

Report on an announced inspection of

HMYOI Deerbolt

20–24 June 2011

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2011

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
Healthy prison summary	9
1 Arrival in custody	
<hr/>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	19
First days in custody	20
2 Environment and relationships	
<hr/>	
Residential units	23
Staff-prisoner relationships	24
Personal officers	25
3 Duty of care	
<hr/>	
Bullying and violence reduction	27
Self-harm and suicide	28
Applications and complaints	30
Legal rights	31
Faith and religious activity	32
Substance use	33
4 Diversity	
<hr/>	
Diversity	35
Race equality	36
Religion	37
Foreign nationals	37
Disability	38
Gender and sexual orientation	38
5 Health services	
<hr/>	
General	41
Clinical governance	42
Primary care	43
Pharmacy	44
Dentistry	45
Inpatient care	45
Secondary care	45
Mental health	46

6	Activities	
	Time out of cell	47
	Learning and skills and work activities	48
	Physical education and health promotion	53
7	Good order	
	Security and rules	55
	Discipline	56
	Incentives and earned privileges	59
8	Services	
	Catering	63
	Prison shop	63
9	Resettlement	
	Strategic management of resettlement	65
	Offender management and planning	66
	Resettlement pathways	70
10	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	77
	Appendices	
	I Inspection team	85
	II Prison population profile	86
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	88

Introduction

Deerbolt Young Offender Institution has an established history of managing young adult male prisoners dating back to when it first opened in the early 1970s. Located near Barnard Castle, County Durham, it provides just over 500 places for convicted young men originating, in the main, from the north east. At our last full inspection in 2006, we noted that Deerbolt provided a safe and constructive environment with improvements evident in the provision of purposeful activity. In 2007, the prison suffered a serious disturbance and since then staff have worked hard to get the prison back on track. At this inspection the evidence suggested that overall outcomes for prisoners continued to be reasonably good, but we identified a number of areas requiring significant further development. It was also a concern that prisoners' perceptions of their experience at Deerbolt were often more negative than we had previously identified.

Deerbolt remained a fundamentally safe institution and overall prisoners in our survey suggested to us that they felt safe. New arrivals were generally received into the establishment well, and there was a broad commitment to safer custody initiatives from across the prison. The quality of care for those at risk of self-harm was good and the prison was active in addressing issues of bullying and violence. The amount of violence prevalent, however, was not insignificant and neither was use of force, although many incidents were comparatively minor. Use of special accommodation, batons, removal to segregation and formal disciplinary procedures were also significant, and in most of these important areas, governance arrangements required improvement.

The quality and cleanliness of the residential units, as well as the general environment, was an impressive feature of the prison. Relationships between staff and prisoners were constructive and respectful and supported by a reasonably effective personal officer scheme. However, in our survey, prisoners' perceptions of staff were worse than at our last inspection. Access to basic amenities was often too restricted, with weak arrangements for the provision of prison kit and inefficient procedures to enable access to stored property. Prisoners were not assured of a daily shower. In our survey, only 37% of prisoners indicated that they could shower daily, against the comparator of 68%. This poor access was in the main caused by limited time out of cell, a lack of domestic time in daily routines and unnecessarily restrictive arrangements to manage evening association.

The prison had a reasonably good approach to diversity with work in place across most strands, although ongoing work would benefit from an up-to-date assessment of need as well as a clearer identification of priorities. Our survey of prisoners from a black and minority ethnic background found reasonably positive perceptions, and there was reasonable individual support for the few foreign national prisoners. Work to address disability issues was good. Prisoners were generally appreciative of the food on offer and the cleanliness of serveries was noteworthy. Arrangements for the management of prisoner complaints worked well but it was concerning that prisoners reported more limited confidence in application and complaints procedures compared with our last survey. Health care provision across a range of services was generally very good.

Learning and skills provision was well managed and the curriculum had been sensibly amended on the basis of local labour market need. There were about 100 vocational training places and 114 education places, but only sufficient activity for about 80% of the population. Take up of education places was inadequate and activity allocation arrangements required further improvements. At the time of our inspection, 79 young men were recorded as unemployed and we found a quarter of the population locked in their cell during the working

day. The quality of provision and the achievements for those who engaged in education or vocational training was, however, reasonably good, and most work activity was also linked to qualifications. The provision of accredited PE was outstanding and most prisoners could access recreational PE.

There had been analyses to better understand the resettlement needs of Deerbolt's population but learning had yet to be taken forward in a comprehensive way. A resettlement unit had been set up on F wing but this was very new and it was too early to establish with any clarity its actual role and purpose. Use of temporary release to support resettlement initiatives was disappointingly low. In general, sentence planning arrangements worked quite well but the quality of supervision for prisoners in scope for formal offender management varied greatly. Much sentence management work would have benefited from a clearer focus, better quality assurance and improved coordination. Work in support of the resettlement pathways was generally adequate but provision to address offending behaviour was limited.

Overall, this is a reasonably good report on an establishment that has sustained good outcomes for prisoners over a number of years. The overarching assessment, however, does not diminish some quite cogent criticisms. The prison is safe but many related indicators are concerning. Prisoners are generally treated decently but access to showers and clothing arrangements need improvement. The quality of regime was generally good, but take up of activity places and time out of cell were inadequate. Resettlement work was adequate, but required better coordination and strategic focus.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2011

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A closed young offender institution holding convicted young male prisoners aged 18-21 drawn mainly from the north and north east.

Prison status

Public

Region

North East

Number held

23.05.11 – 468

Certified normal accommodation

513

Operational capacity

513

Date of last full inspection

24 – 28 April 2006

Brief history

The prison opened in 1973 on the site of a former military camp and was originally a borstal. It subsequently became a youth custody centre and is currently a young offender institution for male prisoners aged 18 – 21.

Short description of residential units

Seven purpose-built residential units, constructed during the 1970s and early 1980s, which are two-storey stand-alone units holding either 60 or 66 young people in single cell accommodation. The residential accommodation has been enhanced with the building of G wing, which holds 36, and the ready-to-use accommodation unit, J wing, with integral showers, which holds 39 young people.

Escort contractor

G4S

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: NHS County Durham

Providers: Care UK Ltd

Tees Esk and Wear Valley Mental Health Trust

Learning and skills provider

The Manchester College

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 All inspection 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, even 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 helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

HP2 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. 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 against this healthy prison test.

There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.

- outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

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 against this healthy prison test.

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 against this healthy prison test.

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.

Safety

- HP3 Arriving prisoners had unreasonable delays in entering the prison but reception procedures were carried out properly and quickly, despite the limitations of the facility. First night and induction arrangements were generally satisfactory but prisoners experienced too much lock up during their induction. There was a significant level of recorded violence but the prison had an effective approach to violence reduction and anti-bullying. Prisoners reported feeling safe, although less so than when we last visited. Suicide and self-harm prevention measures evidenced good quality care. Use of formal disciplinary procedures was high. There was also a high use of force, often for minor incidents, and governance was insufficient. A significant number of prisoners had experienced segregation. The segregation unit required improvement and the regime was too limited. Illicit drug use was very low and integrated drug treatment system procedures were sound. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP4 Escort vans that arrived during lunch were required to wait in the gate area for up to 90 minutes before prisoners could be disembarked, which was very poor. Prisoners were often handcuffed from the escort vans to reception in contravention of local instructions. The escort vans we saw were dirty. Prisoners told us that they were treated well by escort staff.
- HP5 Reception remained too small with limited facilities, although the holding rooms were welcoming and clean. Searching was proportionate and carried out respectfully. Prisoners did not spend too long in reception and we observed staff treating them well. Under a new initiative, Insider prisoner peer supporters now attended reception to meet and greet new arrivals, and supported them during their early days in custody, which prisoners appreciated.
- HP6 We were concerned that full risk assessments were not carried out until the day after prisoners had arrived. We were assured, however, that staff would deal with any immediate issues, and handover arrangements to night staff were good. In our survey¹ prisoners responded positively about their access to showers and a free phone call on arrival.

¹ **Inspection methodology:** There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: 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, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. 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.

(Adapted from Towel et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

- HP7 We were assured that prisoners received a full induction. Induction usually lasted seven days but this included a considerable amount of lock up between sessions, and prisoners could spend a further two weeks on the induction wing after completion. Insiders facilitated a comprehensive presentation introducing the establishment but were not always supervised by staff, and its delivery did not fully engage prisoners. Prisoners were introduced to all departments during induction, concluding with a useful multidisciplinary review of their immediate and resettlement needs.
- HP8 Violence reduction and anti-bullying measures were well managed and underpinned by a whole-prison commitment and approach. The recorded level of violence, while reducing slightly, was not insignificant but included many low-level fights and assaults. Data were well managed and subject to some trend analysis and follow-up action when issues were highlighted. Analysis included consultation with prisoners. The anti-bullying strategy was effective and incidents were taken seriously, appropriately investigated and acted upon. Interventions for bullies were meaningful and, although there was nothing structured, support for victims was good. In our survey, prisoners reported feeling safe but in some areas their responses were poorer than at our last full inspection.
- HP9 Suicide and self-harm prevention measures were also well managed by the safer custody team. Incidents of self-harm were increasing but there had been no apparent self-inflicted deaths. Management of prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents was good. Staff engaged well with prisoners in crisis, had a good knowledge of their personal circumstances and showed genuine care and compassion. There were some impressive initiatives and facilities to support safer custody work. Retention of Listeners was difficult but prisoners had good access to them, including at night.
- HP10 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and not unnecessarily restrictive. The security team processed the increased levels of intelligence but suspicion mandatory drug tests (MDT) were not always carried out in time. The security committee was supported by a comprehensive report that allowed some trend analysis and follow up.
- HP11 The number of adjudications and minor reports was high and many could have been dealt with less formally. Quality assurance of records of hearings had resulted in some improvements, but some charges were still proved without sufficient exploration of the evidence and mitigation was not always taken into consideration.
- HP12 In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons indicated that force had been used against them. The use of force was high but much involved low-level physical direction. Use of handcuffs was high and often unnecessary. In too many instances prisoners were routinely located in the segregation unit when other de-escalation techniques could have been used. Use of force documentation was reasonable but too often lacked detail and did not record efforts to de-escalate. Although planned interventions were video recorded they were not routinely reviewed. Drawing and use of batons was high and sometimes unjustified with little subsequent scrutiny. Use of special accommodation was also high and not always justified. The continued practice of removing prisoners' normal clothing and providing anti-tear gowns, without meaningful risk assessment, when they were located there was inappropriate. There were no protocols for the use of 'cool off' rooms, which should not be used as unauthorised special accommodation. The use of force committee met regularly but governance and the quality and depth of scrutiny required improvement.

- HP13 Cells in the segregation unit were stark, with some graffiti and dirty toilets, and the exercise yard was bleak. Throughput of prisoners in the unit was high but average stays were not excessive. Good order paperwork was too often incomplete or poorly completed. The regime for segregated prisoners was poor, with no daily showers, brief exercise periods and uninspiring activities, but staff engagement was reasonably respectful.
- HP14 Integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) detoxification was well run but there were few patients. There was good integration of IDTS with the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs). The IDTS nurse also usefully spent time in visits offering information and advice to family members. The random MDT rate for the six months to April 2011 was a low 2.7% against a target of 5%.

Respect

HP15 The quality of the internal and external environment was very good, but lack of prisoner access to showers remained unacceptable. Staff-prisoner relationships were respectful and there was a reasonable personal officer scheme. Structures to support and promote diversity were developing, and black and minority ethnic prisoners suggested their treatment and outcomes were broadly equitable. The quality of the food was good. Applications and complaints were reasonably well managed, although prisoner confidence in the systems was mixed. The prison had a well-integrated chaplaincy. The quality of health care was good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP16 Residential wings were clean with well-maintained recreational equipment. The external environment was very tidy and well kept. Cells were clean and mostly free from graffiti, but toilet screening was inadequate. The offensive displays policy was not adhered to. Consultation with prisoners was good and the issues they raised were generally dealt with promptly. Prisoners told us that access to prison kit and clothing was poor. No own clothes were permitted. There was a backlog of property in reception awaiting distribution and prisoners told us that it could take up to two months to receive their items. Communal showers did not have a decent level of privacy. The lack of showers and restricted access to them was unacceptable.

HP17 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was comprehensive but some recent positive changes were not well understood by staff or prisoners. The scheme was broadly fair and well managed. Prisoners had opportunity to progress to the enhanced level, and demotion was managed in a considered way. Prisoners on the basic level could only receive three showers and phone calls per week, which was inappropriate. However, prisoners only remained on basic regime for relatively short periods and were given the opportunity and support to improve their behaviour.

HP18 In our survey, 78% of respondents said that there was a member of staff that they could turn to if they had a problem, against the comparator of 73%. We observed staff of all grades engaging with prisoners respectfully. Many prisoners told us that staff were helpful and mostly addressed them by their preferred names.

HP19 In our survey, prisoners responded less favourably than the comparators when asked about their personal officer. Despite this, in our discussions with prisoners, most said they knew who their personal officer was and that they were generally helpful. Staff

had a good knowledge of their individual prisoners, and case history notes reflected a balanced appraisal of the prisoner's behaviour. Personal officer links with the offender management unit (OMU) were limited and required further development.

HP20 Prisoners were positive about the food, especially the themed catering events. The menu was varied and balanced and religious and healthy options were available. A motivated catering team offered a range of qualifications for kitchen workers and had a clear focus on allowing them to progress. Wing serveries were among the cleanest we had seen. Consultation with prisoners about the food was good.

HP21 The range of goods in the prison shop met the needs of the population, and the canteen list was available in six languages as well as English. There was quarterly consultation through the prisoner representatives.

HP22 A newly introduced diversity and equality management team (DEMT) addressed all aspects of diversity. Diversity policies were up to date but based on a limited analysis of need, and the action plan lacked detail on priorities for action. The diversity and equality officer had a good profile in the prison and all prisoner diversity representatives had been trained using 'challenge it change it' diversity materials, although only half the staff had had this training. Other than the diversity representatives forum there were few opportunities for minority groups to meet together. Equality impact assessments had been undertaken, but the use of SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment) data focused on black and minority ethnic prisoners and not, for example, on the significant Traveller and Muslim populations.

HP23 The results of our survey of black and minority ethnic prisoners were generally positive. The majority said there was a member of staff they could turn to for help if they had a problem, and three-quarters said most staff showed them respect. Discriminatory (previously 'racist') incident reporting forms were handled effectively, and responses were timely and comprehensive.

HP24 There were few foreign national prisoners and limited strategy in this area, although the foreign nationals coordinator gave support to individuals. Foreign national prisoners were given information about their status and procedures, and there was a leaflet detailing independent legal advice services. Access to the UK Border Agency had recently improved.

HP25 Attention to disability issues was good and a disability access audit had led to some improvements. Personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs) were in place. Support for gay prisoners was limited.

HP26 Applications from prisoners were logged on the wings but there was no effective quality assurance of the timeliness or effectiveness of responses. Far fewer prisoners than in 2006 felt applications were dealt with fairly or promptly. Complaints were well managed and monitored, but respondents to our survey suggested less confidence in the arrangements against comparator prisons or when we last visited. There was a limited legal service provision.

HP27 Chaplaincy provision had improved and covered all the relevant religions. Individual needs were well catered for through a range of services, one-to-one sessions and classes. There were good links between the chaplaincy and other departments,

including the wings and educational activity. There was a continued lack of washing facilities near the multi-faith room for Muslim prayer.

HP28 The health care centre provided a good range of facilities but some treatment rooms on the wings were dirty. Primary care services were good with all new arrivals receiving comprehensive initial and secondary screening. Prisoners had access to a daily GP clinic and a range of nurse-led and specialist clinics. The quality of dental care was good but patients could wait up to nine weeks for a routine appointment. Four full-time mental health nurses provided a good primary and secondary service, and a psychiatrist provided a weekly session. Prisoners had no access to counselling services but there were developing daycare services, including the impressive Ashley Done suite.

Purposeful activity

HP29 Time unlocked was limited for many prisoners and there were needless restrictions on access to evening association. Learning and skills provision was well managed, but there were insufficient activity places and education places were underused. Too many prisoners were unemployed. The range of education and vocational training courses was good. Standards of learning and teaching, as well as success rates and achievements, were good. Prisoner time in the library was limited. There was a good range of accredited courses in PE and most prisoners had recreational access. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP30 The prison reported a time unlocked figure of about 6.5 hours a day, which was poor, although a prisoner fully engaged with the regime could achieve just under eight hours during the working week. For many, however, unlock could be considerably less, and we found a quarter of prisoners locked up during the working day. Most prisoners could access three evening association sessions a week, but there were unnecessary restrictions to the number unlocked in an evening. Access to exercise was reasonable but yards had no equipment.

HP31 Learning and skills provision was well managed. Labour market intelligence had been used to review the curriculum, and had led to widened and realigned provision. Induction gave prisoners satisfactory information on the education and vocational activities available, and they all received a literacy and numeracy assessment.

HP32 Allocation of prisoners to activity had improved but inefficiencies still delayed deployment, with about 79 prisoners unemployed. There were only sufficient activity places to meet the needs of approximately 80% of the population. Work opportunities included a charity workshop, catering, drystone walling, gardening, laundry, recycling, wing cleaning and serving, peer mentoring and orderly work. Most work was linked to qualifications and focused on employability skills.

HP33 There was a good range of accredited vocational training programmes, including bricklaying, industrial cleaning, joinery, motor vehicle repair, painting and decorating, plastering, a multi-skills workshop and waste management. About 97 places were available. Learners made good progress and success rates on most vocational programmes were high. Individual coaching was good and met needs well, although individual learning plans were not well developed. Support to develop learners' literacy and numeracy skills was not always contextualised to the vocational area.

- HP34 There were about 114 education places but the uptake was poor at just 64%. Most teaching was good. The range of education courses provided a good balance to develop prisoners' literacy, numeracy, personal skills, ICT, business and enterprise as well as the impressive performing arts facility. Overall achievements of qualifications were satisfactory. Standards of work were generally good, and especially good in the literacy and numeracy workshop, engaging the harder to reach learners. Volunteers and peer mentors provided very effective support. Most lessons had a productive ethos and behaviour was good.
- HP35 The library was small for the population but the range of texts was satisfactory. Most prisoners had access to the facilities once a week, but some had insufficient time in the library. Events such as a reading group, poetry reading and recording and the six-book challenge encouraged participation in the library.
- HP36 There was a range of accredited PE programmes and achievement of qualifications was outstanding, with many courses achieving 100%. Over 80% of the population took part in a range of recreational PE. The PE department had useful links with health care and CARATs, including a programme for tackling drugs through PE. There were inadequate showering facilities in the main gym.

Resettlement

- HP37 There was a reducing reoffending strategy and policy group, although the offender management and resettlement strategies needed better coordination. Needs analyses were comprehensive but many findings had yet to be adopted. Sentence planning arrangements were reasonable and OASys assessments were up to date. The collation and analysis of information on individuals and the quality of offender supervision needed to improve. Pre-release arrangements were variable and arrangements on the new resettlement unit were embryonic. Release on temporary licence was underused. Public protection arrangements were good. Provision across the seven resettlement pathways met some need although more needed to be done. Nevertheless, outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP38 The reducing reoffending strategy document referred to the seven resettlement pathways and an action plan outlined development objectives, although the OMU and public protection work were not referred to. The policy group was well attended and pathway objectives were regularly reviewed and updated. This forum provided some coordination with the OMU. The resettlement unit on F wing was very new. Staff were eager to take developments forward but there was no formal planning process or steering group as yet and, as a consequence, some aspects of its role remained unclear. There had been a formal offending behaviour needs analysis and consultation exercise but this work had not been taken forward effectively. Release on temporary licence to support resettlement was underused.
- HP39 All prisoners were subject to OASys (offender assessment system) assessments and sentence planning. OASys assessments were up to date, but most prisoner contact was oriented to the assessment, with limited follow up. Sentence planning was generally reasonable, but involvement and contributions from other departments were limited and poorly coordinated. Links with community offender managers were consistent. The collation of information by offender supervisors was good, but its

analysis and meaningful risk assessment required further work. Only in-scope prisoners were seen consistently between sentence plan reviews. The focus and quality of contact was variable and there was no quality assurance or professional supervision of offender supervisors. The lack of one-to-one work and structured offence-focused contact with prisoners was compounded by the limited availability of offending behaviour programmes. Pre-release arrangements were variable. All prisoners had an OASys review eight weeks before release but information from other departments was unreliable. The resettlement team had also introduced a pre-release passport for F wing prisoners but this operated in isolation of OASys. Management of the few indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was good.

