79	15.4
Other Christian denominations	0	52	10.2
Muslim	0	85	16.6
Sikh	0	7	1.4
Hindu	0	3	0.6
Buddhist	0	23	4.5
Jewish	0	5	1.0
Other	0	9	1.8
No religion	0	129	25.2
Not stated	0	2	0.2
Total	0	512	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0		60	11.7

1 month to 3 months	0		99	19.3
3 months to 6 months	0		104	20.3
6 months to 1 year	0		132	25.8
1 year to 2 years	0		78	15.2
2 years to 4 years	0		31	6.1
4 years or more	0		8	1.6
Total	0		512	100

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0.0
Public protection cases <i>(this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).</i>	0	4	0.8
Total	0	4	0.8

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 month to 3 months	0	0.0	0	0.0
3 months to 6 months	0	0.0	0	0.0
6 months to 1 year	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	0	0.0
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	0	0.0
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	0	0.0	0	0.0

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			

Appendix IV: 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 establishment. 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 2 April 2013 the prisoner population at HMP Coldingley was 506. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 190 prisoners.

We received a total of 167 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 88%. This included three questionnaires completed via interview. Eight respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, seven questionnaires were not returned and eight were returned blank.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	30
B	29
C	30
D	34
E	38
F	4
Segregation unit	2

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Coldingley.

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%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant 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 Coldingley in 2013 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 39 category C training prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Coldingley in 2013 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Coldingley in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the older wings (A, B, C, D) and the newer wing (E).

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		55 (34%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		50 (30%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		47 (29%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		10 (6%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		151 (92%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		2 (1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced		2 (1%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		31 (19%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		72 (44%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		19 (12%)
	<i>Life</i>		17 (10%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>		16 (10%)
	<i>No</i>		148 (90%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		163 (99%)
	<i>No</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		162 (98%)
	<i>No</i>		3 (2%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	86 (52%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 6 (4%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	22 (13%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Arab</i> 2 (1%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	2 (1%)		

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?

Yes	11 (7%)
No	142 (93%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	45 (27%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	31 (19%)	<i>Jewish</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Catholic</i>	25 (15%)	<i>Muslim</i>	32 (20%)
<i>Protestant</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Other</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	8 (5%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	161 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	3 (2%)

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	30 (18%)
No	136 (82%)

Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?

Yes	7 (4%)
No	158 (96%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	47 (28%)
No	119 (72%)

Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?

Yes	97 (58%)
No	69 (42%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts**Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?**

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	81 (49%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	78 (47%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (5%)

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>	81 (49%)
Yes	66 (40%)
No	18 (11%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)

Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	81 (49%)
Yes	7 (4%)
No	74 (45%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?		
	Yes		113 (68%)
	No		50 (30%)
	Don't remember		3 (2%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?		
	Yes		131 (79%)
	No		30 (18%)
	Don't remember		4 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?		
	Very well		41 (25%)
	Well		90 (54%)
	Neither		32 (19%)
	Badly		3 (2%)
	Very badly		1 (1%)
	Don't remember		0 (0%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Yes, someone told me		109 (65%)
	Yes, I received written information		49 (29%)
	No, I was not told anything		15 (9%)
	Don't remember		1 (1%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?		
	Yes		145 (87%)
	No		22 (13%)
	Don't remember		0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?			
	Less than 2 hours		105 (63%)	
	2 hours or longer		53 (32%)	
	Don't remember		8 (5%)	
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?			
	Yes		143 (87%)	
	No		20 (12%)	
	Don't remember		2 (1%)	
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well		23 (14%)	
	Well		85 (52%)	
	Neither		41 (25%)	
	Badly		11 (7%)	
	Very badly		4 (2%)	
	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	31 (19%)	Physical health	16 (10%)
	Housing problems	29 (18%)	Mental health	15 (9%)
	Contacting employers	1 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	2 (1%)

