

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Exeter

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

29 July – 9 August 2013

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the Glossary of terms on our website at:
http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf

Crown copyright 2013

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

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

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

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

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	45
Section 4. Resettlement	51
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	59
Section 6. Appendices	67
Appendix I: Inspection team	67
Appendix II: Prison population profile	69
Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	73
Appendix IV: Photographs	89

Introduction

In many respects Exeter is a typical Victorian, inner city local prison. It serves a wide catchment area across the south west and holds a largely transient population of just over 500 prisoners, many received recently into custody. With much of the prison old and difficult to maintain, there is limited space and significant overcrowding both in terms of the availability of accommodation and access to amenities and services. Yet despite these challenges and the inherent risks with this type of prison, this is a broadly good report. We were struck by the positive culture we observed at Exeter and the commitment to meeting prisoners' needs, despite the challenges. Across most of our tests of a healthy prison the outcomes were reasonably good.

Exeter is a safe prison. Arrangements to receive and induct newly arrived prisoners were good, although first night supervision needed to be tightened up. Violence reduction procedures were understood by staff and prisoners, but despite a fairly high level of recorded incidents, most were minor and in our survey most prisoners, including vulnerable prisoners, reported that they felt safe. The levels of use of force were similar to comparable prisons. Staff afforded good care for prisoners at risk of self-harm and those prisoners we spoke to felt supported. Formal procedures underpinning this work, however, needed improvement, particularly bearing in mind that there had tragically been three self-inflicted deaths at the prison since our last full inspection in 2009.

The safeguarding of vulnerable adults was high on the agenda and the services offered to a small group of particularly vulnerable adults were impressive. The provision would, however, be further enhanced by more effective integration with community adult safeguarding structures. The segregation unit was basic but not used excessively and most prisoners were usually reintegrated. Interventions for those who misused substances were very good, although testing results suggested that the use of illicit drugs was higher than we would expect to see.

The quality of accommodation was mixed. Some had been refurbished but much was old and the majority of cells were now shared by two prisoners. Access to basic facilities was often poor with, for example, poor showers, inadequate kit and weak application arrangements. Communal areas were better and some of the limitations of the environment were mitigated, to an extent, by excellent relationships between staff and prisoners. The promotion of equality was reasonably good with some useful assistance for a small number of foreign national prisoners and the needs of older or disabled prisoners generally well met. There were comparatively few prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, and although they described to us some sense of isolation in the prison, the evidence suggested their needs were also being met. A gap in provision was the failure to address the specific needs and potential risks affecting young adult prisoners.

Arrangements to deal with prisoner complaints were good but we were surprised that, in the context of a local prison, there was no legal advice service and bail information and support was too limited. Overall, health services, including mental health services, were very good.

Outcomes in Exeter were weakest in relation to access to purposeful activity. Time out of cell was very limited. During the inspection we found nearly half of all prisoners locked up during the working day and many unemployed prisoners had not much more than an hour out of cell each day. The situation for a few more trusted prisoners was better but in general opportunities to associate were poor. The prison had too few work, training and education places to meet need, although for those who did get an education or training place, what was on offer was commendable. The management of learning and skills was good, teaching was good, and available provision was properly tailored to the needs and profile of the population. Those learners who completed their course usually achieved an accreditation or were able to complete their study as they progressed to other prisons.

The prison was correctly prioritising the resettlement needs of the largely short-term population, although there was no formal analysis of need and there was a considerable backlog of individual

prisoner assessments of risk which, in turn, delayed sentence planning and prisoners' ability to progress. The quality of offender supervision was sometimes too reactive but was better for higher-risk cases and there were some useful services in support of the various resettlement pathways. Surprisingly however, these services were poorly promoted among prisoners and could have been better coordinated toward the end of sentence.

Overall, and despite some weaknesses and gaps, Exeter is one of the better older local prisons we have seen recently. There are clear structural challenges for the prison, not least the poor environment and the lack of space, but the prison is well led, and is not overwhelmed by these challenges. There is meaningful work to tackle risks and a sense that progress is being made. This is all underpinned by a positive staff culture. Exeter is a competent and caring prison doing its best in difficult circumstances.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

October 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Exeter is a male category B local prison holding prisoners, including young adults, from the courts of Cornwall, Devon and Somerset.

Prison status (public or private, with name of contractor if private)

Public

Region/Department

South-west

Number held

511

Certified normal accommodation

326

Operational capacity

561

Date of last full inspection

October 2009 (short follow-up inspection July 2011)

Brief history

Built in 1853, HMP Exeter is a Victorian prison of radial design, with three wings positioned around the centre. In the late 20th century, D wing was added and, more recently, education blocks were built. In the last few years, a refurbished reception, new visits hall and a social care unit (F wing) have been introduced.

Short description of residential units

A wing – holds 194 remand or sentenced and convicted adults and young offenders.

B wing – is the vulnerable prisoner wing, which holds 87 remand or sentenced and convicted adults and young offenders.

C wing – holds 189 remand or sentenced and convicted adults and young offenders. C4 landing houses prisoners requiring integrated drug treatment (IDT).

D wing – is the enhanced living unit which holds 80 remand or sentenced and convicted adults and young offenders.

F wing – is a social care unit holding 11 prisoners, which also contains the 'Jubilee Suite', a palliative care room for terminally ill prisoners.

Name of governor/director

Jeannine Hendrick

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Dorset Healthcare University NHS Foundation Trust

Learning and skills providers

Weston College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Derek Dawes

About this inspection and report

- A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.
- A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.
- A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:
- Safety** prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
 - Respect** prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
 - Purposeful activity** prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
 - Resettlement** prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.
- A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.
- **outcomes for prisoners are good.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
 - **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
 - **outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good.**
There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
 - **outcomes for prisoners are poor.**
There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

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

This report

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

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

Summary

Safety

*S1 Reception and early days' processes were generally sound, with some good attention to safety and vulnerability issues. There was a relatively high number of low-level violent incidents but most prisoners felt safe. Prisoners at risk of self-harm felt well supported but we were not assured that case management was effective. Dynamic security was good. Drug availability was relatively high and there was no useful supply reduction plan. Adjudications were well managed. The level of use of force was similar to that at other prisons and was reasonably well managed. Segregation was not overused. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

- S2 Escort vans were clean and well equipped. Good use was made of video-link processes to reduce the number of court appearances for prisoners. Some prisoners waited for too long in court holding cells before their return to the prison and too many prisoners arrived late at the prison.
- S3 Prisoners were positive about their reception experience. The reception area was clean, well organised and provided a welcoming environment. Effective use of peer supporters ensured that prisoners were quickly put at ease. Initial safety screening was comprehensive and staff were focused on safety and vulnerability issues.
- S4 Most prisoners felt safe on their first night at the establishment. The dedicated first night landing was too small to hold all new arrivals. It was clean and offered a quiet location but no additional support was offered. Night staff were not sufficiently aware of the potential needs of newly arrived prisoners, and there were no enhanced observations and little support for them. Induction arrangements were timely, provided to all prisoners who required it and provided sufficient information.
- S5 Despite the lack of a comprehensive policy specific to the establishment, staff and prisoners understood violence reduction procedures. Most prisoners, including vulnerable prisoners, felt safe. The number of incidents of violence was higher than at comparator prisons but they were mostly low level. Violent incidents were investigated thoroughly, and processes to identify perpetrators and victims of violence and antisocial behaviour were good, but support for victims was inadequate.
- S6 Staff were properly focused on risk factors for suicide and self-harm. They were knowledgeable about and showed care for prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for those at risk of suicide or self-harm. Prisoners we spoke to reported feeling cared for. However, this was not reflected in some of the care we observed, and ACCT case management procedures had many shortfalls, including poor care planning and lack of multidisciplinary reviews, which had been highlighted following previous deaths in custody.
- S7 The safeguarding policy was clear and concise but structures, including links with the local adult safeguarding board, were underdeveloped. Social care work with prisoners on F wing was developing well and they experienced good levels of care and support.
- S8 The general security conditions across the prison were appropriate and dynamic security based on staff-prisoner relationships was strong. Our survey results suggested that drug

availability was similar to that at other local prisons but the positive mandatory drug testing rates were relatively high. There was very good intelligence gathering and analysis, resulting in a relatively high suspicion testing positive rate. Some work was being undertaken to reduce drug supply but there was no effective supply reduction policy and no action plan to coordinate supply reduction activities.

- S9 More prisoners than at comparator prisons said that the incentives and earned privileges scheme encouraged a change in behaviour, and the location-based privileges on D wing were an excellent incentive to attaining enhanced status. Prisoners on the basic level of the scheme had a very poor regime.
- S10 Adjudication processes were appropriately managed, and monitoring and quality assurance were effective. The level of use of force was similar to that at comparator prisons and there was good analysis of data to identify patterns and trends. The quality of paperwork that accounted for use of force was good. Special accommodation was used appropriately and infrequently.
- S11 The use of segregation was not high and monitoring arrangements were good. The segregation unit was generally clean but the regime was limited and provided no activities. Staff on the unit knew prisoners well. Despite the lack of a formal reintegration policy, most long-stay prisoners were eventually located back onto normal location.
- S12 Prisoners with substance misuse issues received excellent clinical care and there was an appropriate mix of psychosocial group work and one-to-one interventions. This good support was partly compromised for those on opiate substitution by poor engagement with prisoners at the medication hatch by health services staff, and a lack of joint care planning for prisoners with a dual diagnosis (the co-existence of mental health and substance misuse problems).

Respect

S13 *External areas and most wings were clean. The standards of cells varied, most were overcrowded, and some were in a very poor state. Access to suitable bedding, clean clothes, showers and telephones was problematic for some. Staff were knowledgeable about the prisoners in their care, and relationships were friendly and informal. Diversity provision was effective, with a range of support for most minority groups. Care for prisoners on F wing with complex needs and disabilities was impressive. The needs of young adults had not been addressed. Faith provision was good. Few complaints were submitted but analysis was thorough. Legal services advice was not available. Health services were good. The food provided was reasonable. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

- S14 Communal areas were generally clean and well maintained. Most cells were shared and overcrowded. Standards of cells varied considerably, from very good on F wing to some very poor ones on the older wings, with large amounts of graffiti and missing or broken windows.
- S15 Prisoners reported very negatively about the provision of residential services. Access to clean clothes and bedding was inadequate on some wings. Most showers afforded insufficient privacy and many were in a poor state. There were too few telephones for the population and access was further hindered by too little time out of cell. Prisoner consultation arrangements were reasonable and regular.