- HP40 Public protection arrangements were good. All new arrivals were screened and there were arrangements to undertake risk assessments. There were well-attended monthly interdepartmental risk management team meetings, which considered documentation and reports prepared by one of the probation offender supervisors. Officer offender supervisors tended not to be directly involved in the process, although they had high- and very high-risk cases on their caseloads.
- HP41 New contracts with Shelter to provide accommodation support and finance, benefit and debt services had come into place on 1 July 2011. Referral processes were generally good and well managed. Planned training for the sole housing worker was appropriate. The proportion of prisoners released with no fixed accommodation was concerning, at over 4%.
- HP42 Effective partnership working in support of the education, training and employment pathway was developing. Events at the prison brought employers and prisoners together to discuss employment opportunities and to engage employers. There was some duplication of the pre-release support and intervention provided by the careers information and advice support (CIAS) workers and the wider resettlement team.
- HP43 Discharge planning for health was satisfactory. Prisoners received discharge packs including advice on access to NHS services and a letter to their GP outlining their care and treatment. The care programme approach was used for patients with enduring mental health problems.
- HP44 Debt management was now addressed by the new Shelter worker but it was too early to assess the new service. Around £30,000-worth of prisoner debt per quarter had been identified over the last few years, emphasising need.
- HP45 CARATs provided a very good service to an active caseload of about 80 and were appreciated by prisoners. P-ASRO (prison addressing substance related offending) had not run since November 2010 but was due to restart. There was an alcohol-specific strategy, informed by an excellent needs analysis, although no programme had been provided. Links with local drug intervention programmes were good, helped by a phone conferencing suite for prisoners to contact those that were further away.
- HP46 A family support worker had recently joined the resettlement team to support prisoner contact with their families. There were father/child visits four or five times a year as well as family visits. Visits processes had improved and were managed more efficiently.
- HP47 There was limited offending behaviour programme provision, despite the significant need identified in the 2010 needs analysis. Staffing shortfalls over the last 12 months

meant that programme completions had not reached the targets, which had been reduced in the current schedule.

Main concerns and recommendations

HP48 **Concern:** The level of violence in the prison was not insignificant and, although there had been some work to reduce the incidence, further work was still needed to achieve any meaningful reduction.

Recommendation: There should be further work to reduce the level of violent incidents.

HP49 **Concern:** Prisoners located in the special accommodation continued to be routinely strip-searched and have their own clothing removed and replaced with anti-tear gowns with no meaningful risk assessment to justify this.

Recommendation: Prisoners located in the special accommodation should only be strip-searched and have their own clothing replaced with anti-tear gowns when this is supported by a risk assessment.

HP50 **Concern:** The regime in the segregation unit was poor, with no daily showers, brief exercise periods, uninspiring activities and little to motivate residents.

Recommendation: The regime in the segregation unit should be revised and improved.

HP51 **Concern:** Prisoners, including those undertaking dirty occupations, could not shower every day.

Recommendation: All prisoners should have access to daily showers.

HP52 **Concern:** The diversity and equality policy lacked detail about the specific needs of minority groups, priorities and actions.

Recommendation: There should be a needs analysis to inform the development of a detailed diversity and equality strategy and priorities for the diversity and equality action plan, and specific needs analyses to inform strategy and action plans for each diversity strand.

HP53 **Concern:** The prison recorded a poor time unlocked figure of only about 6.5 hours a day, and a significant number of prisoners were locked in their cell during the working part of the day.

Recommendation: Prisoners should have greater access to time out of cell.

HP54 **Concern:** There were only sufficient activity places to meet the needs of approximately 80% of the population. Allocation of prisoners to activity had improved but inefficiencies still delayed deployment.

Recommendation: The number of activity places should be increased and the allocation process improved so that prisoners are deployed to them effectively.

HP55 **Concern:** The function of the new resettlement unit and its strategic direction were unclear.

Recommendation: The prison should determine the function of the resettlement unit and how this should be developed, and set out a clear strategy to take these objectives forward.

HP56 **Concern:** Offender supervisor contact with prisoners focused primarily on OASys assessment and sentence planning, and the lack of offence-focused work and contact with prisoners was compounded by the limited availability of offending behaviour programmes.

Recommendation: The role of offender supervisors should be clearly defined to include ongoing risk and offence-related assessments and engagement.

HP57 **Concern:** There was limited offending behaviour programme provision, and the target completion rate had been reduced, despite the significant need for programmes identified in the 2010 needs analysis.

Recommendation: There should be a strategy to address the shortfall in offending behaviour provision to meet the needs of the population.

Section 1: Arrival in custody

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners travel in safe, decent conditions to and from court and between prisons. During movement the individual needs of prisoners are recognised and given proper attention.

- 1.1 Escort staff were friendly but vans were often unclean. Prisoners arriving during lunchtime spent a long time waiting on the escort vehicles. Some prisoners were handcuffed from the escort vehicle to reception, which contravened the prison's policy.
- 1.2 The main escort contractor was G4S. The escort vans we saw were dirty, and in our survey, only 30% of respondents said that the cleanliness of the van was good, against the comparator of 41%. The vans held adequate emergency and food supplies. The escort staff we observed were courteous to and friendly with prisoners.
- 1.3 In our survey, 86% of respondents said that they knew where they were going when they transferred, against the comparator of 82%, and 94%, against 85%, said that their property arrived at the same time as they did.
- 1.4 Journey times were relatively quick. In our survey, only 6% of respondents said that they spent more than four hours in the vans, and prisoners we spoke with said that travel times were usually less than three hours.
- 1.5 Reception did not open over lunch and escort vans that arrived during this period were often left to wait up to 90 minutes in the gate area with prisoners on board.
- 1.6 Handcuffs were sometimes used on prisoners during the disembarkation from the vans to reception, which was disproportionate to the risk and in contradiction to the prison's own policy. Some escort and prison staff were unaware of the policy.

Recommendations

- 1.7 Prisoners arriving during lunch should not be left on escort vehicles and should be disembarked into the holding rooms.
- 1.8 Arriving prisoners should not be handcuffed when they are moved from escort vehicles to the reception area, and escort and prison staff should be made aware of the prison's policy on this.

Housekeeping point

- 1.9 Escort vans should be regularly cleaned.

First days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners feel safe on their reception into prison and for the first few days. Their individual needs, both during and after custody, are identified and plans developed to provide help. During a prisoner's induction into the prison he/she is made aware of prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

1.10 The reception area remained small and unsuitable, although the process was speedy and staff respectful. Prisoner Insiders met new arrivals in the holding room and again on the first night wing. New arrivals were given a shower and a phone call but there was no first night risk assessment until the following morning. Induction was protracted with too little to occupy prisoners, and the presentation by Insiders was too detailed and had no staff support, but it ended with a useful multidisciplinary needs meeting.

Reception

- 1.11 The reception area was small and unsuitable, and unchanged since our last inspection. It had an office and two small holding rooms. On average, 15 new arrivals a week were processed but most usually arrived on the same day, putting pressure on the reception process.
- 1.12 The holding rooms had recently been refurbished and were clean and free from graffiti. Each had a television and notice boards with relevant up-to-date information.
- 1.13 Searching of prisoners was proportionate, with transfers from other prisons and internal prison escorts subject only to a rub-down search, metal detection and body orifice scanning chair. Non-prison escorts and prisoners returning from temporary release were subject to a full search. Staff carried out the searches respectfully.
- 1.14 Prisoners were processed through reception quickly and staff treated them respectfully, although in our survey black and minority ethnic respondents were less positive about their treatment by reception staff than white respondents. Prisoner Insiders attended reception to meet new arrivals and sat with them in the holding rooms to assist them to settle.
- 1.15 New arrivals were given a reception pack and informed what would happen to them after the reception procedures had been completed. In our survey, 49% of respondents, against the comparator of 40%, said that they had the opportunity for a shower on the day they arrived, and 75%, against 69%, said that they were given the opportunity to make a free phone call. All new arrivals we spoke to said that they had both a shower and a free phone call, and the prison also advanced a further £2 phone credit.

Recommendation

- 1.16 Reception should be refurbished and made fit for purpose.

First night

- 1.17 I wing was the dedicated first night and induction wing. All cells were designated first night cells and those we saw were clean and adequately furnished.
- 1.18 Three Insiders lived and worked on the first night wing. They met new arrivals in the association area and gave them information on the first night, induction and wider prison regime. New arrivals we spoke to appreciated the help of Insiders.
- 1.19 First night staff saw all new arrivals on the day of their reception for a quick interview. This interview did not cover first night risk assessments, but we were assured that staff would deal with any immediate issues raised. A first night risk assessment was carried out the morning after prisoners had arrived but was perfunctory. Health care staff saw new arrivals in a private room.
- 1.20 New arrivals were given a comprehensive information booklet to read on their first night in custody, and the handover arrangements to night staff were good. In our survey, 84% of respondents, against the comparator of 77%, said that they felt safe on their first night.

Recommendation

- 1.21 **New arrivals should receive a thorough and meaningful risk assessment interview on the day they arrive, and a written record of this interview should be kept.**

Induction

- 1.22 Induction started the day after prisoners arrived. In our survey, 91% of respondents, against the comparator of 87%, said that they had been on an induction course. Although the prison did not have a tracking system to ensure prisoners undertook all aspects of induction, our observations indicated that most prisoners received a full induction.
- 1.23 Induction started with a classroom presentation facilitated by Insiders, but with no support from prison staff. The presentation was comprehensive but covered too much information too quickly, and the inductees we observed were not engaged with it.
- 1.24 The timetable indicated that induction could last up to seven days with prisoners seen by staff from all departments during this period. In practice, the induction programme was equivalent to two days. As a result, prisoners spent too much time locked behind their doors with very little to occupy them. Many prisoners remained on the induction wing for two weeks after they had completed their induction.
- 1.25 Induction concluded with a useful multidisciplinary meeting that reviewed the immediate needs of prisoners and linked these with their resettlement needs.

Recommendations

- 1.26 **The induction presentation should be streamlined and the Insider facilitators supported by staff.**

- 1.27 The induction programme should be condensed into a shorter period, and once completed, prisoners should move to their residential wings as soon as possible.

Section 2: Environment and relationships

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.

2.1 The general environment was clean and well maintained. Toilet screening in cells was insufficient. There was a robust offensive displays policy but it was not fully adhered to. There was good consultation through prisoner representatives. There were problems with clothing and prisoner access to stored property. The restricted access to daily showers was unacceptable.

Accommodation and facilities

- 2.2 There were nine wings, of which I wing was the first night and induction wing and F wing was the resettlement wing. Eight wings had spur-style landings and G wing had gallery-style landings.
- 2.3 The general environment around the prison was tidy, free from litter and with very well-kept gardens. The wings were bright and clean and all had well-maintained recreational equipment. Notice boards were well laid out with relevant information.
- 2.4 All cells were well furnished and most were single occupancy. There were a few double occupancy cells, which were of an adequate size. Except for J wing, which had en-suite facilities, toilet screening in cells was insufficient for privacy – the cells in A, B, C and G wings had no screens, and those in D, E and F wings had partial screening.
- 2.5 Although the prison had a robust offensive displays policy, we found examples of prisoners contravening this policy with no staff intervention.
- 2.6 In our survey, 63% of respondents, against the comparator of 41%, said that cell call bells were normally answered within five minutes. Prisoners told us that staff generally answered cell bells quickly but some gave behaviour warnings for misuse.
- 2.7 Access to phones was good and prisoners could use them when they were unlocked. Incoming and outgoing mail was processed by the night staff, procedures were adequate and mail was not unduly delayed.
- 2.8 Each wing had a prisoner representative, and a committee of prisoner representatives and staff met every month. The minutes indicated a good quality meeting with most issues dealt with efficiently and effectively.

Recommendations

- 2.9 Toilets in cells should be effectively screened.

- 2.10 The prison should ensure that the offensive displays policy is adhered to by all prisoners and enforced by staff.

Clothing and possessions

- 2.11 Prisoners were not allowed to wear their own clothes and many told us that access to weekly kit exchange was poor, with insufficient clothing for a week. In our survey, only 48% of respondents, against the comparator of 55%, said that they were normally offered enough clean suitable clothes for the week. Bedding was exchanged weekly and duvet covers monthly.
- 2.12 In our survey, only 24% of respondents, against the comparator of 37%, said that they could normally access their stored property if needed. Stored property could only be accessed through a wing application, and reception was open on Saturday mornings to distribute stored property. We saw many items in reception awaiting distribution to prisoners, with many applications over six weeks old.

Recommendations

- 2.13 Prisoners should be allowed to wear their own clothes, and sufficient prison clothing should be available.
- 2.14 Prisoners should be able to access their stored property within one week of making an application.

Hygiene

- 2.15 In our survey, 66% of respondents, against the comparator of 56%, said that they normally got cell cleaning materials every week. The cells we saw were well maintained and clean with little evidence of graffiti. J wing cells were particularly clean.
- 2.16 In our survey, only 37% of respondents, against the comparator of 68%, said that they were able to shower every day. J wing had en-suite showers in cells, which its residents appreciated. The other eight wings had insufficient showers for the population of the wing and this, combined with limited time out of cell and a rota to use the showers, meant that most prisoners could not shower every day. In the worst case, prisoners could wait 72 hours between showers (see main recommendation HP51). Communal showers were generally clean but none had adequate screening.

Recommendation

- 2.17 Communal showers should have adequate privacy screening.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions. Healthy prisons

should demonstrate a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of security, control and justice are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness.

2.18 Most prisoners felt that staff treated them with respect and that there was a member of staff they could turn to for help. We observed good relationships between staff and prisoners and positive staff engagement with prisoners. The presentational tone of some notices lacked respect.

2.19 In our survey, 70% of all respondents said that most staff treated them with respect, and 78% said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. Fewer respondents than the comparator, 12% against 24%, said that they been victimised by staff.

2.20 Our own observations were that staff engaged with prisoners, and we saw no disrespectful behaviour by them. Staff seemed helpful and interested in prisoners. We observed a particularly good interaction with a member of the gardens staff thanking and praising his prisoner party for their work.

2.21 Prisoners we interviewed spoke of friendly staff who used their preferred title to address them. Similarly, we observed that prisoners' first names were usually used in official documentation and case history notes. However, some information notices to prisoners were authoritarian in tone and disrespectful.

Housekeeping point

2.22 Information notices to prisoners should be reasonable and presented with respect.

Personal officers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' relationships with their personal officers are based on mutual respect, high expectations and support.

2.23 The personal officer scheme operated well. Most prisoners knew their personal officer, and staff had a good understanding of the prisoners they were responsible for. Allocation of personal officers meant that changes were rare. Case history notes were good but links with the offender management unit required further development.

2.24 There was a comprehensive and succinct personal officer policy document. The wing manager allocated prisoners to personal officers, which meant that changes of personal officer were rare. Each prisoner had a back-up personal officer, which ensured that there was usually a member of staff available who understood the prisoner's circumstances.

2.25 In our survey, respondents were less positive than the comparators about having a personal officer and their helpfulness. Despite this, most prisoners we spoke to knew who their personal officer was and most said that they were helpful. The scheme was well publicised. Electronic case history notes were good and provided a diary of the prisoner's custodial behaviour, which included a balance of positive, negative and generic entries.

- 2.26 Personal officers knew the prisoners for whom they were responsible and could appraise their individual circumstances. However, links with the offender management unit for individual prisoners were limited and required further development, specifically in the application of sentence plans.

Recommendation

- 2.27 Links between personal officers and the offender management unit should be developed.

Section 3: Duty of care

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Active and fair systems to prevent and respond to violence and intimidation are known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and inform all aspects of the regime.

- 3.1 Prisoners reported feeling safe. Violence reduction and anti-bullying were well managed and underpinned by a whole-prison commitment. The recorded level of violence, while reducing slightly, was not insignificant, but many incidents were low-level fights and assaults. Data were well managed and subject to some trend analysis, and action was taken on highlighted issues. The anti-bullying strategy was effective and we were assured that incidents were taken seriously, appropriately investigated and acted upon. Interventions for bullies were positive and support for victims good.
- 3.2 The violence reduction strategy was reasonably comprehensive and provided clear guidance for staff and prisoners on the reporting and monitoring of bullying and violent incidents. Documentation for monitoring bullies was not included, and the strategy was not informed by some of the very positive and regular prisoner consultation. The safer custody team, which consisted of a developing prison service manager (DPSM), senior officer and an administrative officer, had day-to-day responsibility for the delivery of the strategy. The team was widely supported by the whole-prison approach and commitment to the management of violence reduction and anti-bullying.
- 3.3 Attendance at monthly safer custody meetings was reasonable and included prisoner representation. A comprehensive report collated from an impressive database covered a broad range of monitoring data, included some good trend analysis and informed the safer custody committee, which also had oversight of the self-harm and suicide prevention policy. A safer custody continuous improvement plan was reviewed and updated regularly. The meeting was responsive to identified issues and concerns.
- 3.4 Data collated indicated that the level of fights and assaults was significant but there had been a slight decrease from an average of 30 incidents a month in 2010 to 26 a month between January and May 2011. There were effective links with the security department, and the prison had quickly identified hotspots for incidents, such as showers and television rooms, and had some success in taking action to reduce these, but more work was required. There had been nine serious assaults between January and May 2011, and an improved relationship with local police had resulted in more charges taken against those who engaged in serious violence in the prison. However, most incidents were low-level fights and assaults.
- 3.5 Despite the reported level of violence, most related findings in our survey were positive – for example, only 26% of respondents, against the comparator of 37%, said they had ever felt unsafe in the prison, and only 15%, against 22%, had been victimised by other prisoners. Some responses were, however, worse than at our last inspection.

- 3.6 The published strategy included a three-stage anti-bullying monitoring process. Following the receipt of bullying investigation reports (BIRs), wing managers conducted a thorough investigation and decided if further action was required. The first stage involved 14 days of intensive monitoring and observation of the alleged bully, who was required to attend a one-day course on bullying, delivered by gym staff. However, individualised targets to tackle bullying behaviour were not set when the document was initially opened. Stage two was initiated if there was further evidence to support bullying behaviour. This involved challenging the behaviour further through six structured motivational interviews. The prisoner was also downgraded to the basic privilege level via a review board. If he refused to engage with stage two or continued his bullying behaviour, the prisoner was moved to stage three, which included removal to the segregation unit and further action to encourage him to comply with stage two.
- 3.7 In 2010, 147 BIRs were submitted and resulted in 18 prisoners being monitored on stage one and 14 on stage two. Between January and May 2011, 15 prisoners had been monitored under stage one, eight on stage two and three on stage three as a result of 76 BIRs. Although there were no structured interventions for the victims of bullying, they had good support.
- 3.8 There were safer custody notice boards in all key areas, including on each residential wing, and visitors could also report concerns about violence or bullying.

Recommendation

- 3.9 Prisoners should be set individualised behaviour targets when anti-bullying monitoring documents are opened on them.

Housekeeping point

- 3.10 The violence reduction strategy should include documentation used to monitor bullies.

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

Prisons work to reduce the risks of self-harm and suicide through a whole-prison approach. Prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide are identified at an early stage, and a care and support plan is drawn up, implemented and monitored. Prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable are encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- 3.11 Self-harm and suicide prevention were well managed by the safer custody and wider prison teams. Incidents of self-harm had increased but there had been no self-inflicted deaths. Management of prisoners on self-harm monitoring documents was good, and staff engaged well and mostly demonstrated genuine care and compassion. There were some impressive initiatives and facilities to support safer custody work. Retention of Listeners was difficult but prisoners had good access to them.

- 3.12 A comprehensive strategy document on self-harm and suicide prevention was reviewed annually, included guidance on all aspects of prevention and was well understood by staff and

prisoners. Self-harm and suicide prevention were managed by the safer custody team but, as with violence reduction, benefited from involvement by the whole prison.

- 3.13 The monthly safer custody meeting was reasonably well attended and included Listener representation. There was analysis of patterns and trends of self-harm. The continuous improvement plan was regularly reviewed and updated.
- 3.14 There had been 101 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents opened in 2010, and 66 between January and May 2011. There had been 160 acts of self-harm in 2010 and 80 to the end of May 2011, which suggested that the incidence of self-harm, although mainly low level, was increasing. One prisoner had been monitored under constant watch conditions in the health care centre in 2011.
- 3.15 There were four ACCTs open at the time of the inspection. The documentation that we reviewed showed that care for those in crisis was good. Care plans were generally detailed and updated regularly, and case reviews were in depth and demonstrated a good level of care. However, they were not always multidisciplinary, although there was regular mental health input in most cases. Observational entries displayed engagement between staff and prisoners but sometimes fell below the required frequency and were often too predictable, particularly at night.
- 3.16 Staff had a good knowledge and insight into the personal circumstances of prisoners monitored on ACCT documents and demonstrated a genuine concern and compassion for them. It was to the credit of the prison that there had been no apparent self-inflicted deaths in custody since our last inspection. There had, however, been a death from natural causes in December 2009, which appeared to have been managed appropriately.
- 3.17 There was an impressive range of initiatives to support prisoners, particularly those at risk of self-harm, which included the sensory garden, Listener suite, the Ashley Done suite in the health care facility (opened in memory of the young man who had tragically died in 2009), activity boxes and free phone calls available.
- 3.18 At the time of the inspection, there were four trained Listeners. Although their retention was difficult, they were well supported by the prison and the Samaritans. Prisoners had unhindered access to Listeners, including at night, and the comfortable new Listener suite was used overnight and for the first time during the inspection. There was also a dedicated Samaritans phone for prisoners to use.
- 3.19 Regular ACCT refresher training took place but a significant number of staff were not trained. Night staff were trained in ACCT arrangements, carried ligature knives and were generally confident about procedures to enter a cell at night in an emergency.

Recommendation

- 3.20 **All staff should receive regular training in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT).**

Housekeeping point

- 3.21 Observations in ACCT documents should be completed at the required frequency and be less predictable.

Applications and complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective application and complaint procedures are in place, 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.