Contacting family	30 (19%)	Getting phone numbers	14 (9%)
Childcare	4 (3%)	Other	10 (6%)
Money worries	19 (12%)	Did not have any problems	59 (37%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal	14 (9%)		

- Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?**
- | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| Yes | 36 (23%) |
| No | 59 (38%) |
| Did not have any problems | 59 (38%) |
- Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| Tobacco | 124 (74%) |
| A shower | 49 (29%) |
| A free telephone call | 80 (48%) |
| Something to eat | 76 (46%) |
| PIN phone credit | 49 (29%) |
| Toiletries/ basic items | 82 (49%) |
| Did not receive anything | 17 (10%) |
- 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 | 78 (48%) |
| Someone from health services | 121 (74%) |
| A Listener/Samaritans | 40 (25%) |
| Prison shop/ canteen | 36 (22%) |
| Did not have access to any of these | 30 (18%) |
- 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 | 74 (46%) |
| What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal | 54 (34%) |
| How to make routine requests (applications) | 69 (43%) |
| Your entitlement to visits | 65 (40%) |
| Health services | 79 (49%) |
| Chaplaincy | 67 (42%) |
| Not offered any information | 55 (34%) |
- Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Yes | 139 (84%) |
| No | 21 (13%) |
| Don't remember | 6 (4%) |
- Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| Have not been on an induction course | 19 (12%) |
| Within the first week | 118 (72%) |
| More than a week | 23 (14%) |
| Don't remember | 3 (2%) |
- Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?**
- | | |
|---|----------|
| Have not been on an induction course | 19 (12%) |
| Yes | 98 (60%) |
| No | 39 (24%) |
| Don't remember | 8 (5%) |

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?

Did not receive an assessment	28 (18%)
<i>Within the first week</i>	68 (43%)
<i>More than a week</i>	52 (33%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (7%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody**Q4.1 How easy is it to:**

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	20 (13%)	61 (39%)	23 (15%)	23 (15%)	13 (8%)	18 (11%)
<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	18 (13%)	55 (39%)	18 (13%)	7 (5%)	7 (5%)	37 (26%)
<i>Get bail information?</i>	4 (3%)	11 (9%)	21 (17%)	7 (6%)	8 (6%)	74 (59%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?

Not had any letters	21 (13%)
Yes	64 (40%)
No	76 (47%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?

Yes	63 (39%)
No	16 (10%)
Don't know	83 (51%)

Q4.4 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	108 (67%)	52 (32%)	2 (1%)
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	151 (94%)	10 (6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	98 (62%)	57 (36%)	4 (3%)
<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	111 (69%)	48 (30%)	1 (1%)
<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	60 (38%)	59 (38%)	38 (24%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	98 (61%)	62 (39%)	0 (0%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	24 (15%)	88 (55%)	48 (30%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good	16 (10%)
Good	26 (16%)
Neither	34 (21%)
Bad	44 (27%)
Very bad	45 (27%)

Q4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

Have not bought anything yet/ don't know	4 (2%)
Yes	52 (32%)
No	106 (65%)

Q4.7 Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?

Yes	65 (41%)
No	11 (7%)
Don't know	84 (53%)

Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes	77 (47%)
-----	----------

	No	30 (18%)
	Don't know/ N/A	56 (34%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	91 (56%)
	No	13 (8%)
	Don't know/ N/A	58 (36%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend	24 (15%)
	Very easy	41 (25%)
	Easy	51 (31%)
	Neither	9 (6%)
	Difficult	3 (2%)
	Very difficult	4 (2%)
	Don't know	30 (19%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes	143 (88%)		
	No	17 (10%)		
	Don't know	2 (1%)		
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?	7 (5%)	95 (63%)	48 (32%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	7 (5%)	76 (52%)	62 (43%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes	91 (57%)		
	No	23 (14%)		
	Don't know	46 (29%)		
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?	62 (39%)	30 (19%)	65 (41%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	62 (40%)	29 (19%)	63 (41%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes	25 (16%)		
	No	128 (84%)		
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	Don't know who they are	39 (25%)		
	Very easy	19 (12%)		
	Easy	21 (13%)		
	Neither	46 (29%)		
	Difficult	21 (13%)		
	Very difficult	11 (7%)		