- S16 More prisoners than at similar prisons said that staff treated them with courtesy. We saw mostly positive interactions and staff often showed a high level of knowledge, engagement and care. Electronic case note entries were generally good, with regular qualitative entries made and a good level of management oversight.
- S17 The diversity and equality action plan, overseen by the equality action team, lacked detail about meeting the needs of prisoners with protected characteristics. Prisoner equality representatives for each wing had been appointed but they mostly did not live on the wings they represented, had not been formally trained and were not clear about their role. There was no systematic monitoring of outcomes for protected characteristics other than race but there were communication forums for most. The number of discrimination incident report forms submitted was low and they were not readily available on all wings. The quality of investigations and responses was generally good.
- S18 There were few black and minority ethnic prisoners at the prison; they told us that they felt isolated but not subject to discrimination. No provision had been made for the Gypsy/Romany/Traveller population.
- S19 There were some reasonable services for foreign national prisoners, including monthly attendance by Home Office immigration staff. There was insufficient translated information.
- S20 The needs of prisoners with a disability were generally well met. Such prisoners were identified on arrival and care plans, paid prisoner carers and evacuation plans were in place for those who required them. Reasonable adjustments had been made on the main wings, and facilities on F wing for the neediest prisoners were excellent. There was some dedicated provision for older prisoners, including weekly information and activity sessions from a voluntary organisation. However, retired prisoners were not routinely left unlocked during the day.
- S21 There was no analysis of the particular needs of young adults or special provision for them. No risk assessment to identify issues of vulnerability was undertaken.
- S22 A forum for gay prisoners was available but was poorly attended, and there was no link with external support services for them.
- S23 The chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison. There were plans to replace the poor multi-faith facilities by remodelling the main chapel. A community chaplaincy scheme provided a valuable mentoring service, putting released prisoners in contact with faith communities and providing some resettlement support.
- S24 The full range of prisoner complaint forms was not readily available on all wings. The number of complaints submitted by prisoners was relatively low. Responses to complaints were mostly reasonable and there was effective quality control and analysis.
- S25 Despite the large proportion of remand prisoners there was no legal advice service and little bail information or support.
- S26 More prisoners than at similar prisons rated the overall quality of health services as good. The primary care centre provided a suitable area for care and treatment. Access to the GP, nursing staff and the dentist was good. Chronic disease management was effective and there was an excellent range of specialist clinics, with short waiting times. Pharmacy services were satisfactory but few patients were allowed medication in possession and there was limited access to the pharmacist. Dental services provided a good level of care.

- S27 An integrated mental health team provided a good level of primary and secondary care, with good access to the psychiatrist.
- S28 The food provided was reasonably good. Menus were varied and offered healthy, balanced choices, and portion sizes were good. Consultation arrangements were responsive.

Purposeful activity

S29 *Time out of cell was poor for many prisoners. Too little association was offered and too many prisoners were locked up during the day. There were insufficient activity places for the population and not all of these were fully utilised. For those who attended learning and skills and work activities, the quality and range were good. The curriculum was tailored to meet the needs of the short-stay population and well linked into receiving prisons. Most work and training offered accredited qualifications, learners were motivated and engaged, and achievement levels were high. Library services were adequate. Recreational PE was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

- S30 For the many prisoners not engaged in activity, time out of cell was poor, at an average of two hours per day. We found, on average, 40% of prisoners locked up during the core day. Most prisoners had too little association (on average only two sessions a week) and short exercise periods.
- S31 Learning and skills was well managed and senior staff had a well-developed plan for the further improvement of provision. There were insufficient purposeful activity places for the population and not all available places were filled. Around 30% of prisoners were on remand and could choose not to work but we found only 50% of prisoners engaged in activity at any one time. A well-planned curriculum provided good programmes targeted to the needs of short-term prisoners, and courses could often be continued in receiving prisons. The process for self-assessment was thorough but the impact of improvements already made was not sufficiently evaluated.
- S32 Attendance in vocational training was high overall, and exceptionally high on education courses, and punctuality for workshops and education was mostly good. Teaching, learning and assessments were good. Staff in all areas were highly experienced and knowledgeable, and learners were stimulated and fully engaged. Good use was made of well-qualified peer mentors.
- S33 Achievement rates were high on most courses. Good skills were demonstrated by learners and most work and training was supported by accredited qualifications.
- S34 The two libraries were small but well managed, with a wide range of materials available. Library opening hours were reasonable and usage was relatively high.
- S35 PE provision was well managed, with good access for most prisoners. There was a wide range of recreational PE and well-being sessions for all groups, and specialist sessions were run for the over-50s. A variety of recently introduced training equipment in exercise yards provided an additional training resource for prisoners.

Resettlement

- S36 *The resettlement strategy was not informed by a needs analysis. Sentence management provision largely met the needs of the short-stay population, although a backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments hindered some prisoners' progress. Offender supervisors were appropriately focused on risk and transfer. Home detention curfew and public protection arrangements were sound. Transfers were managed proactively. Initial assessment of resettlement needs was good. Most resettlement pathway provision was effective. Children and family services were particularly good and prisoners with substance misuse issues received excellent through-the-gate support, but provision for debt and benefits advice was not good enough. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S37 The reducing reoffending strategy was limited and not informed by a comprehensive needs analysis. Management oversight was adequate and the links between public protection and offender management were good, but coordination with resettlement services were not as well developed.
- S38 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor and their contact with prisoners was appropriately prioritised on risk and focused on transfer. Too many prisoners, however, did not have an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, which hindered their progression. For those with an assessment, the quality was mostly good but it did not always include all evidence about behaviour in custody.
- S39 Home detention curfew decisions were defensible and over half were granted, but too few received a probation report on time.
- S40 Procedures for identifying and monitoring prisoners who presented a risk to the public were effective and proportionate. The risk management team provided good oversight of complex cases, and involvement in multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) was appropriate.
- S41 Categorisation decisions were up to date and efforts were made to transfer prisoners, including sex offenders and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs), at the earliest opportunity. There were effective links with other prisons in the region to enable progressive transfers.
- S42 Remanded prisoners potentially facing an indeterminate sentence were given advice and had access to lifer trained staff. ISPs we spoke to were positive about the level of help and support available.
- S43 Resettlement provision was mainly good. An initial resettlement needs assessment on induction led to appropriate referrals and action. Resettlement services were not well advertised and not always easily accessible, and few prisoners knew whom to go to for help during their sentence. The discharge board was held too close to release to be effective.
- S44 Dedicated and trained housing officers proved a range of accommodation advice and support to a large number of prisoners. Although a large proportion of prisoners who would have been homeless on release had been helped to secure supported housing or temporary accommodation, the percentage being released without a fixed address was still relatively high.
- S45 Prisoners were given good initial advice and guidance on employment and education, and a wide range of courses was available to help prisoners to prepare for release. Links with

employers and a range of external agencies were developing and many prisoners gained employment on release as a result.

- S46 Health care discharge arrangements were good, with planning starting two weeks before release. Palliative care was supported through an excellent new suite which had been created for the care of terminally ill prisoners.
- S47 Resettlement support for prisoners with drug and alcohol issues was very good, with full-time family and resettlement workers in place.
- S48 Finance, benefit and debt provision was limited and no proactive debt management was available. Jobcentre Plus staff were not always available and were not involved in the discharge board we observed during the inspection.
- S49 There was a welcoming visitors centre, where prisoners' families could obtain advice and support or be referred to family support services. Social visits were well run, with good children's play facilities and a refreshments bar, but the hall was hot and noisy during the sessions. Family visit and enhanced visit provision was good. A range of parenting and family work, and direct family support, was provided by a voluntary family support organisation in reception and on application by prisoners.
- S50 No accredited offending behaviour programmes were delivered at the prison. The range of non-accredited interventions provided appropriate opportunities for prisoners but was not based on a needs analysis. Demand for the Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme far exceeded supply.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S51 Concern: Prisoners we spoke to who were currently on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents were positive about the support they received. However, in practice the level of care for those at risk of self-harm was variable, and completed ACCT case management documents were often of poor quality and detailed initial assessments were undermined by weak action plans.

Recommendation: The support prisoners receive through the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) processes should be better reflected through good quality case management documentation and recording by case managers.

- S52 Concern: For many prisoners, time out of cell and association were very restricted. Most prisoners had only two periods of association per week. We found, on average, 40% of prisoners locked up during the day and many of these were locked up for 22 hours.

Recommendation: Opportunities for association should be increased and all prisoners should have access to association every day and during the evenings.

- S53 Concern: There were too few activity places for the population and even these were not fully utilised, resulting in only half the population engaged in work, education or training.

Recommendation: The number of activity places should be increased and fully utilised.

- S54 Concern: Too many prisoners (about a third of those eligible) were lacking an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and this hindered their ability to transfer and progress.

Recommendation: The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be eliminated.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1** *Some prisoners waited too long in court cells to be returned to the prison. Escort vans were clean and in good condition but did not always take transferring prisoners' property.*
- 1.2** Most prisoners had travelled from courts in Somerset, Devon and Cornwall, which meant that they arrived at the establishment late after spending a long time in vans, sometimes following long waits for transport after appearing in court.
- 1.3** Escort vehicles were clean and well equipped, and disembarkation procedures at the prison were reasonably efficient. Consideration was given to the needs of vulnerable prisoners, and staff ensured that they did not come into unsupervised contact with other prisoners.
- 1.4** The prison made good use of video-court facilities to reduce the number of court appearances for prisoners, and encouraged courts to engage in the process.
- 1.5** Prisoners received up to 48 hours' notice before transfer and were given the opportunity to contact family and friends. The conveyance of prisoners' property was occasionally problematic as escort vehicles had insufficient capacity to take property with transferring prisoners.