- 3.22 Application and complaint forms were freely available. Applications were not tracked robustly enough and were not quality assured. The centralised monitoring of complaints was well managed and responses were prompt and good quality. However, fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons said they had confidence in the application or complaint systems.
- 3.23 Prisoners were told how to make an application or complaint during their induction. Application forms were available on request and were submitted in the morning. In our survey, almost all respondents said it was easy to get an application form, and more than in 2006 said they had made an application.
- 3.24 Applications were not copied before they were sent to the relevant department, which made it difficult to track responses. Although applications were logged on the wings, there was no quality assurance scheme to ensure that responses were appropriate, and no target times for responses to be made. Some wings did not log the outcome of the application, which made it even more difficult to see if they were responded to. In our survey, far fewer respondents than in 2006 felt that applications were dealt with fairly (66% against 82%) or promptly (56% against 74%).
- 3.25 Complaint forms, including confidential complaint forms and envelopes, were available on the wings. In our survey, almost all respondents said that it was easy to get a complaints form but only 34%, against the comparator of 44%, had made a complaint. The orderly officer or senior officer emptied complaints boxes each night. Complaints were processed centrally and this was efficient and effective. Timescales for replies were clear and the complaints clerk chased those that had not been returned, including those involving other prisons. The timeliness and quality of complaints were closely monitored, and half were quality assured. The majority of replies were assessed as good quality. We looked at 20 and most were of a sufficient quality. However, in our survey, respondents had less confidence in the complaints system than the comparator and when we last visited. Only 22%, against 45% in 2006, said they were given information about how to appeal against a decision.
- 3.26 Complaints monitoring was reported to the senior management team each month but not aggregated to show themes or trends across the year.
- 3.27 Independent Monitoring Board details were posted on the wings but some of the information was out of date. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman contact details were also displayed and explained.

Recommendations

- 3.28 Responses to applications should be tracked, monitored and quality assured.
- 3.29 Information about complaints should be aggregated over the year to assess themes and areas for improvement, and action taken to rectify issues.

Housekeeping point

- 3.30 Information displayed on wings about access to the Independent Monitoring Board should be updated.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are told about their legal rights during induction, and can freely exercise these rights while in prison.

- 3.31 There were five legal services officers but none had received refresher training and there was no allocated time for the work, although demand was low. There were insufficient facilities and long waits for legal visits.
- 3.32 Five officers were trained in legal services but none had received refresher training for some years, despite the changes in legal rights. One officer based on the induction wing did the majority of the work. His time for providing legal services was not ring fenced and it was difficult to tell how much of his time was spent on this role, as it was not monitored, although he had received only 10 requests for help in the previous six months. Support included issuing solicitors letters, contacting solicitors and completing paperwork on outstanding fines. All foreign national legal services work was referred to the foreign national coordinator, who had good links with the UK Border Agency and could signpost prisoners to independent legal advice.
- 3.33 There were only two booths for legal visits and demand outstripped the available facilities. It was difficult to book an appointment and the next available one-hour slot was almost three weeks after our inspection. Legal visits took place at the same time as domestic visits, and domestic visits tables could be used, but this was not appropriate for confidential meetings.

Recommendations

- 3.34 The legal services officers and the foreign national coordinator should be adequately trained concerning legal issues and have time to support and signpost prisoners.
- 3.35 Access to legal visits should be increased.

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.

- 3.36 The chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison. Facilities for worship were good but there were still no washing facilities for Muslim prisoners. There was a range of courses for faith development and pastoral care, and the chaplaincy had links to community support groups to help prisoners on release.
- 3.37 There was an adequate range of chaplains, but the two Buddhist prisoners only had access to a chaplain once every six weeks. There were quarterly chaplaincy team meetings, and evidence of good links between the chaplaincy and other departments, including the wings and education.
- 3.38 The coordinating chaplain was full time and had been in post for a year. In that time, he had identified the gaps and made progress to bridge most of them. The major gaps remaining were the lack of washing facilities or shoe storage near the multi-faith room for Muslim prayer. Washing facilities was not planned due to the cost, and Muslim worshippers had to wash in their cell. An equality impact assessment had also identified the lack of disabled-access toilets in the multi-faith room.
- 3.39 The religion of new arrivals was printed out each day so that the coordinating chaplain could identify any new needs. A change of religion form was also used and helped to inform the security department of any significant increases in religious groups.
- 3.40 Faith services and chaplaincy activities were well advertised and held at appropriate times to avoid clashes with other activities. Prisoners had to make an initial application to attend a service or activity, and if they failed to attend twice they were contacted to see if they wanted to continue. Muslim Friday prayers were well attended. Segregated prisoners could attend services depending on a risk assessment.
- 3.41 The chaplaincy catered for individual needs through a range of services, one-to-one sessions and classes. A community service provided support, including meeting prisoners at the gate on release. There was links with other community faith services. We noted some good examples of support for prisoners following a bereavement, including one-to-one services. Although there was only one prison visitor, this was adequate to meet need.

Recommendation

- 3.42 There should be washing facilities, shoe storage and a disabled-access toilet within the multi-faith area.

Substance use

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with substance-related needs, including alcohol, are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody. All prisoners are safe from exposure to and the effects of substance use while in prison.

- 3.43 The integrated drug treatment system was well embedded and integrated into the prison's overall approach to tackling drugs, although it had few patients. Mandatory drug testing random positive rates were low, but the suspicion testing process was not well managed.

Clinical management

- 3.44 The integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) was well established, although few patients required the service. At the time of the inspection, three prisoners were receiving methadone treatment; all were on reducing doses. Subutex could also be provided if required. In the previous six months, there had been just one prisoner who needed an alcohol detoxification.
- 3.45 There was one specialist IDTS nurse, which was adequate for the number of patients. The nurse was well integrated with the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team through joint working for clinical reviews, co-facilitation of group work and generally high levels of communication. The IDTS nurse also spent time in visits offering information and advice to family members, which was appreciated by prisoners who we spoke to.

Drug testing

- 3.46 In our survey, 27% of respondents, against the comparator of 19%, said it was easy to get illegal drugs in Deerbolt. Despite this finding, the random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to April 2011 was relatively low, at 2.7% against a target of 5%. For three out of the six months, the rate had been zero, and the highest rate was in March 2011 when it rose to 8.3%. Buprenorphine and cannabis were the main drugs detected in tests and found in searches of visitors and cells.
- 3.47 The MDT testing suite was reasonably clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. Overall, the prison met the minimum number of random tests required for the month and for weekend testing.
- 3.48 By contrast, the management of suspicion drug testing was not satisfactory. The suspicion positive rate over the previous six months had been only 13.3%, where it would be expected to be well in excess of 50%. Managers knew that test requests were falling out of time, mostly due to staff shortage and redeployment. However, the extent of the slippage was not monitored, although this was a recommendation in our previous inspection report.

Recommendation

- 3.49 Suspicion drug tests should be managed and monitored more effectively to ensure they are undertaken within the required timeframe.

Section 4: Diversity

Expected outcomes:

All establishments should be aware of and meet the specific needs of minority groups and implement distinct policies or action plans, which aim to represent their views, meet their needs and offer peer support to ensure all prisoners have equal access to all facilities. Multiple diversity needs should be recognised and met.

- 4.1 The diversity policy lacked detail about the specific needs of minority groups, priorities and actions. Equality work was adequately staffed and managed, and the diversity and equality officer had a high profile. Some prisoners had been trained as diversity champions but not all staff had received the diversity training. There were no support systems for many of the minority groups.
- 4.2 There was an up-to-date diversity policy, but it did not detail specific objectives for each diversity strand and there been no recent analysis of the needs of different groups (see main recommendation HP52).
- 4.3 The diversity and equality action plan had replaced the race equality action plan in April 2011. While it made use of the findings of the equality impact assessments and information such as the access audit, it did not cover all the diversity strands – for example, work to support Muslim or gay or bisexual prisoners – or include all the actual work, such as the promotion of services for gay or bisexual prisoners.
- 4.4 The diversity and equality management team (DEMT) had been formed in May 2011, was chaired by the governor and was well established, given that it was only a few weeks old at the time of our inspection. Membership was appropriate but health care representation had not been included to date. One prisoner representative had attended the last meeting.
- 4.5 Prisoners and staff we spoke to knew who the diversity and equality officer (DEO) was. She had a high profile and had developed good links with other departments, such as safer custody, education and the chaplaincy. Although her time for the role had been reduced because of operational and cover duties, she was up to date with priorities such as investigating discriminatory incident report forms (DIRFs), which had replaced racist incident report forms (RIRFs).
- 4.6 Each wing had at least one prisoner diversity champion, whose job description covered the range of diversity. They had monthly consultation meetings and minutes were detailed. Displays on each wing included the photographs and names of the representatives. All nine diversity champions had been trained with 'challenge it change it' diversity programme materials. However, just under half the staff were still waiting to do the 'challenge it change' training due to the lack of time for in-house trainers.
- 4.7 Other than the diversity representatives forum, there were few formal opportunities for minority groups to meet. The DEO had recognised the potential to establish a Traveller and Gypsy group given an increase in their numbers. Of the 165 replies to our survey, 8% said they were from such a background.

- 4.8 The monitoring of the regime's impact was largely focused on black and minority ethnic prisoners through ethnic monitoring. However, there had been a range of equality impact assessments and more were planned.
- 4.9 A useful information booklet had been produced that explored different cultures and communities, providing detailed information to staff. A diversity week in May 2011 had promoted a range of celebrations, presentations and activities. Religious and cultural festivals were well advertised.

Recommendations

- 4.10 Staff training in diversity should be completed.
- 4.11 Minority group prisoners should have access to formal support groups.
- 4.12 There should be monitoring to assess the impact of prisoners' religion, age, disability and/or foreign national status on their participation in the prison's regime.

Housekeeping point

- 4.13 The diversity and equality management team should include health care representation.

Race equality

- 4.14 Prisoners from minority ethnic groups were generally positive about their relationships with staff, although there were fewer black and minority ethnic prisoners than in other YOIs. Investigations of racist complaints were thorough and quality was monitored. Prisoners with a history of racist behaviour were effectively identified and monitored.
- 4.15 Black and minority ethnic prisoners made up 10% of respondents to our survey, far fewer than the comparator of 35%, and 12% of the prison's statistics on its population. Responses to our survey were generally positive. The majority of black and minority ethnic respondents said there was a member of staff they could turn to for help if they had a problem, and three-quarters said most staff showed them respect.
- 4.16 SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment) ethnic monitoring did not show over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners in any key activities. The DEO explored any potential over-representation that emerged in monthly reports and reported back to the DEMENT meeting. For example, analysis of a difference in the number of releases on temporary licence approved for white and black and minority ethnic prisoners in one month validated the reasons for refusal and reassured the DEMENT that the difference was not due to race discrimination. However, the data were not broken down to assess different minority ethnic groups, such as Travellers or Gypsies.

Managing racist incidents

- 4.17 There had been 125 complaints about racist incidents in 2009/10, 97 in 2010/11 and 40 in the first four months of 2011/12, which showed a potential projection of 120 for the year. Both staff and prisoners reported incidents, which ranged from the content of mail to behaviour in the

classroom. Most responses challenged inappropriate language or conduct and also included an interview with the prisoner.

- 4.18 Incident reporting forms were not available in foreign languages, large print or with pictures to help those less confident with reading. DIRFs (and previously RIRFs) were handled effectively, although some staff did not always follow the submission procedure, which meant that some could get missed. This had been identified through the equality impact assessment and action taken to ensure staff understood the process. Responses to RIRFs were timely and those we saw were generally comprehensive and polite. All responses were approved by the deputy governor, and RIRFs had been subject to external scrutiny for the quality of replies; a similar mechanism for DIRFs was required.
- 4.19 The identification of prisoners serving racially motivated offences was adequate; there were 72 at the time of the inspection. Those who showed further racist behaviour were logged and monitored by the DEO and other departments. Cell sharing risk assessments were often reviewed if further evidence of racism emerged. The DEO had good links with the safer custody team. Violent incidents were monitored for a potential racial element, and the violence reduction strategy had been equality impact assessed in 2010.

Housekeeping point

- 4.20 Discriminatory incident report forms should be available in a range of languages and accessible formats.

Religion

- 4.21 There was little monitoring of prisoners' experience of the regime by their religion, and no support group for the increased number of Muslim prisoners.
- 4.22 There had been little monitoring of prisoners' experience of the regime by their religion (see recommendation 4.12). An equality impact assessment had identified the lack of chaplains and no disabled-access toilets in the multi-faith room (see paragraph 3.38). There had been a significant increase in the number of Muslim prisoners, and over half the black and minority ethnic population were Muslim, but there was no specific forum to support Muslim prisoners (see recommendation 4.11).

Foreign nationals

- 4.23 The needs of the small number of foreign national prisoners had not been analysed strategically, although the DEO provided support. The foreign nationals policy was limited to rules and regulations about immigration, and there was no action plan. Contact with the UK Border Agency had improved.
- 4.24 There were 11 foreign national prisoners, of whom one was beyond the end of his sentence. The foreign nationals policy was limited to detailing information about immigration rules and regulations and did not set out how the prison would respond to their different needs. There was no clear action plan or up-to-date analysis of their needs or prisoner survey (see main

recommendation HP52), and there was no foreign national consultation (see recommendation 4.11).

- 4.25 Quarterly meetings of the UK Border Agency (UKBA) with foreign national prisoner had not always been held due to the absence of the DEO, but had been reinstated shortly before our inspection. The foreign national coordinator reviewed all new arrivals and liaised closely with UKBA. A leaflet detailing independent legal advice services for foreign nationals was available.
- 4.26 Foreign national prisoners were given information about their status and procedures. A professional telephone interpreting service had been used 16 times in the last year, often to explain immigration issues or meet with UKBA. Other interpreting services were available for longer sessions. Other prisoners were not used inappropriately to interpret. Prisoner information booklets were available in a range of languages.

Disability

- 4.27 Prisoners with disabilities were identified and assessed. A useful access audit had identified areas for improvement, although not all were being implemented because of insufficient funding.
- 4.28 In our survey, 14% of respondents said they had a disability. About a quarter of those who said they had a disability also said they were a Traveller or Gypsy. All new arrivals could declare a disability at induction or any later point. The disability liaison officer interviewed each prisoner who declared a disability to identify specific needs and adaptations required. Changes in disability during sentence were acknowledged but sometimes not systematically.
- 4.29 An access audit had identified some key aspects for improvement, some of which had been done – for example, access to visits. Others had not been implemented due to lack of funding – for example, access to adapted toilets in the multi-faith room or programmes. There were well-equipped adapted cells on two wings. The DEMENT action plan focused on disability and was regularly reviewed. Hearing loops had been installed in several areas. Personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs) were in place, appropriately constructed and known to wing staff.
- 4.30 Data on prisoners were not routinely monitored by disabilities (see recommendation 4.12). In our survey, only 9% of respondents with disabilities said they were on enhanced level, compared with 24% of respondents without disabilities. There was no carer or mentor scheme, other than the diversity champions.

Gender and sexual orientation

- 4.31 The needs of gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners had not been analysed, and formal support was underdeveloped.
- 4.32 There was relatively little in place for gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners. There was no specific strategy or action plan and the needs of gay prisoners were not identified, although 3% of respondents to our survey identified themselves as gay or bisexual (see main recommendation HP52). A contact number for a local support service was advertised on most wings but no direct support or advice service came into the prison, although there was work to

achieve this. There was no relevant prisoner forum (see recommendation 4.11). The management of transgender prisoners was not specified.

Section 5: Health services

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners should be 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 in the community.

5.1 There were new health services contracts that had resulted in some movement of staff. Prisoners had access to a good range and level of health services with generally very short waiting lists, and attendance at appointments was very good. However, in our survey responses on the quality of all health services were poorer than at the last inspection. The health care centre provided good facilities, but some wing treatment rooms were unsuitable and all were dirty. The pharmacy service was supply-only with no pharmacist on site. Dental facilities were good but some patients had a long wait. There were appropriate primary and mental health services, although no counselling was provided.

General

- 5.2 Health services were commissioned by North East Offender Health Commissioning Unit, hosted by NHS County Durham, with primary care provided by Care UK Ltd and mental health care by Tees Esk and Wear Valley Mental Health Trust. The provider contracts had been awarded in the previous month and had resulted in some movement of staff and pending recruitment. Integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) services were integrated with the health care team, and a mental health in-reach team was based on site.
- 5.3 A health needs assessment had been completed in January 2010 and was being reviewed at the time of our inspection. The partnership board was chaired by the commissioning PCT and met quarterly. All prisons from the local cluster were represented, and the governor and head of health care represented Deerbolt. The standing agenda for the board included review of the health care delivery plan, the prison health performance quality indicators and the health risk register. The health care manager was on long-term sick leave and the deputy was acting up in the role. She was supported by five nurses and four health care assistants, and there were three vacancies. Despite the shortage of staff, the structure worked well and all staff contributed to the delivery of a good level of care.
- 5.4 The health care centre was in a single-storey building with good disability access and was close to the reception area, with good communication during the reception process. There were adequate rooms to deliver clinics, and the health care centre was very clean and suitable for the treatment and care of patients. The treatment rooms on the wings were used primarily for medicine administration. Some were too small and not suitable, all were dirty and needed a deep clean, and the room on J wing was not fit for purpose. They were all being fitted with gates to improve security.
- 5.5 The inpatient unit took up a large proportion of the health care centre. The patient waiting room had benches and a limited range of health information notices. Prisoner free flow enabled patients to attend timed appointments, reducing waits in the department. The facilities for health screening had been relocated to two rooms on the induction wing, one used solely for

reception health care screening, and adequately equipped for this, and the other to treat prisoners on induction.

Recommendation

- 5.6 The treatment rooms on the wings should be refurbished, kept clean and fitted with security gates.

Clinical governance

- 5.7 The clinical governance steering group met quarterly with representation from the commissioners and the local prison cluster. Communication with the partnership board ensured effective management of the health care plan. There was an active recruitment programme for the three nurse vacancies following the recent restructuring. The mental health team had been enhanced and three further staff had been selected and were awaiting security clearance. The health care team was suitably qualified to deliver the range of appropriate services.
- 5.8 The acting head of health care also led the primary care services. The team was well managed and a good service had been maintained during the time of change and staff shortages. The team was well supported by a senior health care administrator and two administrators.
- 5.9 The department provided a 24-hour health service with regular clinics each weekday and an essential service at the weekends. There was a good range of age-appropriate services. There were links with the local community and the PCT to provide specialist and occupational therapy equipment when required. Staff attended courses for their professional development but the monitoring and maintenance of records was limited. Clinical supervision had been available to all staff and was being revised along with the new structure.
- 5.10 Emergency resuscitation equipment was held in the health care centre and in each wing treatment room. The record of contents was maintained weekly. Automated external defibrillators were available in the health care centre, the main orderly office and the gym, and batteries were checked and recorded daily.
- 5.11 Health care records were compiled using the SystmOne electronic record. Some paper files were still held but most had been scanned into the system. All records were stored appropriately and maintained to meet the requirements of Caldicott principles on the use and confidentiality of personal health information and the Data Protection Act. NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence) guidelines and national service frameworks were not readily available to staff in the main treatment areas.
- 5.12 Prisoners did not have access to a dedicated health care forum. Despite this, there were very few complaints about health care, with none recorded in the previous quarter and only about five each year. The health care manager dealt with them swiftly and sensitively. Our survey indicated that prisoners felt that there had been a decline in the quality of all health services since our last inspection.
- 5.13 Protocols and policies for the management of communicable diseases were up to date and appropriate for the young population. There was a very good range of screening and vaccination programmes, including hepatitis B and measles, mumps and rubella vaccines and chlamydia screening. Health care information sharing was managed on an individual basis.

Recommendations

- 5.14 Clinical supervision should be available to all health care professionals.
- 5.15 Prisoners should have access to a dedicated health care forum.

Housekeeping points

- 5.16 Records of continuous professional development and mandatory training should be maintained.
- 5.17 Staff should have access to NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence) guidelines and national service frameworks to guide and inform practice.

Primary care

- 5.18 New arrivals had an initial health screening during their reception and a secondary screening during their first induction week. Standard screening tools were used on the electronic record, and GPs were available during initial screening if required. Prisoners were given limited health care information, in English only. Health care staff were not involved in any induction presentations.
- 5.19 Health promotion literature was available in the inpatient unit and on the wings and some was in a range of languages. There was very little health promotion material in the health care centre, such as the waiting room. We were told that the department followed national campaign days and presented relevant displays. Smoking cessation clinics were provided with a good throughput and success rate. A visiting specialist provided sexual health clinics, and condoms were available from the health care centre on request. There were appropriate clinics for patients with lifelong conditions. All clinics were managed by health care professionals with specialist qualifications.
- 5.20 A local primary care practice provided a rota of up to 10 GPs to deliver a daily weekday clinic. Out of hours cover was provided by the same service available to the local community. In our survey, 47% of respondents, against the comparator of 42%, said that it was easy to see the GP and 71%, against 60%, said it was easy to see a nurse, and this was reflected in comments from prisoners. An effective appointment system ensured that applications were confidential and processed quickly. All applications were seen within 24 hours and triaged by one of the nursing staff, although we did not observe the use of triage algorithms. Prisoners in the segregation unit were seen daily by a nurse and three times a week by a GP.

Recommendations

- 5.21 Prisoners should have access to information on health services in a range of languages.
- 5.22 Triage algorithms should be developed and used to ensure consistency of care and treatment.

Housekeeping point

- 5.23 Health promotion material should be more easily available to prisoners, especially in the waiting area of the health care centre.