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	3 (2%)
	Yes	81 (50%)
	No	60 (37%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	19 (12%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	3 (2%)
	Yes	69 (43%)
	No	75 (47%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	13 (8%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	5 (3%)
	No	155 (97%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	124 (81%)
	Very well	2 (1%)
	Well	10 (7%)
	Neither	8 (5%)
	Badly	6 (4%)
	Very badly	3 (2%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	114 (71%)
	No	47 (29%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	110 (69%)
	No	50 (31%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	40 (25%)
	No	120 (75%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	8 (5%)
	Never	44 (27%)
	Rarely	52 (32%)
	Some of the time	40 (25%)
	Most of the time	12 (7%)
	All of the time	6 (4%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	32 (19%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	55 (33%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	63 (38%)

Don't remember 15 (9%)

Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	32 (20%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	33 (21%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	39 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	14 (9%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	45 (28%)
	No	116 (72%)

Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	15 (9%)
	No	145 (91%)

Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	116 (73%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>At work</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>During movement</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>At education</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>At health services</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	2 (1%)

Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	38 (24%)
	No	123 (76%)

Q8.5	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>	15 (9%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	6 (4%)

Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	50 (31%)
	No	110 (69%)
Q8.7	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>	21 (13%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>Medication</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	8 (5%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	94 (62%)
	Yes	15 (10%)
	No	42 (28%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		Don't know	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
	The doctor	15 (9%)	8 (5%)	46 (29%)	24 (15%)	48 (30%)	19 (12%)
	The nurse	11 (7%)	20 (13%)	67 (43%)	29 (19%)	17 (11%)	11 (7%)
	The dentist	23 (15%)	5 (3%)	10 (6%)	13 (8%)	48 (31%)	57 (37%)
Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?						
		Not been	Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
	The doctor	20 (13%)	20 (13%)	51 (32%)	35 (22%)	16 (10%)	17 (11%)
	The nurse	12 (8%)	31 (20%)	55 (35%)	32 (21%)	11 (7%)	15 (10%)
	The dentist	35 (23%)	27 (18%)	25 (16%)	28 (18%)	12 (8%)	25 (16%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	Not been					11 (7%)	
	Very good					21 (13%)	
	Good					43 (27%)	
	Neither					29 (18%)	
	Bad					30 (19%)	
	Very bad					24 (15%)	
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes					62 (39%)	
	No					99 (61%)	

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?	
	Not taking medication	99 (61%)
	Yes, all my meds	40 (25%)
	Yes, some of my meds	16 (10%)
	No	7 (4%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	41 (25%)
	No	121 (75%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)	
	Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	121 (75%)
	Yes	23 (14%)
	No	17 (11%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	51 (32%)
	No	110 (68%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	26 (16%)
	No	135 (84%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	36 (23%)
	Easy	25 (16%)
	Neither	10 (6%)
	Difficult	5 (3%)
	Very difficult	4 (3%)
	Don't know	78 (49%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	10 (6%)
	Easy	20 (13%)
	Neither	12 (8%)
	Difficult	14 (9%)
	Very difficult	9 (6%)
	Don't know	91 (58%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	6 (4%)
	No	151 (96%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	4 (3%)
	No	155 (97%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem	104 (68%)
	Yes	40 (26%)
	No	8 (5%)

Q10.8	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>	135 (84%)
	Yes	22 (14%)
	No	3 (2%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	102 (68%)
	Yes	42 (28%)
	No	7 (5%)