Recommendations

- 1.6** **Prisoners should be returned to prison quickly after court appearances.**
- 1.7** **Prisoners' property should accompany them on transfer.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.8** *Reception and first night arrangements were mostly sound. Good attention was paid to safety and vulnerability issues. Induction started promptly and equipped prisoners with an appropriate amount of information.*

- I.9** Prisoners were positive about their experiences in reception. The area was clean and well organised, and provided a welcoming environment for newly arriving prisoners. There was good use of peer support to put prisoners at their ease. Waiting rooms contained little information about the prison but there was good access to telephones, toilets and showers. An advance of £2 telephone credit was issued, subject to public protection measures, and grocery packs were available.
- I.10** Searching procedures were conducted sensitively but all prisoners, including those transferred from other establishments, were strip-searched without consideration of the individual risks posed.
- I.11** First night and induction procedures started in reception, with peer supporters providing an initial insight into the prison using an induction booklet, which they explained to new receptions on a one-to-one basis. This was followed up by a private interview with first night staff (members of the safer custody team), who explored individual vulnerabilities and issues comprehensively and sensitively. Good consideration of information was used to inform location and cell sharing arrangements, including the level of induction required, as many prisoners returned to the prison after short periods in the community. In our survey, significantly more prisoners than in similar establishments said that they had felt safe on their first night.
- I.12** The dedicated first night landing (C1) was too small to accommodate all new receptions and capacity was often further reduced by being used as an overflow to the vulnerable prisoner unit and to reintegrate prisoners from the segregation unit. Beyond the provision of a relatively clean and quiet environment, there was little support for newly arrived prisoners, and night staff we spoke to on all wings had no understanding of the increased vulnerability of new prisoners.
- I.13** Induction (when required) continued on the day after arrival with a formal video-led presentation, usually held on the C1 landing. When newly arrived prisoners were located elsewhere in the prison, they were either brought down to C1 or given an induction presentation individually. All inductees then underwent a resettlement screen and an induction to the education department and the gym. Staff had access to professional interpreting services, and there was some information in languages other than English, although neither the use nor accuracy of these documents was monitored. The induction process provided an adequate insight into the prison, enabling prisoners to understand and gain access to regime activities and routines.

Recommendation

- I.14** **Night staff should introduce themselves to, and make regular checks on, newly arrived prisoners.**

Housekeeping point

- I.15** Induction material should be available in an appropriate range of languages.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels and is safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to

victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

- I.16** *The prison was reasonably safe. Despite the lack of a comprehensive violence reduction policy specific to the establishment, staff and prisoners understood violence reduction procedures. Most prisoners, including vulnerable prisoners, told us that they felt safe. The number of fights and assaults was higher than at similar prisoners but they were generally low level. Violent and antisocial incidents, including bullying, were identified effectively, investigated thoroughly and properly acted on but support for victims was poor. The safer custody committee interrogated data well and generally took appropriate action.*
- I.17** The overarching safeguarding strategy included guidance about bullying and violence reduction but little information was specific to the establishment. There was no consultation with prisoners and findings from the local discharge survey were not used to inform the policy. However, staff and prisoners generally understood violence reduction procedures.
- I.18** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments had previously or currently felt unsafe at the prison. There were more fights and assaults on staff and prisoners than at similar prisons but incidents were generally not of a serious nature.
- I.19** Prisoners who were vulnerable because of either their offence or, less frequently, other issues, including debts or threats from other prisoners, were located on B wing. Prisoners there told us that they felt safe and were treated courteously but complained that verbal abuse from other wings often went unchallenged by staff.
- I.20** Investigations into allegations of violent or antisocial behaviour were good. When there was sufficient evidence of such behaviour, perpetrators were managed through the incentives and earned privileges scheme, with an initial two-week demotion to the basic regime, sometimes in addition to the adjudication process. When there was insufficient evidence, prisoners signed a violence reduction compact. Between January and June 2013, 40 prisoners had signed compacts and 26 had been formally monitored. The quality of the documentation for perpetrators who were being monitored formally was poor; targets were perfunctory and not specific to the behaviour improvement that was required, and ongoing monitoring was therefore not properly focused.
- I.21** Initial identification of victims of violent and antisocial behaviour was good but subsequent support was inadequate and some told us that they continued to feel unsafe and were too afraid to leave their cells.
- I.22** Prisoners contributed to the well-attended monthly safer custody committee, where violence and suicide and self-harm were monitored. The number, type and location of violent and antisocial incidents, including unexplained injuries, were reported and there were effective links with the security team. Trends and patterns were analysed, with actions being added to the safer custody action plan. Minutes of the meeting did not always capture the main concerns or required actions, but discussions with managers assured us that the prison was sighted on the main issues and was trying to address them.
- I.23** Young prisoners did not share cells with adults but there were no risk assessments specific to young adults to identify issues of vulnerability, even for those located on the vulnerable prisoner wing, where possible predatory behaviour was a concern (see recommendation 2.41).

Recommendations

- I.24 Prisoners should be consulted about bullying and violence reduction regularly and systematically, and this should be used to develop a local strategy which focuses on reducing the number of violent incidents.**
- I.25 Support for victims of violent and antisocial behaviour should be improved.**

Housekeeping points

- I.26** The verbal abuse of prisoners on B wing should be addressed.
- I.27** The minutes of the safer custody committee should better reflect the key issues and actions from the meeting.

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

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

I.28 *The initial identification of risk of self-harm and suicide was very good. Levels of self-harm and the number of opened assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were higher than in similar prisons. Staff appeared caring and prisoners told us that they felt supported but the actual experience for many prisoners was poor. ACCT case management documents had many shortfalls, despite a number of self-inflicted deaths which had highlighted some of the weaknesses. Access to Listeners was good.*

- I.29** A small staff group was responsible for safer custody and was properly focused on risk factors. The suicide and self-harm prevention strategy was reasonable and was overseen by the safer custody committee. The committee identified trends and patterns of behaviour by location and type of incident to update the safer custody action plan but not to inform the strategy.
- I.30** The number of acts of self-harm and of opened assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm was higher than in similar prisons. There had been 86 incidents of self-harm, involving 47 prisoners, between January and June 2013, many of which were low level. During the same period, 165 ACCT case management documents had been opened. Five prisoners on ACCT case management documents had been segregated on 17 occasions and we were not assured that there had been exceptional reasons to justify this.
- I.31** Staff we spoke to were properly focused on the preservation of life but some did not carry anti-ligature knives. Staff showed concern for prisoners on ACCT case management procedures and prisoners told us that they felt cared for and supported. However, this was not reflected either in the care we observed or in the quality of ACCT case management documents. Many prisoners spent long periods locked up, with no constructive activity and in poor cells. In many ACCT case management documents, we found poor planning, reviews

and records of interaction with prisoners. Quality assurance measures were ineffective at bringing about the necessary improvements (see main recommendation S51).

- I.32** There had been seven deaths in custody since the previous full inspection, three of which had been self-inflicted. Action plans from Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations had been formulated and were reviewed regularly, but some actions, particularly concerning the quality of ACCT case management documents, were not reinforced regularly enough (see main recommendation S51).
- I.33** Some prisoners on ACCT case management documents were located in cells with closed-circuit television (CCTV) coverage. The cameras were not continually monitored but the prisoners concerned believed that they were being constantly watched and there was a risk that their behaviour and actions were influenced by this.
- I.34** The two constant observation cells (one each on the segregation unit and F wing) were used infrequently. There was one prisoner on constant observation during the inspection. Although we saw some efforts made to engage him, including taking him to the gym, he was in a bare cell without a television and staff did not interact with him sufficiently during periods of observation.
- I.35** There were 12 Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) operating on a rota basis and this was adequate for the needs of the population. They felt supported, and our survey results concerning access to them were positive. The rooms designated for use by Listeners were not conducive to offering a supportive and caring environment.

Recommendations

- I.36 Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management procedures should only be segregated when there are exceptional circumstances to justify it.**
- I.37 The use of cells with closed-circuit television coverage should be carefully managed and used sparingly.**
- I.38 There should be an appropriate Listener suite for use by prisoners in crisis.**

Housekeeping point

- I.39** All staff should carry anti-ligature knives.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

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

I.40 *The safeguarding policy was appropriately focused but not yet sufficiently linked to community services. The social care unit was an impressive facility that catered well for prisoners in need of a therapeutic environment. Staff on the unit delivered personal care and practical assistance to help prisoners maintain a level of dignity.*

I.41 An overarching, comprehensive safeguarding policy for dealing with adults in need of community care services underpinned all aspects of safer custody. There was a nominal lead member of staff for safeguarding, but the policy had not yet been fully implemented.

I.42 The prison had no formal links with the local safeguarding adults board to review current practices. However, staff were aware of some vulnerabilities and screened prisoners on arrival for disability and health issues.

I.43 The social care unit, located on F wing, operated a model for the safeguarding of vulnerable adults at risk. There were clear criteria for admission, and at the time of the inspection prisoners with a range of care needs were accommodated there. The environment on the unit was pleasant, therapeutic and supportive, with individualised care plans. Prison officers cared for prisoners based there, supported by health care assistants, and offered practical assistance to help prisoners maintain a level of dignity. Most prisoners on the unit had their cell doors continuously open. Although services were not yet sufficiently linked with those in the community, the conditions and care afforded were impressive.

Recommendation

I.44 **The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes.**

Good practice

I.45 *The social care unit on F wing was an impressive facility that offered a therapeutic environment and individualised care for prisoners identified as requiring safeguarding services.*

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

I.46 *Physical security measures were proportionate and dynamic security was good. Intelligence systems were effective but undermined by the lack of a drug supply reduction policy. The availability of drugs was similar to that at comparator prisons but higher than at the time of the previous full inspection.*

I.47 Security arrangements were proportionate for a category B prison, and appropriate consideration had been given to D wing (the enhanced living unit) to provide a much more open environment. The excellent staff–prisoner relationships underpinned a high level of

dynamic security (see also section on staff–prisoner relationships), with staff having a high level of contact with prisoners and demonstrating a good level of knowledge of those in their care.