Pharmacy

- 5.24 A local pharmacy supplier provided pharmacy services, visited quarterly and gave a report to the health care staff and the PCT. Under a new agreement, the service was now supply only.
- 5.25 The pharmacy was in the health care centre. Prescriptions and prescription charts were provided to the pharmacy, which supplied medication in a timely manner. There were no dedicated pharmacy staff and no pharmacist was available to see prisoners but appropriate procedures and most policies were in place. Incidents and errors were recorded. Heat-sensitive products were stored in appropriate conditions, and staff recorded the temperatures daily and reset the maximum and minimum temperatures.
- 5.26 Prescriptions were handwritten on standard prescription and administration charts. There was no specific prescribing formulary. Controlled drugs were obtained via a signed order using a duplicate book. Administration was recorded on the charts and electronically on SystemOne. Supplies of medicines for new patients at the special sick clinic and the reason for the supply were recorded in their electronic record. Prescribing was appropriate to the population.
- 5.27 Administration of medication was by nursing staff, generally four times a day from the wing treatment rooms. There was no additional security to ensure staff safety during the administration of medicines and minimise potential bullying and diversion of supplies, but security gates were being installed to wing treatment rooms (see paragraph 5.4). In-possession medication was available for some patients and there was an in-possession policy. Some medicines such as paracetamol and ibuprofen, were available to supply for the special sick clinic, but there was no special sick medicines policy or a list of such medicines. Patient group directions enabled nurses to supply more potent non-prescription medication. Patients could access medication out of hours on the authority of the local out-of-hours doctors' service.
- 5.28 A medicines and therapeutics committee, covering all prisons in the cluster, met once every five months and was attended by the supplying pharmacist and a representative from the PCT.

Recommendations

- 5.29 A pharmacist should visit the prison at least once a month to check the systems in operation.
- 5.30 Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led clinics.
- 5.31 There should be a policy for the issue of medicines at the special sick clinic that the medicines and therapeutics committee reviews regularly to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied.

Dentistry

- 5.32 Dental services were contracted through Weymouth Dental Services, which provided a dentist and dental nurse for two sessions a week. Up to nine patients were seen at each session. The same service provided out-of-hours and holiday cover.
- 5.33 The dental surgery had been refurbished following our last inspection and the equipment was generally well maintained. There were repairs to the suction apparatus at the time of our inspection and the X-ray machine and developer were due for service. Measures for the control of infection were satisfactory and a separate area of the surgery was used for cleaning instruments.
- 5.34 Emergency medicines were available and in date, but there was no resuscitation kit other than that available in the health care centre. We were told that new resuscitation kit, including oxygen, was on order.
- 5.35 Applications to see the dentist were triaged. At the time of our inspection, five high priority patients and 54 low priority patients were waiting to be seen. The waiting list was reducing but patients could still wait up to nine weeks for a routine appointment. There was a very good rate of attendance at appointments. However, in our survey, only 32% of respondents said that the quality of dental services was good, against the comparator of 45%.
- 5.36 The provision of dental checks and treatment was equivalent to that available in the NHS, and oral health promotion was provided individually. The dental staff communicated well with the health care team.

Recommendations

- 5.37 Resuscitation kit, including oxygen, should be available in the dental suite.
- 5.38 Patients should be able to see a dentist for routine treatment within a reasonable timescale.

Inpatient care

- 5.39 There was an eight-bed inpatient unit in the health care centre. All beds were in single cells with none included in the certified normal accommodation. There were no inpatients at the time of our inspection, and we were informed that this was not unusual with very limited use of the unit. The unit was well resourced with an office, servery, association room, toilet and bathroom, clean and well decorated, and all cells were adequately equipped for the management and care of patients. Patients had access to a small exercise yard but there were no facilities to dine out. Nursing staff were deployed from the health care team when inpatients were admitted. Patient care was recorded as a continuation of their electronic record.

Secondary care

- 5.40 One of the administrators managed the outside hospital appointments and maintained records electronically and on paper. The prison provided up to two hospital escorts a day, which was sufficient to meet the demand. Cancellations of appointments for security reasons were very rare. The health care centre had good relations with the local hospital, which was very helpful

in rearranging appointments if required. Patients were put on medical hold when required to ensure continuity of their care.

Mental health

- 5.41 The mental health team provided a primary and secondary service, with four mental health nurses currently delivering the care. Under the new contract, additional staffing of seven nurses and one administrator had been selected. A psychiatrist provided a weekly clinical session seeing up to four patients. There was a caseload of just over 100 patients during our inspection with an average of 40 referrals monthly. Mental health nurses averaged a caseload of up to 30 patients each. All care was recorded on the SystmOne electronic record. Facilities included a room for consultations and a newly refurbished therapies room, the Ashley Done suite, that was used for both group and one-to-one sessions.
- 5.42 Patients were managed through multidisciplinary meetings, including close liaison with the IDTS and CARAT services. There were good links with the relevant community services when required. Staff from Mind visited the prison twice weekly for group work with prisoners but there were no dedicated counselling services. There were rarely more than four transfers a year to secure mental health units. The longest wait in recent years had been four weeks. We were told that discipline staff had received mental health awareness training in the past, and there were plans to recommence courses when the new staff were in post.

Recommendations

- 5.43 Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services.
- 5.44 Mental health awareness training should be provided for all discipline staff.

Section 6: Activities

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in out of cell activities, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied extra-mural activities.

- 6.1 Time out of cell was too limited for many prisoners, and unlock arrangements affected access to basic amenities, such as showers. About a quarter of the population were locked up during the working part of the day. Access to evening association was unnecessarily restricted, and exercise yards required improvement.
- 6.2 The prison reported a time unlocked figure of just under 6.5 hours a day against a target of seven hours, which broadly represented the average experience of prisoners. The standardised core day routine potentially allowed access to over eight hours out of cell for a prisoner fully engaged in the regime and with access to evening association during the working week. For those working part time, three to five hours a day was more likely, with two hours or less for those unemployed. We found about a quarter of the population locked in their cell during the working day, which was concerning in view of the prison's function and its age group. As no domestic time was facilitated during the morning unlock or around mealtimes, prisoner access to amenities, in particular showers, was limited.
- 6.3 Association was scheduled for four weekday evenings, Friday afternoons and weekends. Evening association should have been for 90 minutes but regime slippage cut that by up to 15 minutes. Under a rota arrangement on the seven older wings, only three of the four landings were allowed association per session. As a consequence, a typical prisoner had association on only three evenings a week. There was a ceiling of 50 prisoners supervised by four staff, for each association period, which allowed some additional enhanced prisoners to be unlocked, at the discretion of staff, if the population on the three open landings was under capacity. There was also a rota on the newer G and J wings, although here the population was divided into two so prisoners only accessed association every other weekday evening. Staff generally used their discretion constructively, but we observed cases where a wing was unlocked but five or six prisoners were left locked in their cell because of the inflexibility and illogicality of the arrangement. In our survey, only 31% of respondents said that they associated more than five times a week, against the comparator of 51%, but this was better than the finding of 18% when we last visited.
- 6.4 Exercise was allocated in 30-minute morning and afternoon blocks. This allowed those not at work for all or part of the day to participate in some open air exercise. Prisoners in activities full time received no exercise during the working week. Exercise sessions were also provided on Fridays and at weekends. In our survey, 57% of respondents confirmed that they exercised three or more times a week, against the 39% comparator and the finding of only 8% when we last visited. Each wing had its own exercise yard. All were clean but small and with no equipment or seats.

Recommendations

- 6.5 There should be no regime slippage and the core day routine should be adhered to.
- 6.6 All prisoners should have access to four evening association sessions a week.
- 6.7 Benches and/or recreational equipment should be provided in exercise yards.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

Learning and skills provision meets the requirements of the specialist education inspectorate's Common Inspection Framework (separately inspected by specialist education inspectors). Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after sentence, as part of sentence planning; and have access to good library facilities. Sufficient purposeful activity is available for the total prisoner population.

- 6.8 Learning and skills activities were well managed. A clear strategy and shared vision were developing and improving provision, but there were insufficient activity places. Allocation to activities needed improvement, and too many prisoners were unemployed. Quality processes were effective in improving provision but the observation of teaching and learning was applied insufficiently. Work and vocational training activities developed good skills and most courses were accredited with high success rates of qualifications. Education courses were well planned and managed, and teaching was good. There was a good emphasis on developing prisoners' literacy and numeracy skills. Although small, the library met prisoners' needs satisfactorily, but some did not have sufficient time there.

Leadership and management

- 6.9 Learning and skills provision was well managed. The prison, education and work areas were developing a clear strategy and shared vision, and improving provision linked to employability on release. Annual reviews of the curriculum using information from labour market intelligence, external partners and internal staff had widened and realigned provision to meet industry recruitment needs.
- 6.10 The number of activity places was insufficient and met the needs of only approximately 80% of the population, with 79 prisoners recorded as unemployed. Prisoner allocation to activity had improved with the combination of three separate processes under one allocation unit, but allocation was still inefficient, delayed deployment and led to too many prisoners being unemployed (see main recommendation HP54). Pay rates were equitable and not a disincentive to attend education. All prisoners were risk assessed before they were allocated to an activity.
- 6.11 Equality and diversity were well promoted in the curriculum. Inclusion was a high priority and there were strategies to engage and meet the needs of hard-to-reach learners. The assessment of improvements in prisoners' behaviour and attitude allowed them to engage in a wider range of activities than previously. Activities provided a safe environment, and there had been recent staff training on safeguarding and safe recruiting for activities staff.

- 6.12 The approach to quality improvement was satisfactory overall, with good attention to the views of prisoners and external partners to improve provision. Some aspects, such as the observation of teaching and learning, were undeveloped in wider prison training. The self-assessment process was satisfactory and the report broadly accurate. Some new staff required support and training in the process.

Recommendation

- 6.13 **Quality improvement processes should be extended to all learning and skills provision.**

Induction

- 6.14 The induction process gave prisoners satisfactory information on education and vocational activities, and the assessment of new arrivals' literacy and numeracy was satisfactory. Prisoners' preferred learning styles were also assessed. However, recent initial assessment results and education and training achievements were not widely available electronically from other prisons through the learner record service, which resulted in some prisoners repeating assessments unnecessarily.
- 6.15 The careers information and advice service (CIAS) was provided by A4E. Staff provided a satisfactory service at induction and had focused interviews with new arrivals to advise them on the most appropriate activities to meet their aspirations.

Recommendation

- 6.16 **The prison should endeavour to retrieve information about prisoners' achievements from the learner record service to reduce the need for them to repeat basic skills assessments carried out recently in other prisons.**

Work

- 6.17 There were 175 full-time-equivalent work places, with an 85% participation rate. The range of work included a charity workshop, catering, drystone walling, gardening, laundry, recycling, wing cleaning and serving, peer mentoring and orderly work. Work areas simulated industrial and commercial reality, and gave prisoners good preparation for securing employment after release.
- 6.18 Prisoners had good opportunities to acquire accredited qualifications related to their work, and success rates were high. A new well-equipped laundry provided nine prisoners with employment and had places for a further five. A separate well-equipped classroom in the laundry was used for literacy and numeracy tuition, and health and safety training. A planned print shop would provide further work places.
- 6.19 Prisoners were interviewed for the jobs before they were allocated to them, and received satisfactory work inductions. Some tutors did not ensure that prisoners always used the necessary personal protective equipment, such as safety glasses or face masks. There were no daily showering opportunities for prisoners working in dusty or dirty conditions (see main recommendation HP51).

- 6.20 Although literacy and numeracy tuition was available to prisoners who were employed, it was not always sufficiently linked to their work.
- 6.21 Prisoners produced work of a high quality. The prison gardens, for example, were attractively maintained and the drystone walling was of a high commercial standard. The occupational skills and knowledge that prisoners developed through their work also contributed to their life skills. For example, as well as repairing prisoners' bedding and clothing and making soft toys and cushions, workers in the charity workshop also acquired skills such as sewing on buttons, ironing and understanding washing instructions. In the prison kitchen, in addition to producing three meals a day for up to 500 prisoners, prisoners learned diet, nutrition and budgeting.

Recommendations

- 6.22 All prisoners in work places should wear the relevant personal protective equipment.
- 6.23 Literacy and numeracy training in activities should be contextualised to make them more relevant.

Vocational training

- 6.24 The Manchester College provided approximately 97 vocational training places, which was insufficient for demand. About 85% of places were used and attendance was satisfactory. However, some prisoners had to wait an unacceptably long time before they could join a workshop. The range of accredited vocational training included bricklaying, industrial cleaning, joinery, motor vehicle repair, painting and decorating, plastering, and waste management. A multi-skills workshop also introduced prisoners to bricklaying, joinery, painting and decorating, plastering and plumbing. Qualification success rates for 2009/10 were high.
- 6.25 Tutors were well qualified and most had recent occupational experience. Individual coaching was good and effectively facilitated learning. Learners acquired good basic occupational skills, and their self-confidence, self-esteem and teamworking skills improved as they progressed through their training. Much of the work they produced was of a high standard.
- 6.26 Individual literacy and numeracy support was regularly provided, but learning materials were not contextualised to the occupation (see recommendation 6.23). Grammatical and spelling errors in learners' portfolios were not corrected and used as a basis for further learning.
- 6.27 Resources were of a good standard in many vocational areas, but the hardware and software in the information and communication technology academy needed upgrading, and the cars used in the motor vehicle workshop were unsuitable.
- 6.28 Records of what learners had achieved in each session were satisfactory, but individual learning plans were not well used. Targets were often not sufficiently detailed or specific, which meant there were no clear benchmarks against which the learner's progress could be accurately measured, and contributed to the directionless approach of less motivated learners.

Recommendations

- 6.29 Vocational training provision should be increased to meet the needs of prisoners and reduce waiting times to access programmes.

- 6.30 The resources in the information and communication technology and motor vehicle workshops should be up to date and reflect current industry standards.
- 6.31 Individual learning plans should be better used to give learners clearly defined short-term targets to guide their learning and measure their progress.

Education

- 6.32 The Manchester College provided 114 places in education, but take-up was low. During the inspection, only 64% of education places were filled. Attendance at sessions was satisfactory at approximately 80%.
- 6.33 The curriculum was broad and balanced. There was an appropriate and successful emphasis on enabling prisoners to improve their abilities in literacy and numeracy. The curriculum allowed prisoners to develop their personal and social skills well, and the performing arts facility and programmes were impressive. Prisoners' employment skills were supported by courses such as business enterprise, customer service and preparation for employment on release. The charity Tough Talk also ran a session that used weightlifting and training to encourage prisoners to reflect upon their lives and choices and the damage caused by use of drugs.
- 6.34 Success rates overall were satisfactory. In 2009/10, success rates on literacy and numeracy courses were low at 57%, but this included considerable variation, from a 91% success rate for entry level 3 numeracy to 54% for entry level 2 in numeracy and level 2 in literacy. Success rates on other education courses were satisfactory overall. Retention rates in 2009/10 were low but had improved considerably.
- 6.35 There was a calm atmosphere in education that contributed to prisoners feeling safe, and their behaviour in classes was very good. They showed respect for teachers and each other, and the small amount of bad language was challenged effectively by teachers. Most prisoners contributed well in lessons, displayed positive attitudes to learning and made good progress.
- 6.36 Prisoners made very good progress in the literacy and numeracy workshop, supported by skilled volunteers and peer mentors. They were very focused on their work and proud of their achievements. However, the excellent progress made in key areas, such as reading and spelling, was not recorded formally. In-cell literacy and numeracy education was provided for the small number of prisoners who could not access the main education provision. Some prisoners could only attend the workshop or have in-cell tuition for one session a week, which was insufficient to consolidate learning and progress that were often excellent.
- 6.37 Teaching and learning were good overall. In the better lessons, teachers planned a range of challenging activities. The frequent change of activity during these lessons ensured good pace of learning and prisoners made good progress and grew in confidence. Most lessons had a productive ethos and relationships were good. A few lessons lacked pace and did not always maximise prisoners' progress.

Recommendations

- 6.38 The take-up of education places should be increased.

- 6.39 The progress that learners make in the literacy and numeracy workshop should be formally recorded and reviewed regularly.
- 6.40 Literacy and numeracy workshop and in-cell activities should be more frequent to enable learners to consolidate their learning.

Library

- 6.41 Durham County Council Library Service ran the library. Its location in the education department provided easy access to learners attending classes. The library was too small to accommodate the required stock and had only 1,100 books, which were too few for the population of approximately 500.
- 6.42 The library was staffed by a full-time group manager, who was a chartered librarian, five part-time librarians and two orderlies. Library orderlies were required to obtain a customer service qualification to support their work. All the librarians worked in at least one other prison library in County Durham, which facilitated the sharing of good library practice, teamwork and deputising for absent colleagues.
- 6.43 The library was well publicised during induction and throughout the prison. It was open from 8.45am to 11.45 am Monday to Friday and from 1.45 pm to 4.15pm Monday to Thursday. It was not open in the evenings or at weekends. Prisoners from each wing could access the library once a week for up to 25 minutes, but often had less time than this. Prisoners on the induction wing had three library sessions a week. There was also a delivery service to segregated prisoners and inpatients.
- 6.44 The range of stock included recreational, educational and vocational texts, audio CDs and some easy readers. Dictionaries in many European and other languages were available. Legal books were available for reference and Prison Service Orders were downloaded and distributed on demand. The annual stock loss was low at 3.1%.
- 6.45 A reading group met regularly and other events, such as poetry reading and recording, a poetry competition and the six-book challenge, encouraged attendance in the library. The library responded to prisoners' requests and planned to run a programme on the origins and language of graffiti. Storybook Dads and the Toe-by-Toe reading scheme were not available.

Recommendations

- 6.46 The size of the library should be increased to accommodate the required library stock.
- 6.47 The library should be open on some evenings and at weekends.
- 6.48 All prisoners should have adequate time in the library to browse and select books.
- 6.49 The library should introduce Storybook Dads and the Toe-by-Toe reading scheme.

Physical education and health promotion

Expected outcomes:

Physical education and PE facilities meet the requirements of the specialist education inspectorate's Common Inspection Framework (separately inspected by specialist education inspectors). Prisoners are also encouraged and enabled to take part in recreational PE, in safe and decent surroundings.

- 6.50 Recreational PE was available to prisoners at a range of times, including evenings and weekends. PE facilities were of good quality and sufficient to meet needs. Prisoners benefited from a wide range of accredited training, and qualification achievements were very high. Links with health care were good, and relationships between staff and prisoners were respectful and professional.
- 6.51 The physical education (PE) department was staffed by a senior officer and 11 instructors. Prisoners could access at least two PE sessions a week, and recreational PE was available on four evenings a week and at the weekend. Over 80% of the population participated in PE each week. All prisoners received a satisfactory induction to PE.
- 6.52 Facilities were good and included a large sports hall, cardiovascular suite, well-equipped fitness suite and outside pitches, including a well-used all-weather pitch. The sports hall and equipment were maintained well by enthusiastic orderlies. However, there were only 18 showers for up to 60 gym users at a time, and they did not have privacy screens.
- 6.53 There was a well-planned programme of activities, which included weight training, physical fitness programmes and team sports such as football, basketball and volleyball. The prison ran a successful football team that competed in a local league, but its future was uncertain due to forthcoming reductions in staffing. Prisoners also benefited from a good programme of accredited PE, including the Duke of Edinburgh's Award, a junior sports leader award, an NCFE (national awarding body) certificate in diet and nutrition, and awards in sports such as volleyball, badminton and Australian rules football. Some Football Association coaching and junior manager awards were also available. Most of the courses were only at level 1. Success rates on these programmes were outstanding, with many courses achieving 100%. A full-time learning support teacher provided good support to prisoners requiring help with literacy and numeracy.
- 6.54 The PE department had good links with health care. There was a sports clinic to support prisoners recovering from injuries. Weight loss and weight gain, smoking cessation and a tackling drugs through PE programmes supported prisoners' health and fitness.
- 6.55 Relationships between prisoners and PE staff were professional and mutually respectful. Prisoners' behaviour was often very good.
- 6.56 Accidents and incidents were recorded appropriately in a daily diary and forwarded to the health and safety department. Use of the gym by different groups of prisoners was monitored appropriately.

Recommendations

- 6.57 There should be more showers in the PE department and they should be fitted with privacy screens.
- 6.58 The PE department should offer higher level programmes to provide progression routes from level 1.

Section 7: Good order

Security and rules

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through positive staff-prisoner relationships based on mutual respect as well as attention to physical and procedural matters. Rules and routines are well-publicised, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behaviour.

7.1 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and not unnecessarily restrictive. The security team processed the increasing levels of intelligence efficiently but suspicion drug tests were not always carried out on time. The security committee considered a comprehensive report that allowed some trend analysis and was usually acted upon.

Security

- 7.2 The number of security information reports (SIRs) was increasing – more than 3,300 had been submitted in 2010 and over 1,800 between January and May 2011. The intelligence team was reasonably well resourced, including three trained analysts who processed intelligence efficiently. However, suspicion mandatory drug testing (MDT) was not always carried out on time (see paragraph 3.48). Target cell searches were generally completed as required but yielded relatively few finds. There had been an increase in the number of weapons found but these were generally hidden in outside areas. Security team staff were often cross-deployed to other departments when there were staff shortages.
- 7.3 The security committee was representative and reasonably well attended, except by the MDT team and the police intelligence officer, who only covered the prison for two days a week. A comprehensive and useful security report was presented to the monthly meeting and included some analysis of trends and patterns. The minutes showed that action had been taken to address identified issues. The numbers of mobile phones and drugs found in the prison were low but they remained of ongoing interest to the security team. In our survey, 27% of respondents, against the comparator of 19%, said it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison. Managing violence was cited as its priority, and links between the security department and violence reduction team were good. The committee set appropriate monthly security and intelligence objectives.
- 7.4 Closed visits were used sparingly and were well managed. At the time of the inspection, five prisoners were subject to them. All had regular reviews and few remained on closed visits for longer than one or two months.
- 7.5 Following a disturbance at Deerbolt in 2007, the prison had taken a measured approach to security. Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and not unnecessarily restrictive. However, it was inappropriate that approximately 10% of prisoners were routinely strip-searched following visits with no intelligence to support this.