Section II: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		Don't know	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
	Prison job	10 (6%)	26 (16%)	49 (31%)	33 (21%)	25 (16%)	16 (10%)
	Vocational or skills training	25 (16%)	13 (9%)	44 (29%)	30 (20%)	25 (16%)	15 (10%)
	Education (including basic skills)	18 (12%)	26 (17%)	69 (45%)	21 (14%)	13 (8%)	8 (5%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	27 (18%)	9 (6%)	30 (20%)	31 (21%)	30 (20%)	24 (16%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						15 (10%)
	Prison job						100 (65%)
	Vocational or skills training						23 (15%)
	Education (including basic skills)						32 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes						25 (16%)
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		Not been involved	Yes	No		<i>Don't know</i>	
	Prison job	10 (7%)	60 (43%)	59 (43%)		9 (7%)	
	Vocational or skills training	19 (17%)	53 (48%)	30 (27%)		8 (7%)	
	Education (including basic skills)	16 (14%)	60 (51%)	34 (29%)		7 (6%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes	18 (14%)	61 (48%)	39 (31%)		8 (6%)	
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						17 (11%)
	Never						25 (16%)
	Less than once a week						37 (23%)
	About once a week						61 (38%)
	More than once a week						20 (13%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>						28 (18%)
	Yes						54 (34%)
	No						76 (48%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						27 (18%)
	0						19 (12%)

1 to 2	62 (40%)
3 to 5	44 (29%)
More than 5	2 (1%)

Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	30 (19%)
	0	37 (24%)
	1 to 2	52 (33%)
	3 to 5	23 (15%)
	More than 5	15 (10%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	6 (4%)
	0	1 (1%)
	1 to 2	6 (4%)
	3 to 5	29 (18%)
	More than 5	115 (73%)
Q11.9	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>	9 (6%)
	2 to less than 4 hours	13 (8%)
	4 to less than 6 hours	15 (10%)
	6 to less than 8 hours	40 (26%)
	8 to less than 10 hours	35 (23%)
	10 hours or more	27 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	16 (10%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	46 (30%)
	No	106 (70%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	64 (41%)
	No	92 (59%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	38 (24%)
	No	120 (76%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	18 (11%)
	Very easy	17 (11%)
	Easy	40 (25%)
	Neither	21 (13%)
	Difficult	31 (20%)
	Very difficult	25 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (4%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	2 (1%)

	Yes	133 (84%)
	No	23 (15%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply)	
	Not sentenced/ NA	25 (16%)
	No contact	44 (29%)
	Letter	54 (35%)
	Phone	34 (22%)
	Visit	38 (25%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	95 (61%)
	No	62 (39%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	2 (1%)
	Yes	132 (83%)
	No	25 (16%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	27 (17%)
	Very involved	37 (23%)
	Involved	35 (22%)
	Neither	15 (9%)
	Not very involved	21 (13%)
	Not at all involved	23 (15%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	27 (17%)
	Nobody	63 (40%)
	Offender supervisor	40 (25%)
	Offender manager	40 (25%)
	Named/ personal officer	28 (18%)
	Staff from other departments	19 (12%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	27 (17%)
	Yes	91 (58%)
	No	27 (17%)
	Don't know	13 (8%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	27 (17%)
	Yes	31 (20%)
	No	74 (47%)
	Don't know	26 (16%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	27 (17%)
	Yes	51 (33%)
	No	42 (27%)
	Don't know	36 (23%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes	9 (6%)
No	78 (50%)
Don't know	69 (44%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

Yes	27 (17%)
No	128 (83%)

Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	Do not need help		
	Yes		No
Employment	28 (19%)	34 (24%)	82 (57%)
Accommodation	30 (21%)	32 (23%)	80 (56%)
Benefits	28 (21%)	31 (23%)	76 (56%)
Finances	33 (24%)	23 (17%)	79 (59%)
Education	27 (20%)	43 (32%)	65 (48%)
Drugs and alcohol	34 (24%)	61 (44%)	45 (32%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