- I.48** The change to an electronic security incident reporting system had been well managed and intelligence procedures were good, with a consistently high level of engagement from most areas of the prison leading to an average of 450 information reports being submitted each month. The analysis of this information was effective and provided a wide range of data that were considered at the well-attended monthly security meeting. A dynamic weekly intelligence briefing was also conducted, to inform managers of emerging threats and initiate immediate actions. Outcomes from these meetings were effective and had yielded an impressive success rate of around 50% in targeted cell searches. Key themes included drugs, mobile telephones and threatening behaviour. A range of actions were undertaken to mitigate these threats but there was no effective strategic approach to drug supply reduction to review and coordinate actions.
- I.49** Regular support was provided by the police intelligence officer, and a further counter-extremism officer was also available. Gang-related intelligence was shared and had been used to identify and manage some problematic ‘out of area’ issues well.
- I.50** Visits restrictions were reasonable. At the time of the inspection, there were five prisoners subject to closed visits, all as a direct result of trafficking-related activity. We were assured that such restrictions were removed once the level of threat was deemed to have reduced. There were two visitors banned from visiting. There was sufficient evidence and intelligence to support these restrictions.
- I.51** In our survey, a similar number to the comparator but more than at the time of the previous full inspection (31% versus 25%) said that illegal drugs were easily available.
- I.52** The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was 13.82% for the six months to June 2013, which was higher than the local prison comparator of 11.57% and the prison’s key performance target of 13.5%. The suspicion testing positive rate was also high, at 50.6% for the same six-month period, which was largely because of good intelligence gathering and analysis. Some suspicion tests were not completed as they had slipped outside the required 72-hour window, but as this was not specifically monitored, the effect on the establishment’s overall knowledge of the extent of drug use in the prison was unknown.
- I.53** The MDT suite was clean and tidy but lacked sufficiently respectful screening around the urinal.

Recommendations

- I.54** **The risk of ingress of drugs should be appropriately evaluated in order to provide a cohesive and coordinated drug supply reduction strategy.**
- I.55** **All requested suspicion tests should be completed within the set timescales.**

Housekeeping point

- I.56** The mandatory drug testing suite urinal should be suitably screened.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.57** *The incentives and earned privileges policy was comprehensive. More prisoners than elsewhere said that the scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour. The incentives-based system on D wing was excellent but the regime for those on the basic level of the scheme was poor.*
- 1.58** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was comprehensive and well laid out, and staff had a good understanding of the process. Good management oversight ensured regular application of the scheme.
- 1.59** In our survey, 50% of respondents said that the IEP scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour, which was better than the comparator (45%) and than at the time of the previous full inspection (39%). Prisoners told us that there was a definite benefit to attaining enhanced status, with additional visits and spending capacity, and the opportunity to wear their own clothing. An important incentive was attaining a place on D wing, which allowed much more time out of cell and improved access to association, showers and telephones.
- 1.60** The 10 prisoners on the basic level had a poor regime. They had too little opportunity to demonstrate progress in their behaviour, and for some (especially those placed on the basic regime as a result of violent or threatening behaviour), targets were insufficiently focused on improving their conduct.

Recommendation

- 1.61** **Targets for all prisoners on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be individualised and should promote improvements in behaviour.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.62** Information to prisoners on the purpose and function of the IEP scheme should be improved.

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.

- 1.63** *The number of adjudications was similar to that at other local prisons. The levels of use of force and of segregation were not high, and all uses were well monitored and managed.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.64** The number of adjudications was not high and was similar to that at comparator prisons. Most were for possession of unauthorised articles, disobeying lawful orders and destroying property. Regular monitoring and quality assurance was undertaken, with the governor reviewing at least 10% of adjudications each month and providing feedback where appropriate.
- I.65** There was a small, suitably furnished adjudications room. The adjudications we observed were well conducted, with the prisoner engaged throughout. The independent adjudicator attended monthly to hear the most serious of charges, and heard around 12 cases per month.
- I.66** The adjudication paperwork we reviewed showed a good level of investigation and due consideration in the calling of witnesses and application for assistance.

The use of force

- I.67** There had been 63 recorded control and restraint incidents over the previous six months. This level of use of force was similar to that at comparator prisons, at around 12 per 100 prisoners.
- I.68** The quality of reports (including for use of special accommodation) was mostly of a good standard, although many F213 (injury to prisoner) reports were incomplete because of a misconception that they were to be treated as 'medical in confidence'.
- I.69** Management oversight was mostly good, with the safety committee conducting a wide range of analysis of uses of force. There was also a quarterly use of force meeting.
- I.70** Planned incidents were video-recorded but the quality of the recordings was poor, and we observed a lack of de-escalation and some poor techniques which had not been identified on review.
- I.71** There was little use of special accommodation, having been used only once, for a very short period, in 2013.

Housekeeping points

- I.72** Completed F213 forms should be included with each use of force dossier.
- I.73** The quality of video-recorded incidents should be improved to ensure a continuous and clear record of any planned incidents.

Segregation

- I.74** The small segregation unit was clean. There was evidence of damage to the fabric of the cells and doors which bore witness to the management of some very difficult prisoners. There were eight cells available for use, including one safer cell and one gated special cell.
- I.75** On average, only around four prisoners were segregated at any one time. The regime on the unit was limited, with no off-unit activities, apart from some prisoners being allowed to

attend religious services. Exercise was taken on the main exercise yard and prisoners had access to a range of fixed PE equipment.

- I.76** There had been some long-term occupants but, despite the lack of a formal reintegration policy, most prisoners were eventually returned to normal location. Monitoring arrangements were sound, with the segregation monitoring and review group taking place regularly.
- I.77** Staff on the unit were familiar with those in their care, and daily recording of prisoner behaviour and contact was mostly very thorough. In our survey, considerably more prisoners than in comparator prisons said that they had been treated well or very well by staff on the unit (61% versus 38%).
- I.78** All of the staff on the unit had undergone adjudication liaison training and were in date for use of force training. However, there were no records of staff undergoing mental health awareness training.

Recommendations

- I.79** The regime in the segregation unit should be improved.
- I.80** Segregation unit staff should be trained in mental health awareness.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

I.81 *Prisoners with substance misuse issues received excellent clinical care. There was an appropriate mix of psychosocial group-work and one-to-one interventions. This good support was partly compromised for those on opiate substitution by poor engagement with prisoners at the medication hatch by health services staff, and a lack of joint care planning for prisoners with a dual diagnosis.*

- I.82** At the time of the inspection, a total of 93 prisoners were receiving opiate substitution treatment. Eighty-five prisoners were on methadone, with 69 on maintenance and 11 on reducing doses. Eight prisoners were maintained on Subutex. Five prisoners were on alcohol detoxification regimes.
- I.83** The integrated clinical treatment and psychosocial services had been in place since April 2013. In the four months of delivery, progress had been good and the substance misuse service delivered mainly positive outcomes for prisoners. However, in our survey, fewer respondents than at comparator establishments (53% versus 64%) said that they had received help with a drug problem. Prisoners told us that, although they were very satisfied with the substance misuse service and the GP with a special interest in substance use, staff engagement with them at the medication hatch was poor.
- I.84** Methadone was administered daily by primary health care nurses. We observed poor levels of engagement between nurses and patients. Protocols were not consistently followed when prisoners asked to see a substance misuse service worker. Nurses told prisoners to put in an application to see their drugs worker instead of using the established 'tasking' protocol on

the SystemOne database (the electronic clinical record). Communication between health services and substance misuse service staff was better at the managerial level, with regular multidisciplinary team meetings.

- I.85** The psychosocial recovery team delivered a wide range of short-term group work modules, which was appropriate given the high turnover of the prison population. These courses addressed drug and alcohol issues ranging from harm reduction to tackling dependency.
- I.86** External Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous facilitators attended weekly, and Self-Management and Recovery Training recovery groups, facilitated by in-house recovery workers, were also available weekly. In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments (68% versus 59%) said that they had received help with an alcohol problem while at the prison.
- I.87** Dual diagnosis (the co-existence of mental health and substance misuse problems) was partially addressed through multidisciplinary team meetings between substance misuse and mental health services, but there was insufficient joint care planning and joint delivery of care.

Recommendation

- I.88** **Health care, mental health and substance misuse service managers should ensure that communication and joint working is enhanced between all their departments, which should be demonstrated through improved prisoner satisfaction and outcomes.**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *Communal areas were generally clean and well maintained. Standards of cells varied and some, particularly on C wing, were very poor. Many toilets were not properly screened. Access to some residential services, including showers, clean clothes, bedding and telephones, was inadequate for many. Application systems were poor.*
- 2.2** Despite the age of the prison, communal areas and the external grounds were generally clean and well maintained. The standard of cells varied considerably; those on F wing were very good but some cells on the older wings, C wing in particular, were in a poor state, with large amounts of graffiti (some offensive) and missing or broken windows (see Appendix IV). Around three-quarters of cells were shared and, although many were adequately furnished, the standard of some furniture was poor and, with the exception of D wing, there were no lockable cupboards. On A and C wings there was insufficient screening for the in-cell toilets. There was no in-cell sanitation on D wing but prisoners had free access to showers and toilets. The offensive display policy was mostly adhered to.
- 2.3** In our survey, prisoners reported more negatively than those at comparator establishments across a range of indicators about residential services, including access to clean clothes, bedding, showers and telephones. We found access to these facilities to be inadequate, particularly on A and C wings. Lack of association impeded access to showers and many prisoners could not shower every day. With the exception of F wing, showers across the prison were in a poor state and were insufficiently private. Prisoners on remand or on the enhanced privilege regime could wear their own clothes and laundry facilities were adequate, but for those wearing prison clothes, arrangements for kit change were poor, prison clothes and bedding were often torn or stained, and not enough was available.
- 2.4** In our survey, fewer respondents than at comparator establishments said that their cell call bell was normally answered within the expected five minutes. The prison conducted regular management checks of call bells and often identified instances where it had taken longer than five minutes for staff to answer them; managers took action with the individuals concerned when these issues were highlighted. We saw cell call bells being responded to quickly.
- 2.5** Application forms were not freely available on all wings and we were told that there was no tracking system. Prisoners told us that applications were often not responded to. We found there to be a lack of accountability around procedures.
- 2.6** On most units, there were too few telephones to meet the need of the population, and many were broken and afforded insufficient privacy. This was aggravated by the poor access caused by the short amount of time unlocked by most prisoners (see section on time out of cell and main recommendation S52).