Rules

- 7.6 Rules were explained to new arrivals on their first night and during induction and were reinforced on residential units through staff, compacts and notices. Some prisoners complained to us that rules were applied inconsistently by some staff and that there was also some favouritism in their application, but we found no evidence of this.

Recommendations

- 7.7 Actions requested on security information reports should be completed within appropriate timescales.
- 7.8 Prisoners should only be strip-searched after visits when there is intelligence to support this.

Housekeeping point

- 7.9 The security committee should be attended by appropriate mandatory drug testing (MDT) managers.

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.

- 7.10 The number of adjudications and minor reports was high and many could have been dealt with less formally. Recorded incidents of use of force were high but many were low level. Use of special accommodation was high and not always warranted. Governance of all aspects of use of force was insufficient. Use of segregation was high and sometimes unnecessary. The physical environment in the segregation unit required improvement, and the regime was poor.

Disciplinary procedures

- 7.11 There had been 684 adjudications and 329 minor reports in the previous six months, which was high. Most charges related to threats, fights and disobeying orders. Although most charges were appropriate, some could have been dealt with through informal measures, such as the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. Serious offences, including those relating to drugs, possession of mobile phones and some assaults, were referred to the independent adjudicator; between January and May 2011 there had been 79 such referrals.
- 7.12 The room in the segregation unit used to hear adjudications was large and suitable. The hearings we observed were conducted appropriately. Prisoners were made aware of their rights, given sufficient opportunity to prepare for their hearing and had access to a pen and paper. Where requested, adjudications were adjourned for prisoners to seek legal advice.

- 7.13 We reviewed a sample of completed adjudication and minor report records and found that records of adjudications were generally reasonable but those for minor reports were less good. In both cases, there were examples of insufficient exploration of the incident before reaching a finding of guilt. There were, however, also examples where adjudicators had dismissed cases. A punishment tariff was in place and punishments were broadly fair, but records were not always clear that mitigation was considered when offered. Awards for proven minor reports were sometimes inconsistent between adjudicators. Formal quality assurance of adjudications had resulted in improvements to the completed records but there was nothing similar for minor reports.
- 7.14 Adjudication standardisation meetings took place regularly but attendance was inconsistent. The meeting included a comprehensive report about adjudication data, but minutes did not always record discussions or strategies to address any concerns or anomalies. Data on minor reports were not as in depth as those for adjudications.

Recommendations

- 7.15 **Adjudicators should ensure that all charges are appropriately investigated before reaching a verdict for adjudications and minor reports.**
- 7.16 **Mitigation offered in adjudications or minor reports should be recorded and taken into account with any finding of guilt.**
- 7.17 **Data collected on minor reports should be improved and a formal quality assurance procedure for minor report documentation should be introduced.**

The use of force

- 7.18 In our survey, 20% of respondents told us that they had force used against them within the last six months, against the comparator of 14% and only 7% in 2006. Force had been used on prisoners on 244 occasions in 2010 and 123 to the end of May 2011, which was high, but most involved low level physical coercion. Although handcuffs were not routinely applied, they had been used on 76 of the 113 occasions in the previous six months where force had been recorded.
- 7.19 Documentation accompanying use of force incidents was generally completed to a reasonable standard, but some lacked detail about the incident and many had no evidence of efforts to de-escalate situations. Many of the occasions when force was used resulted in prisoners being located to the segregation unit, which was disproportionate and unnecessary in many cases.
- 7.20 Batons had been drawn on seven occasions in 2010 and were used once, and drawn five times in 2011 and used once – although we found a further instance where a baton had been used. Although their use appeared justified in most cases, it was not always warranted and there had been no scrutiny.
- 7.21 There had been 21 planned interventions in the previous six months, which were generally video recorded. The videos were not routinely reviewed, and there was no formal quality assurance of any use of force documentation.
- 7.22 Use of special accommodation was high at 15 occasions in 2010 and six to the end of May 2011. Use of force documentation and films leading to the use of the special accommodation

did not always justify its use. Subsequent documentation authorising use of the special accommodation was generally well completed, and prisoners spent the minimum time located there. However, it was inappropriate that prisoners were routinely strip searched and had their clothing removed and replaced with anti-tear gowns, generally for the duration of their stay in the special accommodation and with no meaningful risk assessment. Use of the two unfurnished cells in the segregation unit as searching or 'cool off' rooms was not covered by any protocols, and they were sometimes used inappropriately as special accommodation without appropriate authorisation.

- 7.23 A use of force committee met quarterly and was informed by a comprehensive report, which included some trend analysis. The committee did not quality assure use of force documentation or films of planned interventions, and minutes of the meeting did not always show that concerns were highlighted or acted upon.

Recommendations

- 7.24 Any drawing or use of a baton should be scrutinised to give assurance that its use is appropriate and proportionate.
- 7.25 There should be protocols for the use of the two unfurnished searching/'cool off' rooms in the segregation unit, and any use of them as special accommodation should be appropriately authorised and recorded.
- 7.26 Governance of the use of force should be improved.

Segregation unit

- 7.27 Most communal areas in the segregation unit were clean; the exercise yard was bleak but had seating. The shower and communal toilets were dirty and needed refurbishment. There were 13 normal cells, two search or 'cool off' rooms, a safer cell and two special cells. Cells had fixed metal furniture and were reasonably clean but some contained graffiti. Most toilets were scaled and dirty.
- 7.28 Throughput of the segregation unit was high. In 2010, it had held 362 prisoners, of whom 222 were there pending adjudication. To the end of May 2011, there had been 187 residents, including 100 there pending adjudication. However, the unit had not held prisoners seeking refuge for their own protection, and use of cellular confinement and location for good order were not used unreasonably. The length of stay for residents was not excessive, and usually averaged between two and 2.5 days. During the inspection there was one prisoner in the unit, although we were told that it usually held more. In our survey, 24% of respondents said they had spent a night in the segregation unit, against the comparator of 17% and a finding of only 6% in 2006.
- 7.29 It was commendable that prisoners on ACCT documents were held in the segregation unit infrequently, and only in exceptional circumstances.
- 7.30 On location to the segregation unit, prisoners were only strip-searched following a risk assessment. They were given a booklet about the regime in the segregation unit that, although comprehensive, was not particularly user-friendly.

- 7.31 The segregation unit operated a separate regime to the prison's IEP policy. Regardless of the reason for their location, all prisoners were placed on stage one, which gave them 30 minutes of exercise a day (during which phone calls were expected to be made, following application), a shower every other day, prison toiletries, two magazines and no radio. If they progressed to stage two, they could have access to a radio, five magazines and their own toiletries. This differential regime was unnecessarily punitive. The regime in general was poor and uninspiring. In-cell education and a small library were available but televisions were not. Other regime activities were generally not available.
- 7.32 Prisoners who remained in the unit on good order or discipline or for their own protection had fortnightly reviews. Documentation for these reviews was often incomplete or poorly completed, and most had no meaningful behaviour targets. However, there was evidence that some longer-term residents had useful and meaningful care plans, which included efforts to reintegrate them back to regime activities, activities in association and eventually normal location.
- 7.33 All segregation unit staff had been specially selected to work there but many had not received basic training in suicide prevention or mental health awareness. Prisoners generally said there were positive working relationships with most staff. We observed friendly and relaxed engagement between staff and prisoners. Although prisoners were notionally allocated personal officers, case notes failed to evidence the constructive engagement we observed.
- 7.34 A specific group for monitoring and reviewing use of segregation met regularly. It was informed by a comprehensive report but there was little evidence that it identified concerns or acted on them.

Recommendations

- 7.35 The communal showers and toilets in the segregation unit should be refurbished.
- 7.36 Staff working in the segregation unit should receive training in suicide prevention and mental health awareness as a minimum.
- 7.37 Data collated for the segregation monitoring and review group should be used to identify and take action on any concerns highlighted.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

Incentives and earned privilege schemes are well-publicised, designed to improve behaviour and are applied fairly, transparently and consistently within and between establishments, with regular reviews.

- 7.38 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was comprehensive, fair and well managed, but not all staff understood some newer aspects. Prisoners had the opportunity to progress to the enhanced level, and demotion to basic was managed in a considered way. The basic regime required improvement but most prisoners only remained on it for short periods.

- 7.39 The prison operated the three-tier (basic, standard, enhanced) incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, and staff and prisoners were aware of it. The policy was reviewed annually. The most recent review had reduced the minimum period required for new arrivals to apply for the enhanced level from 12 to six weeks but this change was not widely known by staff.
- 7.40 At the time of the inspection most prisoners were on the standard level while 11 were on basic and 96 were on enhanced. New arrivals were automatically allocated to the standard level, but those previously on enhanced could move to this level when this had been confirmed, although there were sometimes delays in this.
- 7.41 Differentials between the enhanced and standard levels included additional association time, access to own trainers and kettles and some other facilities, such as DVD players, as well as increased access to visits and private cash. Additional association periods were facilitated during the inspection but we were not assured that this would happen consistently due to the unnecessary capping on numbers (see paragraph 6.3). It was inappropriate that prisoners employed in the same job received different levels of pay depending on their privilege level.
- 7.42 The IEP scheme was generally well managed and included regular management checks of decisions. There was clear evidence that prisoners could progress to the enhanced level. Prisoners were given verbal warnings before they were issued formal warnings, which remained in place for 28 days. Prisoners perceived that warnings were issued for minor infringements of rules but we found no evidence of this; warnings were mostly based on a pattern of poor behaviour. Review boards could be convened as a result of a single serious incident, often alongside the formal adjudication process. We found evidence that prisoners were demoted from enhanced to basic as a result of a single incident and often in conjunction with a formal disciplinary award. However, in other circumstances it was generally well evidenced in case notes and warning paperwork that prisoners were given sufficient opportunity and support to amend their behaviour before review boards were convened.
- 7.43 Where prisoners were demoted to the basic level there was evidence to support this. Prisoners were given behaviour targets to comply with during their period on basic but these were often generic and not linked to the behaviour that led to the initial demotion. Prisoners on basic were permitted to work but had their access to showers, association, televisions and phones restricted. They were reviewed after seven days and most then returned to the standard level. Daily records to monitor the prisoner while on basic were mainly observational and lacked evidence of engagement but prisoners did not appear to be adversely affected by this.

Recommendations

- 7.44 Prisoners should receive equal pay for the same job, whatever their privilege level.
- 7.45 Prisoners should not be placed on report and downgraded to basic for the same single incident.
- 7.46 Prisoners on basic level should have better access to showers and phone calls.

Housekeeping points

- 7.47 Staff should be made aware of changes to the incentive and earned privileges scheme (IEP) policy.

- 7.48 New arrivals should be able to retain their enhanced status attained at a previous establishment without delay once this had been verified.
- 7.49 The behaviour targets set for prisoners on the basic level should be specific to help them address and improve their behaviour.

Section 8: Services

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.

- 8.1 Prisoners were positive about the food, appreciated the themed food evenings and consultation was good. All food areas were clean and well maintained, and serveries were very clean. Prisoners could gain qualifications in the kitchen and serveries.
- 8.2 In our survey, 39% of respondents, against the comparator of 22%, said that the food was good. A four-week menu offered a wide range of choices to meet individual religious and dietary needs. Breakfast was served on the day it was to be eaten and lunch included a hot or cold option. The evening meal included a lighter option. The prison had run themed food evenings every two months and prisoners appreciated these.
- 8.3 Consultation with prisoners about the food was good with a separate dedicated food consultative group that met every two months. Although the use of food comments books was low, the kitchen manager made regular comments in them. A database of the most and least popular dishes was collated and this was used, along with consultation, to review and amend menus.
- 8.4 The kitchen area, although small, was well laid out and areas for storing, preparing and cooking food were clean, well maintained and took religious requirements into account. Wing serveries were exceptionally clean and the use of a weekly and monthly competition for servery cleanliness motivated prisoners to maintain high standards.
- 8.5 There were training records for all prisoners working in the kitchen and serveries. There was good partnership between the catering team and The Manchester College, and prisoners could attain a national vocational qualification up to level 2 and food safety up to level 3. Seventy-three prisoners had gained a qualification in 2009/10 and 56 in 2010/11.

Prison shop

Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.6 The range of goods sold through the prison shop was suitable, consultation with prisoners was good and they could purchase from a few external outlets.
- 8.7 The prison shop operated under the national DHL contract. There was relevant and up-to-date information about shop items and ordering on the residential wings.

- 8.8 The shop list was revised every three months. Prisoners were consulted monthly through the prisoner consultation meetings and a quarterly canteen review meeting considered the items they wanted to remove and replace. The prices on the shop list were comparable to those of supermarkets. The range of goods was suitable to the needs of the population.
- 8.9 Shop order forms were available in English and six other languages. Prisoners completed their order forms by Sunday and received their orders the following Friday. Prisoners who arrived during the week had to wait till the following Friday to receive an order sheet and then the following Friday to receive it. In our survey, only 7% of respondents, against the comparator of 11%, said that they had accessed the shop within their first 24 hours at the prison. The prison had, however, made suitable alternative arrangements for new arrivals. Prisoners who arrived without sufficient funds were offered an advance of wages.
- 8.10 Prisoners could purchase items from a small range of catalogues and could arrange to buy magazines and newspapers from a local newsagent.

Good practice

- 8.11 *The translation of shop order forms into six other languages ensured that foreign national prisoners could easily access the prison shop.*

Section 9: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 9.1 The reducing reoffending policy and strategy was reasonably comprehensive in focusing on resettlement pathways but omitted the offender management unit and public protection function. The quarterly resettlement group was well attended by key staff, and identified objectives were reviewed regularly. The new resettlement unit was a positive initiative and staff were enthusiastic but it lacked strategic direction. The prison had undertaken some assessments of need but these had not yet been used to inform developments.
- 9.2 The head of reducing reoffending was responsible for the management of resettlement strategically and a functional manager had day-to-day responsibility for the offender management unit (OMU) and resettlement unit (F wing). There were good links with learning and skills. The reducing reoffending policy was up to date. We were told that on average, 60 prisoners a month were released from Deerbolt.
- 9.3 There was an up-to-date reducing reoffending policy based on the seven resettlement pathways. The document was reasonably comprehensive and gave details about how the prison intended to meet the needs of prisoners in each area. The policy was complemented by a strategy that outlined annual development objectives under each heading and which was updated regularly. However, neither document made significant reference to the OMU or to public protection, and the strategy did not include objectives for them. Despite this, developments on offender management and public protection were standing items at the quarterly resettlement policy group meeting.
- 9.4 The resettlement policy group was appropriately constituted and attendance was generally good. Minutes from meetings were comprehensive and indicated reasonable discussions on developments across the function. Attendance by staff from all key departments across the establishment enhanced communication and integration.
- 9.5 In April 2011, with the ending of the high intensity training (HIT) programme, the prison opened F wing as a dedicated resettlement unit. The principle of the unit was to offer all prisoners, both those on short- and longer-term sentences, an opportunity to focus on resettlement needs in the last four months of their sentence. The small resettlement support team was based on the unit, which covered accommodation and finance, benefit and debt along with general assessment, support and links to other pathways elsewhere in the establishment. A detailed policy outlined the broad objectives of the unit, criteria for selection and expected conduct of prisoners, but it remained unclear how the prison intended to develop the unit. Prisoners elsewhere in the prison were still, appropriately, able to access all resettlement support and it was not clear what was unique for prisoners on F wing. While the unit was still in its embryonic phase, it lacked a strategic focus. There was no action plan or clear development objectives, and although staff on the unit were enthusiastic about developing its function, many ideas had yet to be clearly galvanised (see main recommendation HP55).

- 9.6 During the previous 12 months, the prison had undertaken a number of needs assessments and prisoner consultation exercises. In April 2010, there had been a comprehensive offending behaviour needs analysis based on OASys (offender assessment system) assessment data, and there had been focus groups in June 2010 to assess the resettlement needs of prisoners across all wings. In August 2010 there was also an analysis of exit interviews completed by prisoners in the preceding year, and in April 2011 there were further focus groups of prisoners on F wing about their perceived needs. Despite this raft of information, little of it had been used to inform the strategic direction of the reducing reoffending strategy.
- 9.7 In our survey, only 38% of respondents said that they had done anything or anything had happened to them in the prison to make them less likely to offend in future, against the comparator of 59% and the finding of 60% at our last full inspection.

Recommendations

- 9.8 The reducing reoffending policy and action plan should include developments relating to both offender management and public protection.
- 9.9 Information and recommendations identified from prisoner needs analyses and consultation exercises should be used to inform the strategic development of resettlement.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners have a sentence or custody plan based upon 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 with drawing up and reviewing plans.

- 9.10 All prisoners were subject to OASys and sentence planning, and most OASys assessments were up to date. There was quality assurance for OASys but not for the wider work of the OMU. Sentence planning processes were variable. There was no casework supervision for offender supervisors and there had been no case file checks for some months. There was no one-to-one work with prisoners. There were few releases on temporary licence. Public protection arrangements and work with indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were appropriate.

Sentence planning and offender management

- 9.11 All prisoners were subject to OASys and sentence planning, with 183 of the 463 held at the time of the inspection formally in scope for offender management. Prisoners were allocated to one of the 10 officer or three probation offender supervisors within their first few days of arrival and were interviewed promptly. The induction assessment board had recently been expanded and now included representatives from the resettlement unit, learning and skills, and offender management. The board reviewed the prisoner's current circumstances, interests and motivation to engage with the prison during his sentence. In most cases the prisoner had already seen his offender supervisor before the meeting and therefore this was a useful review and preliminary sentence plan. Any prisoners missed by the board were subsequently seen individually.

- 9.12 Cases were allocated to offender supervisors appropriately, with in-scope cases generally going to the more experienced officers. The three probation staff had small caseloads but also undertook more general work, including public protection and home detention curfew (HDC) management. The unit also undertook other functions across the establishment, as well as covering staff absence elsewhere. Offender supervisors consistently told us of their frustration in being taken off this work to undertake generic officer tasks. As a consequence, the primary focus of the OMU was on the completion of OASys assessments and sentence planning reviews, and contact with prisoners tended to concentrate on that (see main recommendation HP56).
- 9.13 OASys assessments were generally well managed and at the time of the inspection nearly all were up to date. While in-scope prisoners had their assessments undertaken by community-based offender managers, the remaining 280 were the responsibility of the OMU. At the time of the inspection 60 OASys were allocated and being undertaken and only two were out of date. The latter were due to disputes with probation areas about whether the prisoner was in or out of scope for offender management and was, therefore, the prison's or the community's responsibility. We were told that such disputes were not uncommon. During our review of in-scope cases with colleagues from HM Inspectorate of Probation, we found three further cases assessed as medium risk that we thought should have been high risk. Although the prison raised such concerns with probation areas, there was no formal process for reviewing cases or pursuing such concerns. All OASys assessments of out-of-scope prisoners were appropriately reviewed and quality assured by the OMU senior officer and head of department.
- 9.14 Sentence planning processes were generally satisfactory but variable. In our survey, 72% of respondents said that they had a sentence plan, against the comparator of 61% and finding of 57% at our last full inspection, but only 58% of those with a sentence plan said that they had been involved in its completion, compared with 71% at the last inspection. Community offender managers were invited to sentence planning meetings but, we were told, many were unable to attend. Offender managers often contributed, or even chaired, meetings for in-scope prisoners via telephone conferencing facilities, but this was less likely for prisoners who were out of scope – with whom offender supervisors usually set and agreed targets without a formal meeting.
- 9.15 Whether for in- or out-of-scope prisoners, sentence planning contributions from other departments also varied considerably. Although they were contacted in advance of sentence plan meetings with requests for information, and given reminders, many failed to respond. The requests for information did not offer guidance on what was required. Offender supervisors consistently told us that they often contacted work areas, personal officers and other departments to get information but that it was not often forwarded as a matter of course. The P-Nomis information available often contained statements of fact, such as adjudication information or IEP warnings, rather than any assessment of progress against objectives. Representatives from other departments were even less likely to attend sentence plan reviews and as a consequence when offender supervisors were not in attendance, primarily for out-of-scope prisoners, the process was informal.
- 9.16 Our review of in-and out-of-scope cases showed that most contact with prisoners focused on the OASys and sentence planning process, with inconsistent contact outside that. Although there was no formal agreement about the frequency of contact with prisoners, other than for formal reviews, informally in-scope prisoners were expected to be reviewed at least three times a year. In fact, our review showed that most in-scope prisoners were seen far more frequently, although the contact was more nebulous. There was no offence-focused work and it was rare that contacts formally assessed ongoing changes to risk or analysis of actual offending behaviour (see main recommendation HP56). There was also no work in relation to

victim awareness, which was a problem given the limited availability of offending behaviour programmes (see section below on attitudes, thinking and behaviour). In our review of 20 in-scope cases, 19 had identified objectives to attend offending behaviour programmes but none had yet done so. Out-of-scope prisoners were only seen formally on application between sentence planning reviews.