Not sentenced	2 (1%)
Yes	78 (52%)
No	69 (46%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Coldingley 2013

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 Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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		167	6231	167	171
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	99%	100%	99%	99%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	9%	7%	5%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	3%	5%	3%	0%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	12%	10%	12%	11%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	11%	10%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	98%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	39%	26%	39%	34%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	4%	7%	9%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	20%	12%	20%	13%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	17%	18%	12%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	6%	4%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	28%	37%	28%	27%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	58%	51%	58%	57%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	47%	44%	47%	39%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	77%	70%	77%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	8%	9%	8%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	68%	67%	68%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	79%	81%	79%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	69%	79%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	65%	61%	65%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	29%	19%	29%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	87%	89%	87%	88%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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?	63%	53%	63%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	83%	87%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	72%	65%	55%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	63%	61%	63%	67%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	16%	19%	24%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	18%	15%	18%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	3%	1%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	19%	21%	19%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	3%	3%	7%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	12%	14%	12%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	13%	9%	9%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	10%	11%	10%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	9%	11%	9%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	4%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	9%	19%	9%	23%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	38%	38%	38%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	74%	79%	74%	61%
3.6	A shower?	29%	32%	29%	38%
3.6	A free telephone call?	48%	43%	48%	53%
3.6	Something to eat?	46%	68%	46%	75%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	29%	56%	29%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	49%	45%	49%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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 continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	48%	53%	48%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	74%	71%	74%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	25%	33%	25%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	22%	18%	22%	7%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	46%	53%	46%	39%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	34%	45%	34%	36%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	43%	46%	43%	29%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	40%	46%	40%	35%
3.8	Health services?	49%	57%	49%	51%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	42%	50%	42%	38%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84%	83%	84%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	93%	88%	97%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	68%	65%	68%	77%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	82%	85%	82%	
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?	51%	48%	51%	50%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	51%	52%	51%	52%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%	15%	12%	10%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	40%	41%	40%	50%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	39%	44%	39%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	67%	65%	67%	50%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	92%	94%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	62%	81%	62%	72%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	69%	74%	69%	78%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	38%	40%	38%	55%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	61%	71%	61%	65%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	15%	28%	15%	26%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25%	28%	25%	43%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	32%	45%	32%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	41%	58%	41%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	54%	47%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	56%	59%	56%	58%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	57%	53%	57%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	88%	84%	88%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	67%	63%	67%	62%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	55%	52%	55%	55%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	63%	57%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	32%	34%	32%	25%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	32%	39%	32%	20%
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?	25%	30%	25%	39%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	55%	50%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	43%	47%	43%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	3%	5%	3%	7%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	41%	43%	41%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71%	78%	71%	68%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	69%	77%	69%	72%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	25%	30%	25%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	11%	20%	11%	15%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	81%	75%	81%	91%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	56%	64%	56%	54%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	28%	31%	28%	29%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	13%	9%	14%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	24%	21%	24%	15%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:					
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	9%	9%	8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	5%	3%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	12%	11%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	3%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	2%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	3%	4%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	31%	25%	31%	34%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	10%	13%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	3%	3%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	12%	11%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	5%	8%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	3%	8%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	2%	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	4%	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	2%	5%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	26%	38%	26%	42%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	34%	35%	34%	34%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	56%	58%	56%	65%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	10%	14%	10%	12%
	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:				
9.2	The doctor?	51%	50%	51%	48%
9.2	The nurse?	60%	62%	60%	63%
9.2	The dentist?	45%	43%	45%	48%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	44%	45%	44%	44%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	39%	47%	39%	35%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	89%	86%	89%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	25%	25%	25%	21%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	57%	51%	57%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	32%	23%	32%	34%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	16%	17%	16%	19%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	39%	29%	39%	29%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	19%	18%	19%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	7%	4%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	6%	3%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	83%	64%	83%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	88%	62%	88%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	86%	80%	86%	92%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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 11: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	47%	44%	47%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	38%	37%	38%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	61%	51%	61%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	26%	20%	26%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	65%	61%	65%	70%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	15%	18%	15%	16%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	21%	29%	21%	26%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	16%	14%	16%	15%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	93%	84%	93%	91%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	47%	43%	47%	55%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	83%	75%	83%	79%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	58%	61%	58%	61%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	86%	81%	86%	86%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	60%	63%	60%	68%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	86%	73%	86%	80%
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?	57%	55%	57%	62%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	51%	49%	51%	58%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	34%	49%	34%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	30%	38%	30%	29%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	24%	46%	24%	36%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	73%	77%	73%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	17%	15%	17%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	30%	36%	30%	40%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	41%	44%	41%	44%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	26%	24%	29%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	36%	26%	36%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Coldingley 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Coldingley 2013	HMP Coldingley 2010
	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 13: Preparation for release					
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	85%	83%	85%	
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	34%	33%	34%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	42%	37%	42%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	27%	24%	27%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	30%	34%	30%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	61%	68%	61%	
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	84%	73%	84%	85%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	55%	56%	55%	61%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	48%	46%	48%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	30%	35%	30%	
13.6	Offender manager?	30%	27%	30%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	21%	13%	21%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	15%	17%	15%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	70%	67%	70%	56%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	24%	22%	24%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	40%	28%	40%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	7%	6%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	17%	18%	17%	19%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
13.12	Employment?	29%	36%	29%	
13.12	Accommodation?	29%	40%	29%	
13.12	Benefits?	29%	41%	29%	
13.12	Finances?	23%	30%	23%	
13.12	Education?	40%	38%	40%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	58%	46%	58%	
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	53%	56%	53%	55%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Coldingley 2013 A,B,C,D wings vs E wing