Recommendations

- 2.7 **All cells should be clean and well maintained, with a properly screened toilet and decent furniture, including a lockable cupboard.**
- 2.8 **All prisoners should have access to sufficient clean clothes and bedding.**
- 2.9 **Prisoners should be able to shower every day and showers should be adequately maintained and screened.**
- 2.10 **Application procedures should be improved.**

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

2.11 *More prisoners than at similar prisons said staff treated them with respect. Electronic case-note entries and the level of management oversight were good. Consultation arrangements were reasonable.*

- 2.12 In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons said that staff treated them with respect. During the inspection, we saw a mostly good level of engagement across the prison. Relationships were generally informal but appropriate, and prison staff demonstrated a sound knowledge of the prisoners in their care. The relationships on B and D wings were particularly good and the levels of care and support offered on F wing were excellent (see sections on diversity and safeguarding).
- 2.13 In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that they had a personal officer or, if they did have one, that they were particularly helpful. However, most prisoners felt that there were staff that they could go to for support.
- 2.14 Electronic case-note entries were frequent, of good quality and subject to regular management oversight.
- 2.15 There was regular consultation at the monthly prisoner council meeting, in addition to a number of other prisoner forums. These meetings were minuted and subsequent actions were reported back.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic³ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability

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

(including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

2.16 *The equality policy lacked detail but there was a good action plan, overseen by the equality action team. Monitoring of equality outcomes was limited to race, although some feedback was obtained from prisoner forums. Prisoner equality representatives were in place but had not received sufficient training or a sufficiently detailed job description. The few black and minority ethnic prisoners told us that they felt isolated but there was no evidence of discrimination. There were no facilities for Gypsy/Romany/Traveller prisoners. There were reasonable services for foreign national prisoners but there was limited translated information. The care of older prisoners and those with disabilities was mostly good and the special facility for those requiring the highest levels of care was excellent. There was no policy for the management of young prisoners and there were no risk assessments of their suitability for location. A forum was offered for gay prisoners. There were no contingency arrangements for transgender prisoners.*

Strategic management

- 2.17** There was a comprehensive equality policy which outlined the responsibilities of managers, staff and prisoners in promoting and maintaining equality. However, there were no detailed operational procedures for ensuring that the needs of prisoners with specific protected characteristics would be met. The policy was overseen by the equality action team (EAT) meeting, chaired by the responsible functional head and attended by the deputy governor and prisoner representatives. All relevant prison departments were represented but there was poor attendance by relevant community groups.
- 2.18** The monitoring of outcomes for prisoners was limited to race monitoring, although information from prisoner equality representatives and forums was considered. Each incident for which ethnic monitoring was out of range was investigated and an explanation or action provided.
- 2.19** Prisoner equality representatives had been appointed for each wing. They met equality staff regularly and attended the EAT meeting. They did not live on the wings they represented and told us that they had not received enough training or a sufficiently detailed job description to help them feel confident in delivering the service required. Forums were held for prisoners with protected characteristics, covering ethnicity, older prisoners, disability, nationality and gay prisoners but not young adult prisoners.
- 2.20** The number of discrimination incident report forms submitted was low and we found that the forms were not always readily available on all wings. The quality of responses was good and we found examples of discriminatory behaviour by staff that had been fully investigated and appropriate action taken. All complaints were quality checked by the deputy governor but there was no quality assessment by an external organisation.

Recommendations

- 2.21** **The equality strategy should provide a detailed outline of how the needs of prisoners under each protected characteristic will be met and outcomes for them should be monitored by the equality action team.**
- 2.22** **Prisoner equality representatives should be fully trained and provided with a clear job description.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.23** External equality groups should attend the equality action team meeting.
- 2.24** Discrimination incident report forms should be readily available on all wings and quality checked by an external organisation.

Protected characteristics

- 2.25** Not all prisoners' protected characteristics were identified on arrival. Although there was reasonably good identification of prisoners with disabilities, we were not assured that all gay prisoners or those from a Traveller background were known to the prison.
- 2.26** There were only 40 prisoners (approximately 9% of the prison population) from a black and minority ethnic background. In our groups and speaking to prisoners individually, we found that they felt isolated but not actively discriminated against. Few complaints citing racist behaviour had been submitted, and the prison held regular forums for black and minority ethnic prisoners, where they were encouraged to discuss their treatment and experience of the prison. There were no displays around the prison of positive images of people from a black and minority ethnic background but Black History Month was celebrated annually.
- 2.27** In our survey, 20 prisoners (approximately 4% of the prison population) identified themselves as being from a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller background, but the prison had identified only one and there was no specific provision for them.
- 2.28** The prison held only 17 foreign national prisoners (3.5% of the prison population) and one prisoner was being detained beyond the end of his sentence. A representative of Home Office Immigration Enforcement visited the prison every month and there was provision of independent advice by free telephone calls to the Detention Advice Service.
- 2.29** A foreign nationals liaison officer had been appointed and met with foreign national prisoners regularly. In our survey, 99% of prisoners said that they understood written and spoken English. Although there was local information about the prison in relevant foreign languages for newly arrived prisoners, most written documentation was available only in English. Professional telephone interpreting services were available and used appropriately.
- 2.30** Prisoners with relatives abroad were given a monthly free telephone credit of £5 rather than a set amount of time, which disadvantaged those wishing to contact countries which were more expensive to call.
- 2.31** At the time of the inspection, there were 39 prisoners who had declared a disability. In our survey, these prisoners reported more negatively than their able-bodied counterparts in important areas such as treatment on arrival, safety and victimisation. However, we found their needs to be mostly met.
- 2.32** At the time of the inspection, there were 59 prisoners (11% of the prison population) over the age of 50, the oldest being 80, and there was a dedicated forum for them. A weekly activity and consultative group was held for these prisoners, hosted by the Resettlement and Care for Older Ex-Offenders and Prisoners (RECOOP) voluntary organisation. Retired prisoners were not routinely unlocked during the day and were required to pay for their television. In our survey, older prisoners were generally positive about their treatment at the prison. Care plans were in place, where required, both for older prisoners and for those with disabilities, and those we examined covered the practical aspects of the care of such prisoners and their participation in the regime.

- 2.33** Some reasonable adjustments had been made for older prisoners and those with disabilities, including stair lifts and wheelchair-accessible cells. Those with disabilities were identified on their cell cards, and there were evacuation plans for them. There was a good scheme to recruit and pay prisoners to provide support and assistance to those who needed it.
- 2.34** Those requiring the highest levels of care were located on F wing, which was the former hospital wing. It was staffed by prison officers and health care assistants (see section on safeguarding). Rooms there were spacious and there were adapted showering facilities, a comfortable association room and a pleasant outside area to which residents had unrestricted access.
- 2.35** The prison held 36 young adults but there was no policy on how to meet their specific needs.
- 2.36** In our survey, 15 prisoners (3% of the prison population) identified themselves as gay. Although there was a forum for gay prisoners, it was poorly attended and the prison had not developed links with external gay support groups. There was no policy for meeting the needs of transgender prisoners and there were no contingency arrangements for them.

Recommendations

- 2.37 All protected characteristics should be identified on arrival.**
- 2.38 The needs of Gypsy/Romany/Traveller prisoners should be identified and met.**
- 2.39 Essential written information about the prison should be available in languages understood by all prisoners.**
- 2.40 The prison should investigate the reasons for prisoners with disabilities reporting more negatively than their able-bodied counterparts, and take action accordingly.**
- 2.41 There should be a policy for meeting the needs of young adult prisoners which includes consultation with them and risk assessments to determine their location.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.42** Free foreign national telephone calls for a set duration should be provided.
- 2.43** Retired prisoners should be unlocked during the working day and should not have to pay for a television.
- 2.44** Links should be established with external gay support groups.
- 2.45** The prison should have a policy for meeting the needs of transgender prisoners.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.46** *Prisoners of all faiths could practise their religion, and facilities were due to be upgraded. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison and provided a wide range of services. There were good links with community faith groups.*
- 2.47** Sixty per cent of the prison population identified themselves as Christian, and only 4% as Muslims. The chaplaincy and sessional chaplains provided for all faiths in the prison, and there were regular opportunities for prisoners to practise their faith. There was a large, well-appointed chapel for Christians. The multi-faith room was small and shabby but there were plans to share the chapel space more equitably.
- 2.48** The chaplaincy was well integrated through regular contact with prisoners and participation in relevant management groups. They had a leading role in dealing with bereavement, supporting prisoners and their families. They also provided a counselling service for bereaved prisoners using trained counsellors, evening faith study groups and a music group, and the Sycamore Tree victim awareness course was provided twice a year.
- 2.49** Links with the community were good, with visiting faith groups, pastoral volunteers and visitors for prisoners who requested them. A community chaplaincy scheme provided links with faith groups for released prisoners and continuing contact to offer resettlement support.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.50** *The number of complaints submitted was low. Complaint forms were not always easily available. Responses to complaints were mostly reasonable. There was good analysis of complaints.*
- 2.51** The number of complaints submitted was low. At various times during the inspection, the full range of complaint forms was not available on the wings. In our survey, only 45% of prisoners, against the 52% comparator, said that it was easy to make a complaint, and 24%, against the 33% comparator, that they were dealt with fairly. However, some prisoners told us that staff resolved issues without a complaint being made.
- 2.52** The responses to complaints that we examined were mostly courteous and answered the issue raised but in many there was no evidence that the complainant had been spoken to.
- 2.53** The quality control of complaints was thorough and an analysis was provided every month to the senior management team.

Housekeeping points

- 2.54** The full range of complaint forms should be readily available to prisoners on all residential units.
- 2.55** Where necessary, the investigator of a complaint should record a discussion with the complainant and try to resolve the underlying problem.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.56 *There was little provision for bail information or support. The availability of legal visits was adequate.*

- 2.57** Despite the large proportion of remand prisoners, there was no dedicated legal advice service. In our survey, far fewer prisoners than in other local prisons (13% versus 22%) and than at the time of the previous full inspection (13% versus 21%) said that it was easy to get bail information. A bail support officer attended the prison only one day a week and those on remand were not routinely assessed. For those assessed, access to bail accommodation was adequate.
- 2.58** In our survey, only 29% of respondents, against the 41% comparator, said that it was easy to contact their solicitor. Prisoners we spoke to said that the lack of time unlocked restricted their access to telephones during the day. Fewer prisoners in our survey than at comparator establishments said that it was easy to attend legal visits but we found that provision was adequate.
- 2.59** Recalled prisoners were told about the reasons for their recall and their right to appeal.