- 9.17 Information exchanges between offender supervisors and offender managers were sufficiently frequent and this was confirmed in most cases we reviewed. Offender supervisors, in particular officer offender supervisors, collated information on prisoners reasonably well but were less skilled at analysing and evaluating it in the context of risk of reoffending. There was no formal quality assurance of offender management activity outside the OASys process. Offender supervisors did not receive casework supervision, and although files were supposed to be checked regularly by the senior officer, this had not been done for some months and, when it had, was oriented to the frequency rather than quality of contact. Despite considerable experience within the offender management team, especially the probation staff, many of their skills in motivational work with prisoners, risk assessment and management were not widely used to the benefit of the team. The range of training for officer offender supervisors was limited and there was no training plan.
- 9.18 There were no formal pre-release boards but all prisoners were subject to an OASys review approximately eight weeks before release. The cases we reviewed generally demonstrated that these meetings took place but, as with other sentence planning processes, contributions from other departments were variable. Staff on the resettlement unit had recently introduced a resettlement passport for prisoners on F wing to review their needs before release. Although a useful initiative, it had little connection with the OMU or the pre-release OASys process, with which it operated in parallel.
- 9.19 Few prisoners were released on temporary licence (ROTL). Since January 2011, only 12 prisoners had successfully gone out on licence on 24 occasions, although applications from a further 16 prisoners were being assessed at the time of the inspection. Only one prisoner was working out at the time of the inspection, although two further placements were possible following interviews during the inspection week. In 2009, the prison reported that 182 ROTLs had been granted in the previous 12 months. The availability of community ROTL options were hoped to increase as F wing became more established, although there were no strategic plans to develop such community links (see paragraph 9.5).
- 9.20 Procedures for managing home detention curfew (HDC) were reasonable. Prisoners were automatically screened if they met the basic criteria and were interviewed by the probation offender supervisors who ran the service. To the end of April 2011, 124 out of 359 prisoners who had been considered by the HDC board had been successful. Six remained on licence at the time of the inspection and approximately 10% had been recalled throughout the year. The rest had successfully completed their licence.
- 9.21 The bail accommodation and support service (BASS) could be accessed where necessary and, while use of the service was relatively low for HDC, the availability of housing and support was a useful resource with five prisoners currently on licence via the service.

Recommendations

- 9.22 There should be a strategy to manage cases of prisoners where the risk of harm level is disputed with community offender managers.

- 9.23 Sentence planning and OASys (offender assessment system) assessments should be informed by contributions from all relevant departments.
- 9.24 There should be a training plan for all offender management staff to address shortfalls in the skills required to undertake the full range of offender management work.
- 9.25 All offender supervisors should have regular professional supervision and casework reviews to aid personal development, and quality assurance should be extended across all offender management work.
- 9.26 The use of release on temporary licence, and links with employers, should be expanded to offer as many prisoners as possible the opportunity to work outside the prison and access resettlement support before release.

Housekeeping point

- 9.27 Requests for information reports for sentence planning should include guidance on the type of information required.

Public protection

- 9.28 Public protection arrangements were generally well managed and there was a comprehensive public protection policy. All new arrivals were screened to identify concerns about child protection or harassment or if they were subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA). Screening procedures were appropriate and proportionate for the age and previous offending histories of most prisoners. At the time of the inspection, seven prisoners were subject to sex offender registration, 25 to safeguarding children procedures and 47 to harassment concerns. All cases were reviewed appropriately through the interdepartmental risk management team (IDRMT).
- 9.29 The monthly IDRMT was well attended with representatives from key departments. Discussions and identified actions were appropriate, and information from meetings was relayed to offender managers where necessary. At the time of the inspection, 284 prisoners were subject, or likely to be subject, to MAPPA: 218 had not yet been assigned a MAPPA level, 51 were level one, 14 level two and one was level three. All prisoners subject to MAPPA were reviewed during the six months before release and given detailed assessments by a probation offender supervisor. Although officer offender supervisors were able to hold MAPPA cases, their involvement in the IDRMT was often minimal.

Recommendation

- 9.30 Offender supervisors should be more actively involved in risk management assessment and management for the prisoners for whom they are responsible.

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

- 9.31 At the time of the inspection there were just seven prisoners on indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPPs). Given the low number, there were no specific facilities for this group and all were managed within the OMU by one of three offender supervisors. These cases were well known to the offender supervisors and case files indicated appropriate management. In

most cases, IPP prisoners were transferred to adult prisons but, where necessary, a multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel was convened. All such cases were up to date at the time of the inspection.

Resettlement pathways

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are met under the seven pathways outlined in the Reducing Reoffending National Action Plan. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual offender in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

Reintegration planning

9.32 There were new contracts with Shelter for accommodation support and the finance, benefit and debt service. Accommodation provision had been reasonable with 92% of the population released to settled accommodation. The primary focus of the service was on prisoners with no planned release address, although those released with no fixed accommodation remained high at over 4%. There was some duplication of pre-release education, training and employment work, and limited opportunities for release on temporary licence for employment. Health discharge planning was satisfactory. The level of identified prisoner debt was high, although around a quarter was written off, frozen or renegotiated. A money matters programme had recently been incorporated into the employability induction programme.

Accommodation

- 9.33 Until the end of June 2011, housing support had been offered by Depaul UK, with a dedicated full-time worker as part of the resettlement team. A new area contract had recently been awarded to Shelter who were due to provide both accommodation and finance, benefit and debt support starting the week after our inspection. Both services were due to be delivered by the same person as previously employed by Depaul, and continuity of provision was likely to be maintained.
- 9.34 In our survey, 15% of respondents said they had a housing problem on arrival at Deerbolt, against the comparator of 20%, although the prison's 2010 offending behaviour needs analysis had identified 19% with no fixed accommodation or in transient accommodation before custody.
- 9.35 All prisoners were seen during induction with the primary focus on those with outstanding tenancies, accommodation debt or likely to be homeless on release. The latter were subsequently picked up before release. The accommodation service was well advertised across the prison, and there were good links with the OMU for prisoners likely to be placed in approved premises as part of their licence conditions on release. In many cases, there was direct liaison with offender managers in the community. For prisoners without stable accommodation, there was access to a range of accommodation providers across the area.
- 9.36 In the year to the end of May 2011, 65 prisoners (8% of the population) were released from Deerbolt without settled accommodation, of whom 37 were found temporary accommodation.

However, 35 (over 4% of the released population) were released with no fixed accommodation, which was high, given the age of the population.

Recommendation

- 9.37 The no fixed accommodation release rate for prisoners should be reduced.

Education, training and employment

For further details, see Learning and skills and work activities in Section 6

- 9.38 There was some duplication of the pre-release support and intervention provided by the careers information and advice service (CIAS) workers and the wider resettlement team. The process was different for those on the resettlement wing and mainstream prisoners. Mainstream prisoners were identified at approximately 18 weeks before release and offered individual interviews with a resettlement officer. Prisoners on the resettlement wing could access regular support from the resettlement officers based there. They also had the opportunity to participate in the focus on release course, which mainstream prisoners did not. Resettlement officers and CIAS workers did not liaise sufficiently well. There was little emphasis on preparation for release during the prisoner's sentence, and not enough done to reduce duplication of effort to serve prisoners' needs.
- 9.39 Some education courses prepared prisoners for work on entry to the prison. Each prisoner participated in employability skills, self-assessment and health and safety courses as part of their induction. Prisoners received individual support from the resettlement team to develop curriculum vitae, compose application letters and discuss the requirements of disclosure. There were few group events to help prisoners discuss issues collectively in preparation for work and employment on release.
- 9.40 Effective partnership working was developing commercial ventures to help prisoners develop business and work skills. Employers were engaged through a series of events where chief executives met prisoners at the prison to discuss training and employment. However, links with employers prepared to take prisoners who qualified for release on temporary licence were limited (see recommendation 9.26).

Recommendation

- 9.41 The resettlement programme should be rationalised to reduce duplication and make better use of careers information and advice support (CIAS) and other workers to support prisoners leading up to release.

Housekeeping point

- 9.42 There should be group sessions to enable prisoners to share concerns and discuss issues collectively in preparation for work and employment on release.

Mental and physical health

- 9.43 Health discharge planning was satisfactory with good links with the community when required. Prisoners received discharge packs including advice on access to NHS services and a letter to

their GP outlining their care and treatment. There was appropriate provision of medication before release, and methadone was routinely given to those prescribed it with arrangements made for its continuation on release. The care programme approach was used for those with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care, although rarely required, was supported with the cooperation of local support services.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 9.44 Shelter was about to take over the service from Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB), which had been in place since 2004. The service's new worker had already undertaken a Nacro debt management course and was scheduled to receive further training from Shelter.
- 9.45 The service had focused primarily on debt support and management. Although in our survey only 13% of respondents said that they had money worries when they first arrived at Deerbolt, against the comparator of 20%, we were told that on average the CAB had identified around £30,000-worth of debt each quarter. In many cases, subsequent help and support was limited because of the prisoner's short stay at the prison and so the service was primarily oriented to signposting to community support. Nevertheless, it was estimated that around £6-7,000-worth of debt was written off, suspended or renegotiated each quarter. Most debt was due to mobile phone contracts and outstanding fines.
- 9.46 Although there was no dedicated money management programme, the prison had recently started to incorporate a money matters module into the four-week employability programme delivered through induction and which all prisoners were expected to attend.

Drugs and alcohol

- 9.47 There were separate drug and alcohol strategies, although alcohol services were inadequate to meet the analysed needs. The CARAT team received consistent praise from prisoners. The P-ASRO course was due to restart following a lengthy gap. Links with drug intervention programmes were good.
- 9.48 The drug strategy was up to date and overseen by a bimonthly drug strategy group, which was well attended by managers from across the establishment. There was also a separate alcohol strategy, informed by an excellent needs analysis that highlighted the need for an alcohol programme (as did our inspection report in 2009). This level of need was starkly underlined in our survey, where 37% of respondents said they had come into Deerbolt with an alcohol problem against the comparator of 26%, and only 8% in our survey in 2006. In addition, 32% of respondents thought they would have a problem with alcohol when they left the prison, against the comparator of 23%. However, even with such a strong evidence base of need, there was still no alcohol programme in place.
- 9.49 The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service team comprised a manager with a half caseload, one civilian, two officers and an administrator. The total caseload was 80 active and 67 suspended clients. Prisoners we spoke to had high levels of satisfaction with the service. A new method of assessment and care planning had been well received by workers and clients, and our random sampling of case files showed that it was well integrated into the service.

- 9.50 The CARAT team was not contracted to work with alcohol-only prisoners, although it did deliver alcohol brief interventions and the alcohol awareness module of the IDTS psychosocial programme to poly-drug users.
- 9.51 P-ASRO (prison addressing substance related offending) had not been delivered since November 2010 due to staffing difficulties, but these were now resolved and the programme was due to restart in July 2011, although with a reduced target of 26 completions for the year.
- 9.52 There were good links with drug intervention programmes (DIPs) in the community, with regular visits from those nearest to the establishment. There was a telephone conferencing suite for prisoners to contact their DIP workers who were further away.

Recommendation

- 9.53 **An accredited alcohol group work programme should be put in place without further delay.**

Children and families of offenders

- 9.54 The visitors' centre offered a good range of support for visitors and arrangements for managing visits had improved significantly, although visits booking arrangements were still limited. Family visits were appropriate, as were father and child visits. The recent employment of a family links worker was a positive initiative.
- 9.55 The visitors' centre was just outside the main prison gate and was managed by NEPACS (formerly, North East Prison After Care Society). The centre was welcoming and offered visitors refreshments and support before and after visits, and had a small children's play area. There was a good range of information for visitors about visiting prisons generally, as well as specifically about Deerbolt. Information for visitors was included in induction packs for prisoners but staff at the centre also sent information directly to visitors if needed. The visitors we spoke to were unequivocal in their support for the staff at the centre. A new forum had recently been set up to allow visitors to discuss issues and concerns with both visitors' centre and prison staff. Two meetings had taken place so far.
- 9.56 Arrangements for managing visits had improved significantly since the last inspection. Up to 40 visits could be accommodated on Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday or Sunday afternoons between 2pm and 4pm. Visitors were allocated a place on a first come, first served basis and started going over to the visits hall at 1pm, although they could book in at the visitors' centre from noon. On a full visits session, it took approximately 1.25 hours for all visitors to be booked in and go through the search process. Although those allocated to an early slot could wait for around half an hour in the visits hall, or the prisoner wait for about the same time for a late slot, visitors told us they preferred this system. When we observed visits, all visitors were in the visits hall by 2.15pm, allowing for a visit of at least an hour and a half.
- 9.57 Access to the visits booking system was reasonable but some prisoners said that as the telephone booking line was only open between 9am and noon on weekdays this created a problem for parents and friends, especially those who worked. This had also been raised at the resettlement focus groups in June 2010. There was no facility to book visits by text or email.

- 9.58 The visits hall was comfortably furnished, staff were friendly but professional and the general atmosphere was relaxed. There was a small refreshment bar serving hot and cold drinks and food, and a small play area staffed by workers and volunteers managed through NEPACS. We were told that the play area was rarely not staffed.
- 9.59 Visits staff managed prisoners quickly and efficiently to their table. However, prisoners had to wear coloured bibs, which was disproportionate.
- 9.60 Father and child visits were facilitated between four and six times a year, and there were two or three family visits a year. The first of regular family visits for prisoners on F wing, and therefore close to release, took place during our inspection.
- 9.61 An 'inside parenting' course for fathers had been delivered through the education department twice a year but had not run so far in 2011.
- 9.62 A family support worker had just come into post and was part of the resettlement team. The primary focus of the role was anticipated to be work with prisoners experiencing family difficulties. Many prisoners told us they were concerned about whether their families would be able to visit them, primarily because of Deerbolt's distance from their home and its rural location. In our survey, only 22% of respondents said they had received a visit in their first week, against the comparator of 31%, and 40% in 2006, and only 29%, against 41%, said they had had one or more visits in the last week. It was anticipated that the family links worker would also help visitors find the easiest means of visiting the prison.

Recommendations

- 9.63 **The opening times of the telephone booking line should be extended, and visitors should also be able to book visits by email and text.**
- 9.64 **Prisoners should not have to wear bibs during visits.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 9.65 Although the needs analysis in 2010 had identified significant need across the prison, there were only three accredited offending behaviour programmes, and the target completion rate had been reduced. There was no strategy to address these shortfalls. There was no one-to-one work and few opportunities to transfer prisoners to other establishments for programmes.
- 9.66 The prison had undertaken a comprehensive analysis of its population's offending behaviour need in 2010, which had outlined a wide range of need – for example, 46% of the population were convicted of a violent offence or robbery, 93% had issues with their lifestyle that required intervention, and 85% engaged with activities that increased their likelihood of offending. Although the prison delivered three accredited programmes, there was no strategy to address the significant shortfall (see main recommendation HP57).
- 9.67 P-ASRO (prison addressing substance related offending), the thinking skills programme (TSP) and focus on resettlement (FOR) were the only programmes currently available. Although P-ASRO and TSP hit their targets for 2010/11, the FOR programme did not, and overall only 144 prisoners completed a programme against a target of 153. The overall target for 2011/12 had also been reduced to just 109, although the TSP retained its objective of 56 completions. In

our survey, only 4% of respondents, against the comparator of 12%, said they were currently involved in an offending behaviour programme, and only 48% of those who had been on any programme while in the prison thought that it would help them on release, against the comparator of 57%.

- 9.68** There was no programme addressing violence or anger management or issues of victim empathy. No alternatives were available via the OMU and there was no individual work. As Deerbolt was the only YOI in the North East, there were few opportunities to transfer prisoners to other establishments to complete offending behaviour work. The exception to this was for sex offenders (six at the time of the inspection), for whom there was a comprehensive area policy that identified treatment pathways across the country.
- 9.69** The OMU cases that we reviewed suggested an over-reliance on the completion of offending behaviour work in the community once the prisoner was released on licence. As many prisoners were on relatively short licences, this approach did not seem realistic, but there had been no analysis to establish its validity.

Section 10: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

The following is a listing of recommendations 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.

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 10.1 There should be further work to reduce the level of violent incidents. (HP48)
 - 10.2 Prisoners located in the special accommodation should only be strip-searched and have their own clothing replaced with anti-tear gowns when this is supported by a risk assessment. (HP49)
 - 10.3 The regime in the segregation unit should be revised and improved. (HP50)
 - 10.4 All prisoners should have access to daily showers. (HP51)
 - 10.5 There should be a needs analysis to inform the development of a detailed diversity and equality strategy and priorities for the diversity and equality action plan, and specific needs analyses to inform strategy and action plans for each diversity strand. (HP52)
 - 10.6 Prisoners should have greater access to time out of cell. (HP53)
 - 10.7 The number of activity places should be increased and the allocation process improved so that prisoners are deployed to them effectively. (HP54)
 - 10.8 The prison should determine the function of the resettlement unit and how this should be developed, and set out a clear strategy to take these objectives forward. (HP55)
 - 10.9 The role of offender supervisors should be clearly defined to include ongoing risk and offence-related assessments and engagement. (HP56)
 - 10.10 There should be a strategy to address the shortfall in offending behaviour provision to meet the needs of the population. (HP57)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 10.11 Prisoners arriving during lunch should not be left on escort vehicles and should be disembarked into the holding rooms. (1.7)
- 10.12 Arriving prisoners should not be handcuffed when they are moved from escort vehicles to the reception area, and escort and prison staff should be made aware of the prison's policy on this. (1.8)

First days in custody

- 10.13 Reception should be refurbished and made fit for purpose. (1.16)
- 10.14 New arrivals should receive a thorough and meaningful risk assessment interview on the day they arrive, and a written record of this interview should be kept. (1.21)
- 10.15 The induction presentation should be streamlined and the Insider facilitators supported by staff. (1.26)
- 10.16 The induction programme should be condensed into a shorter period, and once completed, prisoners should move to their residential wings as soon as possible. (1.27)

Residential units

- 10.17 Toilets in cells should be effectively screened. (2.9)
- 10.18 The prison should ensure that the offensive displays policy is adhered to by all prisoners and enforced by staff. (2.10)
- 10.19 Prisoners should be allowed to wear their own clothes, and sufficient prison clothing should be available. (2.13)
- 10.20 Prisoners should be able to access their stored property within one week of making an application. (2.14)
- 10.21 Communal showers should have adequate privacy screening. (2.17)

Personal officers

- 10.22 Links between personal officers and the offender management unit should be developed. (2.27)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 10.23 Prisoners should be set individualised behaviour targets when anti-bullying monitoring documents are opened on them. (3.9)

Self-harm and suicide

- 10.24 All staff should receive regular training in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT). (3.20)

Applications and complaints

- 10.25 Responses to applications should be tracked, monitored and quality assured. (3.28)
- 10.26 Information about complaints should be aggregated over the year to assess themes and areas for improvement, and action taken to rectify issues. (3.29)

Legal rights

- 10.27 The legal services officers and the foreign national coordinator should be adequately trained concerning legal issues and have time to support and signpost prisoners. (3.34)
- 10.28 Access to legal visits should be increased. (3.35)

Faith and religious activity

- 10.29 There should be washing facilities, shoe storage and a disabled-access toilet within the multi-faith area. (3.42)

Substance use

- 10.30 Suspicion drug tests should be managed and monitored more effectively to ensure they are undertaken within the required timeframe. (3.49)

Diversity

- 10.31 Staff training in diversity should be completed. (4.10)
- 10.32 Minority group prisoners should have access to formal support groups. (4.11)
- 10.33 There should be monitoring to assess the impact of prisoners' religion, age, disability and/or foreign national status on their participation in the prison's regime. (4.12)

Health services

- 10.34 The treatment rooms on the wings should be refurbished, kept clean and fitted with security gates. (5.6)
- 10.35 Clinical supervision should be available to all health care professionals. (5.14)
- 10.36 Prisoners should have access to a dedicated health care forum. (5.15)
- 10.37 Prisoners should have access to information on health services in a range of languages. (5.21)
- 10.38 Triage algorithms should be developed and used to ensure consistency of care and treatment. (5.22)
- 10.39 A pharmacist should visit the prison at least once a month to check the systems in operation. (5.29)
- 10.40 Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led clinics. (5.30)
- 10.41 There should be a policy for the issue of medicines at the special sick clinic that the medicines and therapeutics committee reviews regularly to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied. (5.31)

- 10.42 Resuscitation kit, including oxygen, should be available in the dental suite. (5.37)
- 10.43 Patients should be able to see a dentist for routine treatment within a reasonable timescale. (5.38)
- 10.44 Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (5.43)
- 10.45 Mental health awareness training should be provided for all discipline staff. (5.44)

Time out of cell

- 10.46 There should be no regime slippage and the core day routine should be adhered to. (6.5)
- 10.47 All prisoners should have access to four evening association sessions a week. (6.6)
- 10.48 Benches and/or recreational equipment should be provided in exercise yards. (6.7)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 10.49 Quality improvement processes should be extended to all learning and skills provision. (6.13)
- 10.50 The prison should endeavour to retrieve information about prisoners' achievements from the learner record service to reduce the need for them to repeat basic skills assessments carried out recently in other prisons. (6.16)
- 10.51 All prisoners in work places should wear the relevant personal protective equipment. (6.22)
- 10.52 Literacy and numeracy training in activities should be contextualised to make them more relevant. (6.23)
- 10.53 Vocational training provision should be increased to meet the needs of prisoners and reduce waiting times to access programmes. (6.29)
- 10.54 The resources in the information and communication technology and motor vehicle workshops should be up to date and reflect current industry standards. (6.30)
- 10.55 Individual learning plans should be better used to give learners clearly defined short-term targets to guide their learning and measure their progress. (6.31)
- 10.56 The take-up of education places should be increased. (6.38)
- 10.57 The progress that learners make in the literacy and numeracy workshop should be formally recorded and reviewed regularly. (6.39)
- 10.58 Literacy and numeracy workshop and in-cell activities should be more frequent to enable learners to consolidate their learning. (6.40)
- 10.59 The size of the library should be increased to accommodate the required library stock. (6.46)
- 10.60 The library should be open on some evenings and at weekends. (6.47)
- 10.61 All prisoners should have adequate time in the library to browse and select books. (6.48)