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	E wing	A, B, C, D 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		38	123
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?		
1.3	Are you sentenced?	95%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	5%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%	3%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	8%	12%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	42%	40%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	26%	18%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	5%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	5%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	29%	28%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	64%	57%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	50%	46%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	77%	81%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	69%	63%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	97%	84%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	60%	66%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	87%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	A, B, C, D 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		
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	65%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	53%	65%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	14%	20%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	17%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	14%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	14%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	3%	10%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	6%	12%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	3%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	11%	8%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	71%	75%
3.6	A shower?	31%	28%
3.6	A free telephone call?	53%	46%
3.6	Something to eat?	50%	44%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	31%	28%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	58%	45%
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?	58%	45%
3.7	Someone from health services?	77%	73%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	31%	22%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	34%	17%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	64%	39%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	37%	31%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	50%	39%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	53%	35%
3.8	Health services?	50%	48%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	A, B, C, D 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	The chaplaincy?	45%	39%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	85%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	92%	81%
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?	53%	52%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	44%	52%
4.1	Get bail information?	16%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	46%	38%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	41%	38%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	74%	63%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	92%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	75%	57%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	95%	61%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	47%	35%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	81%	54%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	24%	11%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	29%	25%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	26%	35%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	44%	39%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	60%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	51%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	71%	52%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	60%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	19%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	34%	22%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	55%	47%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	A, B, C, D 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		
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	60%	38%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	3%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	68%	71%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	67%	70%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	32%	22%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	13%	10%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	92%	76%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	29%	29%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	3%	12%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	24%	25%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	12%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	3%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	A, B, C, D 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 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	33%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	16%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	3%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	13%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	5%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	32%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	57%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	13%	9%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	37%	38%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	24%	25%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	49%	26%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	24%	13%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	40%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	19%	20%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	A, B, C, D 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		
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	8%	3%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	2%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	49%	46%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	43%	36%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	59%	63%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	36%	21%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	57%	66%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	8%	16%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	32%	17%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	30%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	60%	48%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	28%	37%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	43%	23%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	29%	23%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	79%	71%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	19%	14%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	33%	28%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	42%	40%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	25%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	38%	36%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	69%	58%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	28%	14%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Coldingley 2013