Recommendations

- 2.60** **Bail information and support services should be improved.**
- 2.61** **Arrangements should be made to enable prisoners to contact their solicitors during the day.**

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.62 *The provision of health services had improved and more prisoners than at comparator prisons were positive about the quality of care. All services were accessed quickly and most of the initial care provided was wing based. A major refurbishment of the primary care centre had improved the environment for the care and treatment of patients. Pharmacy services were satisfactory and a good level of dental care was provided. The quality and range of mental health services were good and arrangements for tertiary care excellent.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.63** New commissioning and provider arrangements with Dorset Healthcare University NHS Foundation Trust were becoming established but the partnership board had not yet met. The governor and health care manager had a good relationship with the provider. The health care manager met the governor regularly and was a member of the senior management team.
- 2.64** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments were positive about the overall quality of health services, but fewer said that it was easy to see a nurse, GP or dentist. Health services were available 24 hours a day and were wing based, with a primary care centre located on B wing. A major restructure and refurbishment had taken place since the previous inspection, resulting in an enhanced primary care centre, the creation of a social care wing and the palliative care suite, and reorganisation of office space. This had had a positive effect on the delivery of care for patients.
- 2.65** A health needs assessment had been refreshed in 2012 and was due for renewal with the new provider of services. There had been much investment in the development of staff, resulting in a good skill mix and a team that worked well together, providing a wide range of care for prisoners. Regular staff meetings ensured that they were kept well informed about changes in health care policies. Clinical supervision was available but was generally informal and lacked sufficient recording.
- 2.66** There was very good access to the services throughout the week. A wide range of clinics, including for chronic diseases, was provided, in line with what was available in the community, with short waiting times. Two of the nurses led the care of older prisoners, with a focus on cognitive and physical capabilities, respectively.
- 2.67** One lead GP had been recruited and two further vacancies were currently being filled by locum GPs, with out-of-hours cover being delivered by the same provider as in the local community. Pharmacy services were provided by another local prison, and a pharmacy technician was employed on site. The supply service was very good but patients were not able to see a pharmacist and there were no medicine use reviews. Dental care was provided by two dentists and two dental nurses, who delivered up to six sessions each week, according to the demand. The waiting list was short and patients were generally seen for routine appointments within four weeks.
- 2.68** Clinical records were maintained using SystemOne (the electronic clinical record); they were well written and demonstrated some patient involvement, as appropriate. Paper records were stored appropriately.
- 2.69** Emergency resuscitation equipment was widely distributed throughout the prison, with three automated external defibrillators (AEDs) located at the centre and on D and F wings. Some custody staff had been trained in the use of AEDs, and this was expected to increase. The resuscitation kit was maintained well but the AEDs were checked only weekly.

- 2.70** A dedicated health care forum had recently been created, enabling health care issues to be discussed by prisoners. There were an average of 15 health care complaints each month and these were dealt with professionally and sensitively. Although a number of health promotion clinics were provided, there was neither a health promotion strategy nor a lead nurse for the service. There were no health care noticeboards on the wings, despite each having a treatment area where information could be shared and distributed.

Recommendation

- 2.71** **The pharmacist should provide pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication reviews.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.72** All occasions of clinical supervision provided should be recorded.
- 2.73** A record of daily checks should be made for all automated external defibrillators.
- 2.74** Prisoners should have access to health care information and health promotion material and this should be available in a range of languages.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.75** The health care facilities in reception were very good and a GP was available each evening, apart from Sunday, to see new prisoners when required. The reception screening process was well managed and prisoners were provided with information about the services available, but only in English (see housekeeping point 2.74). Secondary screening was carried out during prisoners' first week at the establishment. Prisoners accessed health services mainly through the nurses allocated to their wing but could also use a written health care application. Following any triage or treatment, patients could then be given an appointment to attend an appropriate clinic if required. Waiting times for all clinics were short and patients needing to be seen by a GP were seen within four days.
- 2.76** The inpatient unit had closed since the previous inspection and was now used successfully as F wing, a residential unit to locate prisoners with social care needs (see section on safeguarding). One health care assistant was employed on the unit and custody staff had received additional training in manual handling and tissue viability.
- 2.77** A satisfactory range of health promotion screening and vaccination clinics were provided. Three escort opportunities were provided each weekday for patients attending external hospital appointments and cancellations were rare.

Pharmacy

- 2.78** The main pharmacy room was located on F wing and medicines were administered on each wing. Most medicines management and clinical governance procedures were good. Standard operating procedures and other policies, including the formulary (a list of medications used to inform prescribing), were undergoing review. We saw out-of-date reference sources.
- 2.79** The prescribing of tradable medicines was relatively common, although generally correctly as not held in-possession. For most prisoners, medicines were administered by nurses on the

wings. The process was well organised and consideration was given to patient confidentiality; however, nurses told us that there was not always an officer present to supervise prisoners. To save time, nurses dispensed medicines into small containers before the administration round began. If a patient did not receive their medication for any reason, the dose remained in this container until the next administration round; this created a risk and was inappropriate. Medication could be administered at night, although patients sometimes received a single dose in-possession if they needed medicine to help them sleep. Several charts had gaps in administration records, including one chart for a controlled drug.

- 2.80** A small number of prisoners were allowed medication in-possession, based on a risk-assessment carried out on their arrival at the prison. It was unclear how often risk assessments were reviewed as they were not always recorded on SystmOne. Prisoners were responsible for ordering their in-possession medicines, and this worked well. Patients with diabetes could not keep their insulin in-possession, partly because those sharing cells could not store it securely (see recommendation 2.7). Nurses conducted in-possession checks randomly and also if there were concerns.
- 2.81** Prisoners could access medication out of hours and this was subject to audit by the pharmacist. There was a small range of patient group directions (PGDs) (enabling nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) but these were mostly for over-the-counter medicines rather than prescription-only medicines. Prisoners could obtain small supplies of simple pain relief from the nurses under the PGDs and each prisoner had their own card on which these supplies were recorded. Paracetamol could be bought from the prison shop and was not usually given under a PGD.
- 2.82** The medicines management group met monthly and was well attended by relevant stakeholders. It approved guidelines but did not ratify policies or receive aggregated prescribing data for analysis.

Recommendations

- 2.83 Medicines that are not in-possession should be administered directly to the patient from an appropriate container. Any medicines that are removed from the container but not administered should be destroyed. Administration of medication should always be supervised by a prison officer.**
- 2.84 Full and complete records of medicines administration should be made.**
- 2.85 A risk assessment of both the prisoner and his medication should be undertaken. It should be recorded on SystmOne and reviewed as necessary.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.86** Old reference books should be discarded, and only the most recent copy should be kept.
- 2.87** Prisoners should have prompt access to appropriate medication through patient group directions and their use should be monitored.

Dentistry

- 2.88** Dental care was provided by Devon Dental Ltd. The surgery had been refurbished since the previous full inspection, with the addition of a separate room for the decontamination of

instruments. The surgery was very clean and well equipped but one of the chairs needed replacing and one of the compressor instruments had been faulty for a long time.

- 2.89** At the time of the inspection, 59 patients were waiting for a routine appointment, with a maximum waiting time of four weeks. Patients requiring urgent care were seen quickly. We saw patients being treated with courtesy and with sufficient privacy. The dentist and dental nurse had a caring approach and provided appropriate information to patients as required.
- 2.90** Emergency resuscitation equipment was shared with the treatment room on F wing, and dental emergency drugs were located in the surgery. Dental health records were maintained on paper, with comments added to the SystemOne clinical records when required.

Recommendation

- 2.91** **All dental equipment should be serviceable and any repairs required should be carried out quickly.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.92** A large, integrated mental health team provided primary and secondary care. The team was based on F wing and consulted patients on the wings. A mental health occupational therapy and learning disability service were also included. There were up to 20 referrals each week and patients were satisfied with the level of mental health care provided. All care was well documented on the SystemOne clinical record.
- 2.93** A multidisciplinary team met weekly and was attended by the visiting psychiatrist and other prison departments, including representation from the substance misuse service. Patients had access to the psychiatrist, who attended the prison twice weekly. A comprehensive counselling service was offered through the chaplaincy.
- 2.94** Good relationships had been established with secure mental health units and, when required, transfers were often expedited within a week. There had been eight mental health transfers in the previous six months.
- 2.95** Mental health awareness training, including some input from the learning disability nurse, had been delivered to a small number of discipline staff but there was no rolling programme to include more staff on a regular basis.

Housekeeping point

- 2.96** There should be a continual programme of mental health awareness training for staff.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

2.97 *Catering arrangements were well managed. Meals were of a good quality, varied and of sufficient quantity. Consultation was responsive.*

2.98 A published four-week menu cycle catered for different dietary needs and preferences. One hot meal was provided every day and the baguette lunch was accompanied by soup. Each meal included four to five options, and opportunities to consume fresh fruit and vegetables.

2.99 Breakfast was served on the morning it was to be eaten and included fresh toast, with a hot option on a couple of mornings each week. Lunch was served at around noon and dinner just before 6pm on Monday to Thursday, but the evening meal was served too early on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, at around 4.30pm. Portion sizes were adequate and the food was of a reasonable quality.

2.100 There were no facilities for communal dining. Serveries were generally clean but were not consistently supervised, giving rise to opportunities for bullying. We saw halal choices being served without using the correct tools, and servers using their gloved hands rather than utensils to serve some choices.

2.101 The kitchen was clean and well equipped, with good attention paid to arrangements for halal food. Prisoners were consulted about the food through a twice-yearly survey, food forums and the regular prisoner consultative meetings, and there was evidence that menus changed as a result.

Recommendations

2.102 **Dinner should always be served after 5pm.**

2.103 **Serveries should be supervised.**

Housekeeping point

2.104 Halal food should be served properly to avoid contamination.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.105 *Prisoners felt that the cost of items from the prison shop was too high. The range of products was adequate and the ordering and delivery processes were good. Some prisoners had to wait too long for their first shop order but reception packs were available. There was a charge for catalogue orders.*

2.106 The range of items on the prison shop list was adequate and regularly updated, and 57% of respondents to our survey, against the 46% comparator, said that it was wide enough to meet their needs. However, prisoners complained about the cost of items relative to their low wages. Consultation with prisoners about the list had not taken place for some time.

- 2.107** Some prisoners had to wait two weeks to receive their first full shop order (and there was a risk that this led to borrowing and debt), although reception packs were available (see section on early days in custody).
- 2.108** Prisoners could order newspapers and magazines, and the range of catalogues available was adequate. However, prisoners were charged for making orders from the catalogues.

Recommendation

- 2.109** Prisoners should not have to wait two weeks to receive their first shop order.