- 10.62 The library should introduce Storybook Dads and the Toe-by-Toe reading scheme. (6.49)

Physical education and health promotion

- 10.63 There should be more showers in the PE department and they should be fitted with privacy screens. (6.57)
- 10.64 The PE department should offer higher level programmes to provide progression routes from level 1. (6.58)

Security and rules

- 10.65 Actions requested on security information reports should be completed within appropriate timescales. (7.7)
- 10.66 Prisoners should only be strip-searched after visits when there is intelligence to support this. (7.8)

Discipline

- 10.67 Adjudicators should ensure that all charges are appropriately investigated before reaching a verdict for adjudications and minor reports. (7.15)
- 10.68 Mitigation offered in adjudications or minor reports should be recorded and taken into account with any finding of guilt. (7.16)
- 10.69 Data collected on minor reports should be improved and a formal quality assurance procedure for minor report documentation should be introduced. (7.17)
- 10.70 Any drawing or use of a baton should be scrutinised to give assurance that its use is appropriate and proportionate. (7.24)
- 10.71 There should be protocols for the use of the two unfurnished searching/'cool off' rooms in the segregation unit, and any use of them as special accommodation should be appropriately authorised and recorded. (7.25)
- 10.72 Governance of the use of force should be improved. (7.26)
- 10.73 The communal showers and toilets in the segregation unit should be refurbished. (7.35)
- 10.74 Staff working in the segregation unit should receive training in suicide prevention and mental health awareness as a minimum. (7.36)
- 10.75 Data collated for the segregation monitoring and review group should be used to identify and take action on any concerns highlighted. (7.37)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 10.76 Prisoners should receive equal pay for the same job, whatever their privilege level. (7.44)

- 10.77 Prisoners should not be placed on report and downgraded to basic for the same single incident. (7.45)
- 10.78 Prisoners on basic level should have better access to showers and phone calls. (7.46)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 10.79 The reducing reoffending policy and action plan should include developments relating to both offender management and public protection. (9.8)
- 10.80 Information and recommendations identified from prisoner needs analyses and consultation exercises should be used to inform the strategic development of resettlement. (9.9)

Offender management and planning

- 10.81 There should be a strategy to manage cases of prisoners where the risk of harm level is disputed with community offender managers. (9.22)
- 10.82 Sentence planning and OASys (offender assessment system) assessments should be informed by contributions from all relevant departments. (9.23)
- 10.83 There should be a training plan for all offender management staff to address shortfalls in the skills required to undertake the full range of offender management work. (9.24)
- 10.84 All offender supervisors should have regular professional supervision and casework reviews to aid personal development, and quality assurance should be extended across all offender management work. (9.25)
- 10.85 The use of release on temporary licence, and links with employers, should be expanded to offer as many prisoners as possible the opportunity to work outside the prison and access resettlement support before release. (9.26)
- 10.86 Offender supervisors should be more actively involved in risk management assessment and management for the prisoners for whom they are responsible. (9.30)

Resettlement pathways: reintegration planning

- 10.87 The no fixed accommodation release rate for prisoners should be reduced. (9.37)
- 10.88 The resettlement programme should be rationalised to reduce duplication and make better use of careers information and advice support (CIAS) and other workers to support prisoners leading up to release. (9.41)

Resettlement pathways: drugs and alcohol

- 10.89 An accredited alcohol group work programme should be put in place without further delay. (9.53)

Resettlement pathways: children and families of offenders

- 10.90 The opening times of the telephone booking line should be extended, and visitors should also be able to book visits by email and text. (9.63)
- 10.91 Prisoners should not have to wear bibs during visits. (9.64)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escorts and transfers [to Prison Escort and Custody Services]

- 10.92 Escort vans should be regularly cleaned. (1.9)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 10.93 Information notices to prisoners should be reasonable and presented with respect. (2.22)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 10.94 The violence reduction strategy should include documentation used to monitor bullies. (3.10)

Self-harm and suicide

- 10.95 Observations in ACCT documents should be completed at the required frequency and be less predictable. (3.21)

Applications and complaints

- 10.96 Information displayed on wings about access to the Independent Monitoring Board should be updated. (3.30)

Diversity

- 10.97 The diversity and equality management team should include health care representation. (4.13)
- 10.98 Discriminatory incident report forms should be available in a range of languages and accessible formats. (4.20)

Health services

- 10.99 Records of continuous professional development and mandatory training should be maintained. (5.16)
- 10.100 Staff should have access to NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence) guidelines and national service frameworks to guide and inform practice. (5.17)

10.101 Health promotion material should be more easily available to prisoners, especially in the waiting area of the health care centre. (5.23)

Security and rules

10.102 The security committee should be attended by appropriate mandatory drug testing (MDT) managers. (7.9)

Incentives and earned privileges

10.103 Staff should be made aware of changes to the incentive and earned privileges scheme (IEP) policy. (7.47)

10.104 New arrivals should be able to retain their enhanced status attained at a previous establishment without delay once this had been verified. (7.48)

10.105 The behaviour targets set for prisoners on the basic level should be specific to help them address and improve their behaviour. (7.49)

Offender management and planning

10.106 Requests for information reports for sentence planning should include guidance on the type of information required. (9.27)

Resettlement pathways: reintegration planning

10.107 There should be group sessions to enable prisoners to share concerns and discuss issues collectively in preparation for work and employment on release. (9.42)

Example of good practice

10.108 The translation of shop order forms into six other languages ensured that foreign national prisoners could easily access the prison shop. (8.11)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nigel Newcomen	Deputy Chief Inspector
Martin Lomas	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Michael Skidmore	Researcher
Helen Wark	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Helen Jackson	Pharmacist
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted
Dr Ken Fisher	Ofsted
Yvonne McGuckian	HMI Probation
Martin Jolly	HMI Probation
Ian Cavanagh	Practice assessor HMI Probation

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	384	36	90.5
Recall	34	8	9.2
Detainees	0	1	0.3
Total	418	45	100

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced – no sentence	1	0	
Less than 6 months	19	0	
6 months to less than 12 months	14	0	
12 months to less than 2 years	75	6	
2 years to less than 4 years	208	25	
4 years to less than 10 years	96	13	
Life	5	1	
Total	418	45	

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	418	
21 years to 29 years	45	
Total	463	

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	406	45	97.42
Foreign nationals	11	0	2.37
Not stated	1	0	0.22
Total	418	45	100

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category C – YOI closed	418	45	
Total	418	45	

Ethnicity	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
<i>White</i>			
British	362	37	86.2
Other white	1	0	0.2
<i>Mixed</i>			
White and black Caribbean	4	1	1.1
White and Asian	2	0	0.4
Other mixed	4	0	0.9
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>			
Indian	4	0	0.9
Pakistani	9	5	3
Bangladeshi	3	0	0.6
Other Asian	9	1	2.2
<i>Black or black British</i>			
Caribbean	5	0	1.1
African	5	0	1.1
Other black	2	1	0.6
<i>Not stated</i>	8	0	1.7
Total	418	45	100

Religion	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Church of England	71	12	17.8
Roman Catholic	67	5	15.4
Other Christian denominations	23	2	5.4
Muslim	35	6	8.8
Buddhist	2	0	0.4
No religion	220	20	52.1
Total	418	45	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	60	14.4	0	
1 month to 3 months	123	29.4	5	11.1
3 months to 6 months	95	22.7	13	28.9
6 months to 1 year	106	25.4	18	40
1 year to 2 years	34	8.1	9	20
Total	418	100	45	100

Main offence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	140	13	
Sexual offences	6	0	
Burglary	95	10	
Robbery	102	8	
Theft and handling	8	1	
Fraud and forgery	2	1	
Drugs offences	28	8	
Other offences	35	2	
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	2	2	
Total	418	45	

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

The baseline for the sample size was calculated using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician. Essentially, the formula indicates the sample size that is required and the extent to which the findings from a sample of that size reflect the experiences of the whole population.

At the time of the survey on 23 May 2011, the young adult population at HMYOI Deerbolt was 468. The sample size was 176. Overall, this represented 38% of the young adult population.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a P-Nomis list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Six respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. Three respondents were interviewed.

Methodology

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to each respondent on an individual basis. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the independence of the Inspectorate and the purpose of the questionnaire, as well as to answer questions.

All completed questionnaires were confidential – only members of the Inspectorate saw them. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to do one of the following:

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire.

Response rates

In total, 165 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 35% of the young adult population. The response rate was 94%. In addition to the six respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, three questionnaires were not returned and two were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following documents detail the results from the survey. Data from each establishment have been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2011 against comparator figures for all young adults surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young adult surveys carried out in 13 young offender institutions since 2007.
- The current survey responses in 2011 against the responses of young adults surveyed at HMYOI Deerbolt in 2006.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of young adults who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

In all the above documents, statistical significance is used to indicate whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in young adults' background details.

It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and those of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in changes to percentages from previously published surveys. However, all percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

Summary

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages to certain responses within the summary, for example, 'not sentenced' options across questions may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data are excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data are cleaned to be consistent.

Percentages shown in the summary may differ by 1% or 2 % from those shown in the comparison data as the comparator data have` been weighted for comparison purposes.

Survey results

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	150 (91%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	150 (91%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	Not sentenced	0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	35 (22%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	63 (40%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	36 (23%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Life</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.5	Approximately, how long do you have left to serve (if you are serving life or IPP, please use the date of your next board)?	
	Not sentenced	0 (0%)
	<i>6 months or less</i>	76 (53%)
	<i>More than 6 months</i>	67 (47%)
Q1.6	How long have you been in this prison?	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>1 to less than 3 months</i>	22 (13%)
	<i>3 to less than 6 months</i>	37 (22%)
	<i>6 to less than 12 months</i>	52 (32%)
	<i>12 months to less than 2 years</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 years</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>4 years or more</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.7	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not hold UK citizenship)	
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (9%)

No..... 144 (91%)

Q1.8 Is English your first language?

Yes..... 157 (98%)
 No..... 4 (2%)

Q1.9 What is your ethnic origin?

<i>White - British</i>	142 (87%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	2 (1%)
<i>White - Irish</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	3 (2%)
<i>White - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	1 (1%)

Q1.10 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?

Yes..... 13 (8%)
 No..... 150 (92%)

Q1.11 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	77 (47%)	<i>Hindu</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Church of England</i>	32 (20%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	36 (22%)	<i>Muslim</i>	13 (8%)
<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	2 (1%)		

Q1.12 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/straight..... 157 (97%)
Homosexual/gay..... 1 (1%)
Bisexual..... 4 (2%)
Other..... 0 (0%)

Q1.13 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Yes..... 23 (14%)
 No..... 142 (86%)

Q1.14 How many times have you been in prison before?

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
55 (33%)	26 (16%)	62 (38%)	22 (13%)

Q1.15 Including this prison, how many prisons have you been in during this sentence/remand time?

<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
17 (10%)	135 (83%)	11 (7%)

Q1.16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	
	Yes	52 (32%)
	No.....	113 (68%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons. How was:

	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>	<i>N/A</i>
The cleanliness of the van?	6 (4%)	42 (26%)	36 (22%)	45 (28%)	17 (10%)	14 (9%)	2 (1%)
Your personal safety during the journey?	15 (10%)	85 (54%)	29 (19%)	14 (9%)	7 (4%)	4 (3%)	2 (1%)
The comfort of the van?	5 (3%)	16 (10%)	13 (8%)	38 (24%)	82 (51%)	4 (3%)	2 (1%)
The attention paid to your health needs?	7 (4%)	45 (29%)	44 (28%)	28 (18%)	17 (11%)	5 (3%)	10 (6%)
The frequency of toilet breaks?	2 (1%)	20 (13%)	22 (14%)	33 (21%)	60 (38%)	6 (4%)	17 (11%)

Q2.2 How long did you spend in the van?

<i>Less than 1 hour</i>	<i>Over 1 hour to 2 hours</i>	<i>Over 2 hours to 4 hours</i>	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
17 (10%)	79 (48%)	54 (33%)	9 (6%)	4 (2%)

Q2.3 How did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?

<i>Very well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Badly</i>	<i>Very badly</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
11 (7%)	85 (53%)	45 (28%)	12 (7%)	6 (4%)	2 (1%)

Q2.4 Please answer the following questions about when you first arrived here:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	138 (86%)	20 (13%)	2 (1%)
Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	32 (20%)	115 (73%)	10 (6%)
When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	148 (94%)	9 (6%)	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help or support with the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Didn't ask about any of these.....</i>	30 (20%)	<i>Money worries.....</i>	20 (13%)
<i>Loss of property.....</i>	15 (10%)	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal.....</i>	73 (49%)
<i>Housing problems.....</i>	35 (23%)	<i>Health problems.....</i>	91 (61%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	17 (11%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	16 (11%)

Contacting family.....	82 (55%)	Accessing phone numbers.....	59 (39%)
Ensuring dependants were being looked after	12 (8%)	Other.....	3 (2%)

Q3.2 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Didn't have any problems	68 (50%)	Money worries.....	18 (13%)
Loss of property.....	16 (12%)	Feeling depressed or suicidal.	13 (10%)
Housing problems.....	20 (15%)	Health problems.....	20 (15%)
Contacting employers	5 (4%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	11 (8%)
Contacting family.....	32 (24%)	Accessing phone numbers.....	26 (19%)
Ensuring dependants were looked after	3 (2%)	Other.....	0 (0%)

Q3.3 Please answer the following questions about reception:

	Yes	No	Don't remember
Were you seen by a member of health services?	111 (70%)	40 (25%)	7 (4%)
When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	128 (81%)	27 (17%)	4 (3%)

Q3.4 Overall, how well did you feel you were treated in reception?

Very well	Well	Neither	Badly	Very badly	Don't remember
14 (9%)	86 (54%)	38 (24%)	12 (8%)	7 (4%)	2 (1%)

Q3.5 On your day of arrival, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Information about what was going to happen to you	78 (53%)
Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	89 (61%)
Information about how to make routine requests	67 (46%)
Information about your entitlement to visits.....	86 (59%)
Information about health services	91 (62%)
Information about the chaplaincy	91 (62%)
Not offered anything	28 (19%)

Q3.6 On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

A smokers/non-smokers pack.....	155 (95%)
The opportunity to have a shower.....	80 (49%)
The opportunity to make a free telephone call.....	123 (75%)
Something to eat.....	112 (69%)
Did not receive anything	3 (2%)

Q3.7 Did you meet any of the following people within the first 24 hours of your arrival at this prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Chaplain or religious leader	67 (43%)
Someone from health services	111 (71%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	19 (12%)

Did not meet any of these people..... 33 (21%)

Q3.8 Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours of your arrival at this prison?

Yes 11 (7%)
 No 149 (93%)

Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes 135 (84%)
 No 13 (8%)
 Don't remember 12 (8%)

Q3.10 How soon after your arrival did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course..... 14 (9%)
 Within the first week 86 (53%)
 More than a week 51 (32%)
 Don't remember 10 (6%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?

Have not been on an induction course..... 14 (9%)
 Yes 84 (53%)
 No 38 (24%)
 Don't remember 22 (14%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	9 (6%)	60 (38%)	24 (15%)	33 (21%)	17 (11%)	16 (10%)
Attend legal visits?	13 (8%)	59 (39%)	33 (22%)	9 (6%)	10 (7%)	29 (19%)
Obtain bail information?	7 (5%)	32 (21%)	33 (22%)	16 (11%)	15 (10%)	46 (31%)

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 29 (18%)
 Yes 56 (36%)
 No 72 (46%)

Q4.3 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know	N/A
Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	77 (48%)	81 (50%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)

Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	59 (37%)	100 (63%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	114 (72%)	41 (26%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	104 (66%)	46 (29%)	7 (4%)	1 (1%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	98 (63%)	35 (22%)	19 (12%)	4 (3%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	94 (59%)	63 (40%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	38 (24%)	78 (49%)	31 (20%)	11 (7%)

Q4.4 What is the food like here?

<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
10 (6%)	51 (33%)	38 (25%)	35 (23%)	21 (14%)

Q4.5 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

<i>Have not bought anything yet</i>	1 (1%)
Yes	74 (47%)
No.....	83 (53%)

Q4.6 Is it easy or difficult to get:

	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
A complaint form?	74 (47%)	65 (41%)	4 (3%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)	11 (7%)
An application form?	78 (50%)	61 (39%)	5 (3%)	6 (4%)	2 (1%)	4 (3%)

Q4.7 Have you made an application?

Yes	135 (86%)
No.....	22 (14%)

Q4.8 Please answer the following questions concerning applications:

(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with fairly?	22 (14%)	86 (56%)	45 (29%)
Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with promptly? (Within seven days)	22 (15%)	68 (47%)	54 (38%)

Q4.9 Have you made a complaint?

Yes	54 (34%)
No.....	103 (66%)

Q4.10 Please answer the following questions concerning complaints:

(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with fairly?	103 (65%)	13 (8%)	42 (27%)
Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with promptly? (Within seven days)	103 (65%)	15 (9%)	41 (26%)
Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	76 (49%)	34 (22%)	44 (29%)

Q4.11 Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?

Not made a complaint	103 (64%)
Yes	8 (5%)
No.....	49 (31%)

Q4.12 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?

<i>Don't know who they are</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
67 (43%)	5 (3%)	27 (17%)	34 (22%)	13 (8%)	11 (7%)

Q4.13 What level of the IEP scheme are you on now?

Don't know what the IEP scheme is	5 (3%)
<i>Enhanced</i>	35 (22%)
<i>Standard</i>	114 (71%)
<i>Basic</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Don't know</i>	3 (2%)

Q4.14 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?

Don't know what the IEP scheme is	5 (3%)
Yes	75 (47%)
No	65 (41%)
<i>Don't know</i>	13 (8%)

Q4.15 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?

Don't know what the IEP scheme is	5 (3%)
Yes	83 (52%)
No.....	56 (35%)
<i>Don't know</i>	15 (9%)

Q4.16 Please answer the following questions about this prison?

	Yes	No
In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	31 (20%)	126 (80%)
In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation /care and separation unit?	37 (24%)	120 (76%)

Q4.17	Please answer the following questions about your religious beliefs	Yes	No	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	68 (43%)	25 (16%)	66 (42%)
	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	76 (49%)	11 (7%)	68 (44%)
Q4.18	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	Yes 72 (46%)	No 11 (7%)	<i>Don't know</i> 75 (47%)
Q4.19	Please answer the following questions about staff in this prison:	Yes	No	
	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	122 (78%)	35 (22%)	
	Do most staff treat you with respect?	109 (70%)	47 (30%)	

Section 5: Safety

Q5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	Yes 41 (26%)	No 119 (74%)																				
Q5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	Yes 18 (11%)	No 141 (89%)																				
Q5.3	In which areas of this prison do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><i>Never felt unsafe</i>..... 119 (76%)</td> <td><i>At mealtimes</i>..... 7 (4%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Everywhere</i>..... 7 (4%)</td> <td><i>At health services</i>..... 6 (4%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Segregation unit</i>..... 4 (3%)</td> <td><i>Visits area</i>..... 6 (4%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Association areas</i>..... 16 (10%)</td> <td><i>In wing showers</i>..... 25 (16%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Reception area</i>..... 2 (1%)</td> <td><i>In gym showers</i>..... 18 (11%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>At the gym</i>..... 16 (10%)</td> <td><i>In corridors/stairwells</i>..... 8 (5%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>In an exercise yard</i>..... 13 (8%)</td> <td><i>On your landing/wing</i>..... 7 (4%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>At work</i>..... 15 (10%)</td> <td><i>In your cell</i>..... 5 (3%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>During movement</i>..... 18 (11%)</td> <td><i>At religious services</i>..... 3 (2%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>At education</i>..... 16 (10%)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		<i>Never felt unsafe</i> 119 (76%)	<i>At mealtimes</i> 7 (4%)	<i>Everywhere</i> 7 (4%)	<i>At health services</i> 6 (4%)	<i>Segregation unit</i> 4 (3%)	<i>Visits area</i> 6 (4%)	<i>Association areas</i> 16 (10%)	<i>In wing showers</i> 25 (16%)	<i>Reception area</i> 2 (1%)	<i>In gym showers</i> 18 (11%)	<i>At the gym</i> 16 (10%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> 8 (5%)	<i>In an exercise yard</i> 13 (8%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> 7 (4%)	<i>At work</i> 15 (10%)	<i>In your cell</i> 5 (3%)	<i>During movement</i> 18 (11%)	<i>At religious services</i> 3 (2%)	<i>At education</i> 16 (10%)	
<i>Never felt unsafe</i> 119 (76%)	<i>At mealtimes</i> 7 (4%)																						
<i>Everywhere</i> 7 (4%)	<i>At health services</i> 6 (4%)																						
<i>Segregation unit</i> 4 (3%)	<i>Visits area</i> 6 (4%)																						
<i>Association areas</i> 16 (10%)	<i>In wing showers</i> 25 (16%)																						
<i>Reception area</i> 2 (1%)	<i>In gym showers</i> 18 (11%)																						
<i>At the gym</i> 16 (10%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> 8 (5%)																						
<i>In an exercise yard</i> 13 (8%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> 7 (4%)																						
<i>At work</i> 15 (10%)	<i>In your cell</i> 5 (3%)																						
<i>During movement</i> 18 (11%)	<i>At religious services</i> 3 (2%)																						
<i>At education</i> 16 (10%)																							
Q5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner or group of prisoners here?	Yes 23 (15%)	No 135 (85%) If No, go to question 5.6																				
Q5.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i></td> <td>12 (8%)</td> <td><i>Because of your sexuality</i>.....</td> <td>3 (2%)</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	12 (8%)	<i>Because of your sexuality</i>	3 (2%)																
<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	12 (8%)	<i>Because of your sexuality</i>	3 (2%)																				

<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	9 (6%)	<i>Because you have a disability...</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Because of your age.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Because of drugs.....</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken.....</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Because of your offence/ crime.</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Because you were new here.....</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)

Q5.6 Have you been victimised by a member of staff or group of staff here?