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

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	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		65	100	16	148	32	132
1.3	Are you sentenced?	97%	100%	88%	100%	100%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11%	9%			13%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	94%	100%	97%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	88%	99%	97%	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.)			44%	38%	94%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	9%	31%	4%	0%	9%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	48%	2%	25%	19%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	14%	21%	38%	16%	9%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	7%	13%	3%	0%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	25%	25%	29%	34%	27%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	78%	94%	77%	69%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	72%	62%	50%	67%	69%	65%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	93%	100%	85%	84%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	73%	67%	65%	54%	68%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	62%	64%	71%	62%	52%	66%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	73%	74%	88%	72%	78%	73%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	87%	94%	82%	81%	85%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	85%	91%	88%	89%	87%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	47%	54%	38%	53%	47%	53%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim 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						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	63%	70%	81%	66%	71%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	95%	93%	95%	97%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	39%	57%	37%	38%	39%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14%	33%	13%	27%	19%	28%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	20%	40%	33%	32%	19%	36%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	31%	47%	40%	41%	30%	44%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	46%	63%	46%	68%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	50%	63%	56%	93%	47%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	91%	73%	90%	84%	90%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	58%	67%	56%	62%	56%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	37%	58%	60%	50%	29%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	43%	64%	41%	50%	41%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	4%	13%	2%	3%	3%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	56%	80%	80%	71%	64%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	56%	77%	67%	70%	60%	72%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	9%	12%	7%	12%	10%	12%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	71%	86%	75%	83%	75%	83%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	30%	26%	33%	28%	19%	29%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	10%	21%	8%	7%	10%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	22%	25%	25%	23%	16%	24%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	9%	12%	6%	12%	6%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	2%	0%	4%	3%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	6%	4%	6%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	3%	5%	13%	4%	3%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	2%	5%	0%	4%	0%	5%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	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						
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	45%	23%	38%	30%	38%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	21%	4%	0%	11%	16%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	18%	2%	6%	8%	22%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	14%	4%	6%	8%	19%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	8%	1%	6%	4%	6%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	5%	6%	4%	0%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	26%	40%	50%	33%	29%	36%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	47%	62%	67%	55%	46%	58%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	28%	46%	47%	39%	22%	43%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	14%	32%	38%	23%	16%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	18%	53%	40%	39%	16%	44%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	50%	74%	79%	64%	38%	72%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	13%	16%	0%	17%	21%	13%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	14%	29%	20%	45%	16%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	15%	16%	7%	18%	17%	16%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	37%	60%	33%	53%	35%	54%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	37%	26%	31%	29%	31%	30%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	22%	26%	38%	22%	31%	22%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	76%	56%	76%	68%	75%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	23%	14%	6%	19%	27%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	48%	38%	36%	42%	52%	39%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	25%	24%	23%	23%	30%	22%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Coldingley 2013

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

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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		30	136
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	20%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	90%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	30%	42%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	14%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	10%	22%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	-	-
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	30%	28%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	43%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	73%	64%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	93%	58%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	77%	74%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	87%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	87%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	53%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	63%	68%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	40%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	27%	25%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35%	32%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	38%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	46%	58%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	90%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	63%	56%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	43%	51%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	23%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	2%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	69%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	79%	67%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	7%	12%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	83%	80%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	46%	24%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	50%	18%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	18%	10%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	7%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	11%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	7%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	14%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	43%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	11%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	7%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	7%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	14%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	41%	32%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	72%	52%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	79%	30%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	63%	18%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	46%	37%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	73%	63%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	11%	16%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	19%	21%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	15%	16%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	43%	52%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	27%	31%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	25%	24%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	72%	74%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	14%	18%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	56%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	39%	21%