Housekeeping points

- 2.110** Prisoners should be regularly consulted about the prison shop.
- 2.111** There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

3.1 *The amount of time out of cell for most prisoners was poor but unlocking times were reliable. Exercise facilities were good.*

3.2 The amount of time out of cell for most prisoners was poor and this was reflected in our survey questions about time out of cell and association. In our two roll checks, we found 46% and 37% of prisoners, respectively, locked in their cells during the working day, which was high (see main recommendation S52).

3.3 On the two most populous wings, together holding over two-thirds of the population, the many prisoners without a job were unlocked for just one hour and 15 minutes a day, including just 30 minutes' outdoor exercise. In addition, they were unlocked to collect meals, and had two evening association periods of 90 minutes a week. Prisoners working off the wing had the most time unlocked, with six and a half hours out at work and longer evening association periods.

3.4 Prisoners on the small vulnerable prisoner unit, which held 73 prisoners during the inspection, had longer periods unlocked during the day than those on the other wings. Those on D wing (the enhanced unit), which held 75 prisoners during the inspection, had keys to their own cells.

3.5 Association and exercise were rarely cancelled and unlocking times were adhered to.

3.6 Association equipment was limited on A, B and C wings and some was in a poor state. Exercise yards were clean and well equipped, with seating and outdoor gym equipment.

Recommendation

3.7 **Prisoners should have access to sufficient good-quality association equipment.**

3.8 **Prisoners should have access to at least one hour's outdoor exercise per day.**

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and

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

after their sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.

3.9 *The range of learning and skills activities was good, although there were still not enough places for all prisoners. The prison had responded well to the increased need for short-duration programmes to provide prisoners with initial skills that could be developed at subsequent training prisons. The short education and vocational courses were well suited to the short-term population. Insufficient work was provided, with too many prisoners underemployed. Teaching and training were highly motivating. Most prisoners achieved well and demonstrated good skills in education and in the work place. Attendance was good but punctuality, although generally good, was more erratic, and the late arrival of learners at some sessions disrupted learning. Arrangements to quality assure and evaluate the provision were strong in principle but were not yet fully effective in all areas. The library was well managed, had a good range of stock and was well used, but had insufficient space for prisoners to browse, sit and read.*

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

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: good

Quality of learning and skills and work provision: good

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: good

Management of learning and skills and work

3.11 The management of learning and skills was good. Strategic planning was very effective and had significantly improved the provision, offering a wide range of education and vocational training programmes. The prison worked well with Weston College, the education provider, to ensure that the provision responded to an analysis of local employment information. Coordination with nearby training prisons ensured that prisoners could continue their qualifications on transfer.

3.12 Induction to the prison was effective, enabling prisoners to make an informed choice of activity. Good working between the careers service and the education provider provided a coordinated approach to learning and training.

3.13 The prison had good quality assurance procedures and included all partners in quality improvement. However, these procedures were not used to their full effect in promoting improvement across all aspects of the provision. The self-assessment was good and clearly indicated that the prison recognised what it did well and what it needed to improve. However, it was over-descriptive and did not sufficiently evaluate the impact of all the improvements already made on learners and learning. Not enough use was made of all the observations of teaching, learning and assessment to improve learning in all areas across the prison.

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

Recommendation

- 3.14 The prison should make better use of the quality assurance arrangements to improve learning and skills provision.**

Provision of activities

- 3.15** Around 30% of prisoners were on remand and could choose not to work. Even taking this into account, the prison had insufficient purposeful activity places, with enough to occupy only just over half of the prison population. Jobs in the prison were available in a reasonable range of areas, such as waste recycling, kitchen work, painting and decorating, general maintenance, barbering and general wing work. Insufficient work was provided, with too many prisoners underemployed. Most work areas offered prisoners the opportunity to gain qualifications. Despite identifying over 350 work and activity places for each session, only 280 were filled during the inspection. Too many prisoners were unemployed and left on the wings (see main recommendation S53).
- 3.16** Attendance in vocational training was high overall, and exceptionally high on education courses. Although mostly good, punctuality was more erratic and the late arrival of learners at some sessions disrupted learning and sometimes slowed learners' progress.
- 3.17** The range of vocational training had improved and was good. It included cleaning, painting and decorating, and customer service and was based on units of qualifications that prisoners could achieve in just a few weeks.
- 3.18** Prisoners participating in education classes completed short accredited programmes that enabled them to progress to higher levels on release or in prisons to which they progressed. Language, literacy and numeracy support were available in most of the vocational training areas as required.
- 3.19** The allocation of prisoners to activity places was fair, equitable and appropriately informed by sentence planning and assessments conducted at induction. There were few waiting lists, except for industrial cleaning, where insufficient places were available on the training course. Pay rates were reviewed annually and encouraged learners to complete qualifications; however, they were not equitable and some prisoners could earn considerably more than others for doing the same work.

Recommendation

- 3.20 Pay rates should be equitable so that prisoners doing the same work are paid at the same rate.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.21** Prisoners should arrive at vocational training sessions on time.

Quality of provision

- 3.22** Teaching, learning and assessment had improved and were good, and we observed some outstanding lessons. Teaching staff were well qualified and experienced, and took good account of prisoners' individual learning needs, particularly in education classes. They made

effective use of information and communications technologies and a wide range of high-quality learning materials to enhance their teaching. Most learners were stimulated and fully engaged. Assessments were appropriately planned and clear feedback was given to learners.

- 3.23** Good use was made of a 'learning folder', explained and given to all prisoners at induction. This file worked well as a learning plan and learning record, linking learning, careers service advice and offender management interviews. Most prisoners were proud to show these files as records of their achievements.
- 3.24** The quality of teaching and training accommodation was mostly good and well maintained. Learning support was effective, with good in-class support given by well-trained prisoner peer mentors. The eight prisoners on Open University and distance learning courses were well supported by education and library staff.
- 3.25** The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) was a reasonable facility, but access was difficult for those not attending education classes or receiving careers advice. The system was frustratingly slow.
- 3.26** In vocational training areas, the quality of teaching and individual coaching was mostly good and took place in appropriately equipped training areas. The better sessions presented prisoners with suitable challenge. In some sessions, prisoners received good support from trained peer support workers. Vocational training resources and facilities were good. The prison instructors and the college staff worked well together to provide workshop training and assessments in the workplace.

Recommendation

- 3.27 Prisoner access to the virtual campus should be broadened and the system speed increased.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.28** Qualification pass rates for accredited vocational courses and in education classes were generally high. Achievement rates on many courses were high, at well over 80%, and outstanding on some, at between 95% and 100%. Most prisoners who stayed in the prison until the end of their course were successful. Achievement rates in vocational training were good. Learners demonstrated very good standards of work, and high skill levels were demonstrated in most vocational areas.
- 3.29** Most learners developed good practical and communication skills. Many gained initial qualifications that they could then continue in other prisons or in college on release. Behaviour was good and prisoners in all learning environments showed good levels of mutual respect to staff and other prisoners.

Library

- 3.30** The library provision was well managed. The libraries on B and C wings were small and compact, with insufficient space for prisoners to browse, sit, read or access the virtual campus. However, there were imminent plans to relocate these facilities to establish a larger library for all prisoners.

- 3.31** Opening hours were good and around 62% of prisoners regularly used the provision. Storybook Dads (a scheme whereby detainees record stories for their children) and Toe by Toe (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read) were well established and effectively coordinated through the library. Withdrawn book stock from the library was placed on a variety of wings, to encourage reading.
- 3.32** The range of materials was good and carefully selected, with a variety of easy-read and large-print books available. Book requests through the Devon library service were generally quick. A small range of magazines and newspapers were provided and Prison Service Orders and legal materials were readily available.

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

3.33 *PE provision was well managed and staff were highly motivated and well qualified. They delivered a wide range of well-promoted recreational PE. Only one gym instructor qualification was offered and achievement was satisfactory. Induction to the gym was thorough and included the promotion of healthy living.*

- 3.34** The PE provision was well managed by a small team of staff, who were enthusiastic and appropriately qualified. The only accredited training was a gym instructor course at level 2 for a very small number of prisoners, and achievement was satisfactory. Prisoners were employed as gym orderlies and provided useful support to PE staff in helping other prisoners in the gym.
- 3.35** Resources were satisfactory, with a wide range of activities. Wing noticeboards and the regular presence of gym staff on the wings promoted courses and encouraged prisoners to join in activities. The small sports hall was used for a wide range of games, circuit training and coaching activities. A cardiovascular suite with modular weight training facilities was heavily used during recreational sessions. A small, recently refurbished outside exercise yard was regularly used for football, team sports and circuit training. Specialist sessions were run for healthy living, fitness training and older prisoners. However, vulnerable prisoners could not access the gym activities at weekends or in the evenings. All equipment was well maintained and in good order. Changing facilities were clean, with good, well-used showers.
- 3.36** All prisoners completed an appropriate induction to the gym which included an introduction to the recently introduced static equipment in the exercise yards (see section on time out of cell), and advice on healthy living, diet and nutrition. Use of the gym was monitored thoroughly and well recorded, identifying around 35% of the population using it regularly, with all prisoners having access at least four times a week.

Housekeeping point

- 3.37** Vulnerable prisoners should have evening and weekend gym sessions.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *The reducing reoffending strategy was not informed by a needs analysis and the action plan was not sufficiently comprehensive. Oversight was adequate but there was no specific committee to monitor progress. Links with external agencies was good but there was little outcome evaluation, and links between offender management and the resettlement services were undeveloped.*

4.2 There was a reducing reoffending strategy for 2013 but it was not informed by an analysis of the needs of the prison population. An analysis of services used had been completed in 2012 but this had not analysed offending-related needs presented through offender assessment system (OASys) assessments or the views of prisoners.

4.3 The strategy covered the seven resettlement pathways and offender management and was supported by an action plan. However, the action plan was not sufficiently specific and some of the milestones were out of date, with no evidence of progress made. The action plan did not cover offender management, despite some clear areas for improvement – for example, the backlog of OASys assessments.

4.4 Resettlement pathway meetings were held each month. However, the monitoring of reducing reoffending had been moved to the quality improvement group for the previous six months, which provided adequate oversight but its meetings were not attended by all stakeholders. The need for a separate reducing reoffending committee had been recognised and was to recommence towards the end of August 2013.

4.5 There were some good links with statutory and voluntary agencies that assisted with resettlement but some gaps around help with finance, benefits and debt persisted. Resettlement work was not well monitored and there was little evaluation of outcomes to support service provision.

4.6 Links were good between public protection and offender management but less well developed between offender management and resettlement services, with the exception of accommodation, where the providers were located in the offender management unit (OMU).