Yes.....	19 (12%)	If No, go to question 5.8
No.....	136 (88%)	

Q5.7 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>	11 (7%)	<i>Because you have a disability...</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	7 (5%)	<i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Because of your age.....</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	7 (5%)
<i>Because of drugs.....</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Because of your offence/ crime.</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Because you were new here.....</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Because of gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Because of your sexuality.....</i>	2 (1%)		

Q5.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?

Not been victimised	121 (79%)
Yes.....	5 (3%)
No.....	28 (18%)

Q5.9 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?

Yes.....	27 (17%)
No.....	131 (83%)

Q5.10 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff/group of staff in here?

Yes.....	17 (11%)
No.....	140 (89%)

Q5.11 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
20 (13%)	22 (14%)	17 (11%)	13 (8%)	21 (13%)	64 (41%)

Section 6: Health services

Q6.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?

	Don't know	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	23 (15%)	16 (10%)	58 (37%)	23 (15%)	30 (19%)	8 (5%)
The nurse	12 (8%)	27 (17%)	85 (54%)	16 (10%)	13 (8%)	5 (3%)
The dentist	30 (19%)	6 (4%)	20 (13%)	16 (10%)	51 (32%)	35 (22%)
The optician	58 (37%)	5 (3%)	22 (14%)	22 (14%)	32 (21%)	16 (10%)

Q6.2 Are you able to see a pharmacist?

Yes	56 (42%)
No	77 (58%)

Q6.3 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?

	Not been	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	30 (19%)	17 (11%)	62 (40%)	18 (12%)	20 (13%)	9 (6%)
The nurse	10 (6%)	22 (14%)	78 (51%)	22 (14%)	17 (11%)	5 (3%)
The dentist	56 (36%)	9 (6%)	22 (14%)	27 (18%)	21 (14%)	19 (12%)
The optician	76 (50%)	6 (4%)	26 (17%)	28 (19%)	10 (7%)	5 (3%)

Q6.4 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

Not been	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
8 (5%)	11 (7%)	71 (46%)	29 (19%)	24 (16%)	11 (7%)

Q6.5 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	42 (27%)
No	115 (73%)

Q6.6 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?

Not taking medication	115 (73%)
Yes	21 (13%)
No	21 (13%)

Q6.7 Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?

Yes	42 (27%)
No	114 (73%)

Q6.8 Are your emotional well-being/mental health issues being addressed by any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Do not have any issues/not receiving any help	123 (80%)
<i>Doctor</i>	14 (9%)
<i>Nurse</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Psychiatrist</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Mental health in-reach team</i>	27 (18%)
<i>Counsellor</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Other</i>	3 (2%)

Q6.9	Did you have a problem with either of the following when you came into this prison?			
			Yes	No
	Drugs	63 (42%)		86 (58%)
	Alcohol	53 (37%)		90 (63%)
Q6.10	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?			
	Yes			9 (6%)
	No			145 (94%)
Q6.11	Do you know who to contact in this prison to get help with your drug or alcohol problem?			
	Yes			63 (42%)
	No			14 (9%)
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem</i>			74 (49%)
Q6.12	Have you received any intervention or help (including, CARATs, health services etc.) for your drug/alcohol problem, while in this prison?			
	Yes			60 (39%)
	No			20 (13%)
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem</i>			74 (48%)
Q6.13	Was the intervention or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?			
	Yes			47 (31%)
	No			12 (8%)
	<i>Did not have a problem/Have not received help</i>			94 (61%)
Q6.14	Do you think you will have a problem with either of the following when you leave this prison?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	Drugs	18 (12%)	102 (68%)	31 (21%)
	Alcohol	22 (15%)	101 (68%)	26 (17%)
Q6.15	Do you know who in this prison can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?			
	Yes			23 (16%)
	No			27 (18%)
	N/A.....			96 (66%)

Section 7: Purposeful activity

Q7.1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Prison job		61 (40%)
	Vocational or skills training.....		22 (14%)
	Education (including basic skills).....		54 (35%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....		6 (4%)
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>		39 (25%)

Q7.2 If you have been involved in any of the following, whilst in this prison, do you think it will help you on release?

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	29 (23%)	58 (47%)	26 (21%)	11 (9%)
Vocational or skills training	26 (24%)	56 (51%)	19 (17%)	9 (8%)
Education (including basic skills)	18 (15%)	74 (63%)	18 (15%)	7 (6%)
Offending behaviour programmes	30 (33%)	30 (33%)	19 (21%)	13 (14%)

Q7.3 How often do you go to the library?

Don't want to go	18 (12%)
<i>Never</i>	29 (19%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	23 (15%)
<i>About once a week</i>	74 (48%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)

Q7.4 On average how many times do you go to the gym each week?

Don't want to go	0	1	2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
11 (7%)	8 (5%)	55 (36%)	46 (30%)	23 (15%)	4 (3%)	5 (3%)

Q7.5 On average how many times do you go outside for exercise each week?

Don't want to go	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
4 (3%)	7 (5%)	48 (32%)	25 (17%)	61 (41%)	5 (3%)

Q7.6 On average how many hours do you spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	35 (23%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	27 (17%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	35 (23%)
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	26 (17%)
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	10 (6%)
<i>10 hours or more</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Don't know</i>	16 (10%)

Q7.7 On average, how many times do you have association each week?

Don't want to go	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
1 (1%)	0 (0%)	8 (5%)	88 (58%)	47 (31%)	9 (6%)

Q7.8 How often do staff normally speak to you during association time?

Do not go on association	0 (0%)
<i>Never</i>	29 (19%)
<i>Rarely</i>	32 (21%)
<i>Some of the time</i>	63 (41%)
<i>Most of the time</i>	19 (12%)
<i>All of the time</i>	12 (8%)

Section 8: Resettlement

Q8.1	When did you first meet your personal officer?					
	<i>Still have not met him/her</i>					52 (34%)
	<i>In the first week</i>					41 (26%)
	<i>More than a week</i>					39 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>					23 (15%)
Q8.2	How helpful do you think your personal officer is?					
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ still have not met him/her</i>	<i>Very helpful</i>	<i>Helpful</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Not very helpful</i>	<i>Not at all helpful</i>
	52 (34%)	19 (12%)	37 (24%)	19 (12%)	17 (11%)	10 (6%)
Q8.3	Do you have a sentence plan/OASys?					
	<i>Not sentenced</i>					0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>					111 (72%)
	<i>No</i>					43 (28%)
Q8.4	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?					
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>					43 (28%)
	<i>Very involved</i>					19 (12%)
	<i>Involved</i>					45 (29%)
	<i>Neither</i>					10 (7%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>					19 (12%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>					17 (11%)
Q8.5	Can you achieve all or some of your sentence plan targets in this prison?					
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>					43 (29%)
	<i>Yes</i>					78 (52%)
	<i>No</i>					28 (19%)
Q8.6	Are there plans for you to achieve all/some of your sentence plan targets in another prison?					
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>					43 (29%)
	<i>Yes</i>					44 (30%)
	<i>No</i>					59 (40%)
Q8.7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to address your offending behaviour while at this prison?					
	<i>Not sentenced</i>					0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>					52 (35%)
	<i>No</i>					98 (65%)
Q8.8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?					
	<i>Yes</i>					21 (14%)
	<i>No</i>					130 (86%)
Q8.9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?					
	<i>Yes</i>					71 (46%)

No..... 72 (47%)
 Don't know..... 11 (7%)

Q8.10 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?

Yes 36 (24%)
 No..... 112 (73%)
 Don't know..... 5 (3%)

Q8.11 Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?

Not been here a week yet 17 (11%)
 Yes 34 (22%)
 No..... 97 (63%)
 Don't remember..... 6 (4%)

Q8.12 How many visits did you receive in the last week?

<i>Not been in a week</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1 to 2</i>	<i>3 to 4</i>	<i>5 or more</i>
17 (11%)	90 (60%)	41 (27%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)

Q8.13 How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?

Not had any visits 40 (26%)
 Very well..... 11 (7%)
 Well 50 (32%)
 Neither 24 (16%)
 Badly 6 (4%)
 Very badly 5 (3%)
 Don't know..... 18 (12%)

Q8.14 Have you been helped to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?

Yes 68 (44%)
 No..... 85 (56%)

Q8.15 Do you know who to contact to get help with the following within this prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Don't know who to contact . 75 (54%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i> 32 (23%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships</i> 23 (17%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i> .. 43 (31%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> 14 (10%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i> 28 (20%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i> 39 (28%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i> 23 (17%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release</i> 46 (33%)	<i>Opening a bank account</i> 29 (21%)

Q8.16 Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>No problems</i>	53 (37%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i>	39 (27%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships</i>	23 (16%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i> ..	35 (24%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	25 (17%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i>	31 (21%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	74 (51%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i>	21 (14%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release</i>	35 (24%)	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	27 (19%)

Q8.17 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Yes</i>	56 (38%)
<i>No</i>	91 (62%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMYOI Deerbolt 2011

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

		HMYOI Deerbolt	YOI comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt	HMYOI Deerbolt 2006
	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		165	1583	165	93
SECTION 1: General information					
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	91%	87%	91%	90%
3a	Are you sentenced?	100%	83%	100%	100%
3b	Are you on recall?	9%	7%	9%	0%
4a	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	10%	15%	10%	16%
4b	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	8%	3%	0%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	53%	37%	53%	51%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	8%	14%	8%	12%
7	Are you a foreign national?	9%	12%	9%	8%
8	Is English your first language?	98%	90%	98%	99%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	10%	35%	10%	9%
10	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	5%	8%	
11	Are you Muslim?	8%	16%	8%	
12	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	2%	3%	
13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	14%	11%	14%	
14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	43%	33%	41%
15	Have you been in more than five prisons this time?	7%	4%	7%	
16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	32%	23%	32%	35%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
For the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons:					
1a	Was the cleanliness of the van good/very good?	30%	41%	30%	40%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	64%	61%	64%	61%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	13%	11%	13%	17%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	33%	34%	33%	48%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	14%	13%	14%	18%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	6%	7%	6%	1%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	60%	63%	60%	73%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	86%	82%	86%	85%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	21%	24%	21%	20%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	94%	85%	94%	93%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMVOI Deerbolt	YOI comparator	HMVOI Deerbolt	HMVOI Deerbolt 2006
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					
1	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:				
1b	Problems with loss of property?	10%	15%	10%	
1c	Housing problems?	23%	31%	23%	
1d	Problems contacting employers?	11%	12%	11%	
1e	Problems contacting family?	55%	59%	55%	
1f	Problems ensuring dependants were looked after?	8%	12%	8%	
1g	Money problems?	13%	17%	13%	
1h	Problems of feeling depressed/suicidal?	49%	49%	49%	
1i	Health problems?	61%	60%	61%	
1j	Problems in needing protection from other prisoners?	11%	19%	11%	
1k	Problems accessing phone numbers?	39%	45%	39%	
2	When you first arrived:				
2a	Did you have any problems?	50%	60%	50%	43%
2b	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	16%	12%	3%
2c	Did you have any housing problems?	15%	20%	15%	15%
2d	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	6%	4%	5%
2e	Did you have any problems contacting family?	24%	22%	24%	16%
2f	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	4%	2%	3%
2g	Did you have any money worries?	13%	20%	13%	15%
2h	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	10%	14%	10%	9%
2i	Did you have any health problems?	15%	12%	15%	6%
2j	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	9%	8%	3%
2k	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	19%	18%	19%	
3a	Were you seen by a member of health services in reception?	70%	91%	70%	92%
3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	78%	80%	80%
4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	60%	63%	79%
5	On your day of arrival, were you offered information about any of the following:				
5a	What was going to happen to you?	53%	54%	53%	71%
5b	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	61%	54%	61%	63%
5c	How to make routine requests?	46%	46%	46%	60%
5d	Your entitlement to visits?	59%	57%	59%	75%
5e	Health services?	62%	63%	62%	
5f	The chaplaincy?	62%	57%	62%	
6	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:				
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	95%	91%	95%	90%
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	49%	40%	49%	73%
6c	The opportunity to make a free telephone call?	75%	69%	75%	59%
6d	Something to eat?	69%	81%	69%	87%
7	Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:				
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	43%	45%	43%	29%
7b	Someone from health services?	71%	78%	71%	66%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMYOI Deerbolt	YOI comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt	HMYOI Deerbolt 2006
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					
7c	A Listener/Samaritans?	12%	16%	12%	26%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	7%	11%	7%	18%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84%	77%	84%	93%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	87%	91%	98%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	58%	60%	58%	74%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
1	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	39%	43%	
1b	Attend legal visits?	47%	52%	47%	
1c	Obtain bail information?	26%	20%	26%	
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	36%	38%	36%	38%
3	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	48%	55%	48%	63%
3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	37%	68%	37%	33%
3c	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	72%	82%	72%	93%
3d	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	66%	56%	66%	86%
3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	63%	41%	63%	72%
3f	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	59%	57%	59%	65%
3g	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	24%	37%	24%	47%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	39%	22%	39%	33%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	42%	47%	52%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	88%	82%	88%	87%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	89%	87%	89%	92%
7	Have you made an application?	86%	84%	86%	69%
For those who have made an application:					
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	66%	61%	66%	82%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	56%	46%	56%	74%
9	Have you made a complaint?	34%	44%	34%	37%
For those who have made a complaint:					
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	23%	35%	23%	50%
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	27%	41%	27%	59%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	14%	25%	14%	15%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	22%	28%	22%	45%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	21%	24%	21%	22%
13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	22%	37%	22%	22%
14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	48%	50%	48%	56%
15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	52%	57%	52%	
16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	20%	14%	20%	7%
16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	24%	17%	24%	6%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	53%	43%	33%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	49%	58%	49%	36%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerbolt	YOI comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt	HMYOI Deerbolt 2006
	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				
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	46%	41%	46%	54%
15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	78%	73%	78%	84%
15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	70%	67%	70%	89%
SECTION 5: Safety					
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	26%	37%	26%	15%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	11%	14%	11%	
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	15%	22%	15%	15%
5	Since you have been here, has another prisoner:				
5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	13%	8%	7%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	9%	6%	7%
5c	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	1%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	1%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	6%	2%	3%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	7%	5%	3%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	2%	1%	2%	
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	
5k	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	
5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	6%	6%	5%
5m	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	4%	1%	
5n	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	6%	3%	
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	12%	24%	12%	12%
7	Since you have been here, has a member of staff:				
7a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	12%	7%	5%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%	5%	2%
7c	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	0%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	5%	1%	1%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	2%	3%	0%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	7%	3%	2%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	2%	1%	2%	
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	
7j	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	
7k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	5%	5%	2%
7l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	4%	1%	
7m	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	4%	1%	
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:					
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	15%	34%	15%	44%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	17%	27%	17%	16%
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	11%	19%	11%	8%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerbolt	YOI comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt	HMYOI Deerbolt 2006
	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				
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	19%	27%	25%
SECTION 6: Health services					
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	47%	42%	47%	
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	71%	60%	71%	
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	17%	16%	17%	
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	18%	17%	18%	
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	42%	49%	42%	
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:					
3a	The doctor?	63%	60%	63%	73%
3b	The nurse?	70%	64%	70%	82%
3c	The dentist?	32%	45%	32%	50%
3d	The optician?	43%	46%	43%	75%
4	The overall quality of health services?	56%	53%	56%	71%
5	Are you currently taking medication?	27%	22%	27%	
For those currently taking medication:					
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	50%	69%	50%	
7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	27%	22%	27%	
For those with emotional well-being/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:					
8a	Not receiving any help?	22%	42%	22%	
8b	A doctor?	35%	24%	35%	
8c	A nurse?	20%	21%	20%	
8d	A psychiatrist?	22%	23%	22%	
8e	The mental health in-reach team?	68%	33%	68%	
8f	A counsellor?	7%	12%	7%	
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	42%	30%	42%	10%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	37%	26%	37%	8%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	6%	5%	6%	
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	82%	82%	82%	
12	Have you received any help or intervention while in this prison?	75%	79%	75%	
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:					
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	80%	82%	80%	
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	32%	24%	32%	30%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	32%	23%	32%	31%
For those who may have a drug or alcohol problem on release, do you know who in this prison:					
15	Can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?	46%	53%	46%	67%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Deerholt	YOI comparator	HMYOI Deerholt	HMYOI Deerholt 2006
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 7: Purposeful activity				
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:			
1a	40%	44%	40%	
1b	14%	19%	14%	
1c	35%	37%	35%	
1d	4%	12%	4%	
2ai	77%	76%	77%	
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?			
	61%	49%	61%	
2bi	76%	66%	76%	
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?			
	67%	65%	67%	
2ci	85%	79%	85%	
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?			
	75%	67%	75%	
2di	67%	63%	67%	
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?			
	48%	57%	48%	
3	52%	30%	52%	48%
4	48%	51%	48%	45%
5	57%	39%	57%	8%
6	4%	8%	4%	6%
7	31%	51%	31%	18%
8	20%	25%	20%	25%
SECTION 8: Resettlement				
1	66%	76%	66%	75%
For those with a personal officer:				
2	55%	61%	55%	66%
For those who are sentenced:				
3	72%	61%	72%	57%
For those with a sentence plan:				
4	58%	63%	58%	71%
5	74%	81%	74%	
6	43%	47%	43%	
For those who are sentenced:				
7	35%	39%	35%	
8	14%	21%	14%	
9	46%	47%	46%	27%
10	24%	35%	24%	13%
11	22%	31%	22%	40%
12	29%	41%	29%	
For those who have had visits:				
13	54%	53%	54%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Deerbolt	YOI comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt	HMYOI Deerbolt 2006
	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				
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	44%	43%	44%	
15	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with the following:				
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	17%	17%	17%	
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	10%	13%	10%	
15d	Finding a job on release?	28%	33%	28%	68%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	33%	34%	33%	63%
15f	With money/finances on release?	23%	22%	23%	59%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	31%	28%	31%	65%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	20%	26%	20%	54%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	17%	17%	17%	53%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	21%	19%	21%	
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison:				
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	16%	14%	16%	
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	17%	16%	17%	
16d	Finding a job?	51%	47%	51%	
16e	Finding accommodation?	24%	29%	24%	
16f	Money/finances?	27%	26%	27%	
16g	Claiming benefits?	24%	24%	24%	
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	21%	26%	21%	
16i	Accessing health services?	15%	11%	15%	
16j	Opening a bank account?	19%	17%	19%	
For those who are sentenced:					
17	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	38%	59%	38%	60%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and nationality) HMP Deerbolt 2011

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
	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		16	148
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	13%	9%
1.8	Is English your first language?	87%	99%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?		
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	8%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	62%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	15%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	44%	62%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good on your journey here?	50%	31%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	69%	59%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	62%	90%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	26%	58%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	33%	50%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	60%	61%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	50%	49%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	62%	72%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	80%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	44%	66%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	86%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	91%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	44%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	69%	45%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	31%	38%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	56%	64%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	41%	40%
4.5	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	38%	48%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	92%	88%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	81%	91%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	48%	33%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	31%	21%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	38%	48%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	82%	49%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	18%	20%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	18%	24%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	56%	42%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	82%	45%
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	44%	46%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	87%	77%
4.19b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	76%	69%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	7%	27%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	7%	11%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	7%	15%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	4%
5.5i	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	18%	12%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	7%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.7h	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	1%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	2%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	0%	19%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	7%	12%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	13%	29%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	38%	48%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	76%	71%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	48%	42%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	0%	30%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	13%	28%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	50%	39%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	18%	14%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	56%	33%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	4%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	56%	52%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	50%	48%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	59%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	0%	4%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	24%	32%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	31%	19%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	82%	65%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	50%	45%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38%	21%

Diversity analysis - disability



Key questions (disability analysis) HMYOI Deerbolt 2011

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	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		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		23	142
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	10%	9%
1.8	Is English your first language?	95%	98%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	0%	11%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	26%	5%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	0%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	34%	33%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	24%	35%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	61%	59%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	73%	88%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	53%	55%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	48%	49%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	53%	62%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	74%	46%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	64%	71%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	82%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	62%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	68%	72%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	87%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	92%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	23%	47%

Diversity analysis - disability

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		
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	34%	50%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	45%	36%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	77%	61%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25%	42%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	46%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	83%	89%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	87%	90%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	52%	31%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	9%	24%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	48%	47%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	39%	54%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	36%	17%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	34%	22%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	31%	45%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	50%	49%
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	41%	46%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	82%	77%
4.19b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	83%	68%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	52%	21%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	23%	9%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	39%	10%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	13%	2%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	13%	1%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	17%	11%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	1%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	0%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	2%

Diversity analysis - disability

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		
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	48%	12%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	17%	10%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31%	26%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	52%	46%
6.1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	66%	72%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	26%	45%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	48%	23%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	61%	21%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	27%	42%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	5%	16%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	50%	33%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	13%	2%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	61%	50%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	34%	50%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	52%	58%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	5%	4%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	26%	32%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	13%	21%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	69%	66%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	48%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	13%	25%