Recommendation

4.7 **The reducing reoffending strategy should be informed by a comprehensive needs analysis, monitoring of outcomes and an action plan that is closely monitored, with remedial action taken as required.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.8** The links between the offender management unit and all resettlement services should be improved.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.9 *The offender management unit was well developed and all prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor. There was no routine cross-deployment of uniformed offender supervisors, and caseloads were manageable. Not all prisoners requiring an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment had one. The quality of OASys assessments was generally good but contact with prisoners was inconsistent. Home detention curfew processes were clear but too many prisoners were released late. Public protection arrangements were sound and proactively managed. Categorisation and transfer arrangements were adequate and the small number of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were well supported to prepare for sentence or transfer.*

- 4.10** The OMU had recently been reorganised to integrate observation, classification and allocation, public protection and offender supervisors with case administrators. This appeared to have gone well.
- 4.11** A large proportion of the population was either on remand or serving under 12 months. All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor, and in our survey far more prisoners (58%) than at other local prisons (30%) said that they had an offender supervisor. There was no routine cross-deployment of uniformed offender supervisors.
- 4.12** In our survey, far fewer sentenced prisoners than at comparator prisons said that they had a sentence plan (24% versus 39%) and this reflected a large backlog of OASys assessments. Out of 101 prisoners who had been sentenced for eight weeks or more, 36 did not yet have an OASys assessment or sentence plan (see main recommendation S54). Tiering, using shorter versions of OASys for lower-risk prisoners, had not yet been introduced. This lack of an OASys assessment disadvantaged prisoners as it held up transfer and progression through their sentence.
- 4.13** We looked at a small number of OASys assessments, sentence plans and contact records. The OASys assessments completed by prison-based offender supervisors were generally good and there was effective oversight by the countersigning officers to promote quality. However, assessments did not always include evidence of the prisoner's behaviour during custody. Risk management plans did not always focus on the steps required to reduce risk both in and out of custody.
- 4.14** The quality of sentence plans was adequate but some failed to include specific objectives to challenge attitudes, thinking and behaviour – including accredited programmes (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour). Community-based offender managers had limited involvement in sentence planning boards and little use was made of video-link facilities. Far more prisoners (53%) than at comparator prisons (42%) said that they had not had any contact with their offender manager during their time at the establishment.

- 4.15** Offender supervisors had reasonable-sized caseloads and had a good understanding of the need to prioritise contact based on risk, and to maintain a focus on transfer. However, there was no minimum expectation about the frequency or structure of contact. For some offender supervisors, contact was reactive rather than proactive. However, we saw some high-risk-of-harm cases receive regular and meaningful contact (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).
- 4.16** Offender supervisors were appropriately trained and the introduction of practice supervision for uniformed staff was a sensible step to help to improve the quality of case management.
- 4.17** A total of 159 applications for home detention curfew (HDC) had been received in the previous six months; 62 of these had been considered by the board and 36 (58%) had been granted. Reasons for not granting HDC were valid and based on relevant evidence. The timeliness of release on HDC was poor, with only 17 of the 36 prisoners released at their earliest eligibility date. Although the assessment was started 10 weeks before the release date, delays were experienced – for example, in receiving reports from the Probation Trust. Reasons for delays were not routinely monitored or addressed.

Recommendation

- 4.18** **Offender supervisors should have regular and structured contact based on risk and need with those on their caseload.**
- 4.19** **The timeliness of release on home detention curfew should be monitored and appropriate action taken to release prisoners on time.**

Housekeeping points

- 4.20** Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should include relevant information about the prisoner's behaviour while in custody. Risk management plans and sentence plans should be comprehensive.
- 4.21** Relevant prisoners should have initial and regular contact with their offender manager in the community.

Public protection

- 4.22** Public protection work was appropriately prioritised and prisoners' risk of harm to others, based on previous offending, was identified on arrival. Appropriate restrictions, including mail and telephone monitoring, were applied and good attention was paid to identifying breaches and reporting these to the police when necessary. Issues relating to domestic violence were also well spotted and there was a good link with the local police domestic violence units. Offender supervisors told prisoners about the restrictions placed on them.
- 4.23** The head of the OMU chaired the well-attended monthly meetings of the interdepartmental risk management team, which was multidisciplinary and had a high profile across the prison. Complex cases were discussed regularly at the meeting and plans were developed to address the risks posed. Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases were identified on arrival and contributions to community meetings were well developed. Access to, and use of, the violent and sexual offenders register was good.

Categorisation

- 4.24** Initial categorisation processes were sound but the prisoner was not automatically informed about the outcome. Decisions about categorisation were reasonable and most prisoners were transferred before a review was required. Despite huge demands on the uniformed offender supervisors in undertaking the work, it was up to date and efforts were made to transfer sex offenders and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) at the earliest opportunity.
- 4.25** There were links with other prisons in the region to enable transfers; for example, many prisoners nearing release were transferred to the resettlement unit at HMP Dartmoor. Sex offenders were transferred to HMP Channings Wood or HMP Dartmoor, depending on their level of denial, and category B prisoners could access places at HMP Isle of Wight.

Housekeeping point

- 4.26** Prisoners should always be informed of the outcome of the initial categorisation process.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.27** There was a small ISP population, comprising 10 life-sentenced prisoners and six serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP). Work with ISPs was proactive and the prisoners we spoke to were very positive about the help they received. Remanded prisoners potentially facing an indeterminate sentence were given advice and had access to lifer staff to prepare them for their sentence. Those waiting for a transfer were also helped to understand the next steps and prepare for their move.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.28** *Assessment of resettlement needs on arrival was satisfactory but not all prisoners' needs were checked during their sentence, and the discharge board process was inadequate. Resettlement services were not sufficiently well promoted across the prison. Accommodation provision was good but too many prisoners were homeless on release. There was a good training and employment resettlement course and several links with external providers. Health care discharge arrangements were good and there was a well-resourced palliative care suite. Resettlement support for prisoners with drug and alcohol issues was very good. Provision under the finance, benefit and debt pathway was underdeveloped. There were sufficient visits places. Visits facilities were mostly good and visitors were treated respectfully. Provision of interventions to challenge attitudes, thinking and behaviour was not based on a needs analysis and there was no provision for perpetrators of domestic violence.*

- 4.29** Shortly after arrival at the establishment, prisoners underwent an interview with an offender supervisor which covered most of the resettlement pathways. The outcomes were entered onto a useful database (known as the 'toolbox') in the OMU and referrals were made as necessary.

- 4.30** There was no dedicated resettlement team and services provided in the prison were not well advertised or easy to access. There was an over-reliance on prisoners applying to see resettlement staff, and they were not routinely seen during their stay at the establishment to check on issues or on progress made. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at other local prisons said that they knew whom to turn to for help with any of the resettlement pathways on release.
- 4.31** A discharge board was held but we were not confident that all prisoners were seen, as attendance was not formally monitored. The board was held two to three weeks before release, which would have been too late to deal with the more complicated resettlement problems. The discharge board we observed involved health services, drug services, accommodation and National Careers Service (NCS) staff, but not Jobcentre Plus staff. Information and actions identified by the discharge board were not routinely reported back to the offender supervisor.
- 4.32** Considerably more veterans were held at the establishment relative to other local prisons. They were identified on arrival and an officer provided support as required. Links with agencies offering help to veterans had developed well and there was evidence of veterans being helped into accommodation on release.

Recommendations

- 4.33** **The resettlement services available, and how to access them, should be more widely publicised across the prison.**
- 4.34** **The discharge board should be held earlier to ensure that issues can be dealt with; attendance by prisoners should be monitored and feedback given to the offender supervisor.**

Accommodation

- 4.35** Two trained housing officers from St Petrock's charity provided support to a large number of prisoners. On average, just over 12% of prisoners were released homeless or to temporary accommodation, which was relatively high. In the previous three months, 180 prisoners had been released, 21 of whom without accommodation, although the housing officers had helped another 50 to secure supported housing or at least temporary accommodation in preparation for release. The officers provided a wide range of help and advice and had good links with providers in the community. Many prisoners had been helped to maintain tenancies or deal with rent arrears. There was good attention to risk issues and the placement of those being released. Links with the OMU and offender supervisors were very good.

Education, training and employment

- 4.36** Arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work were good. Prisoners had appropriate access to a well-taught resettlement programme, which included advice and guidance on all aspects of employment, education and training. Personal advisers carried out well-structured interviews for all prisoners during induction, making effective links to education and work skills required for employment on release. Prisoners also had access to a business development course as well as being able to gain good practical and work skills during their time at the prison (see also section on learning and skills and work activities). Links with employers were good and continuing to develop.

- 4.37** The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) was used appropriately as an aid for searching for work, although staff recognised that many of the jobs advertised may have been out of date by the time that prisoners gained clearance to apply.

Health care

- 4.38** Health care discharge planning was good and started two weeks before release. Patients were then seen by a nurse on the day before release to receive any medication they required and further information. The care programme approach was used for prisoners with enduring mental health problems.
- 4.39** Palliative care and end-of-life programmes were well developed with the recent creation of a palliative care suite on F wing that provided an excellent area for the management of patients who were in the terminal stages of their illness.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.40** Resettlement options for prisoners with substance use issues were excellent, with full-time family and resettlement workers in the substance misuse service team arranging contacts with community agencies for prisoners and their families.
- 4.41** The substance misuse service had recently held a seminar with staff from nearby HMPs Dartmoor and Channings Wood and a wide range of community agencies. As a result, joint working protocols and working groups had been established that were expected to improve resettlement outcomes for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.42** Some money management advice was provided during the 'through the gate' course, which was delivered by the education department, and a member of staff from the 'money advice' course was available one day a week to provide advice to individual prisoners. However, there was little other provision to manage finances or deal with debts.
- 4.43** Jobcentre Plus had experienced some staff shortages over recent months, so provision had been hindered. As a result, we were not assured that all prisoners were signed up to the National Work Programme in order to claim benefits on release.
- 4.44** At the time of the inspection, prisoners could not open a bank account before release, as the previous arrangements with a bank had ended. Efforts were being made to secure a new arrangement.

Recommendation

- 4.45 Individual support for managing finance, benefits and debts should be improved and prisoners should be able to open a bank account before release.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.46** Social visits were provided six days a week but not in the evening. There were sufficient spaces to meet need within a reasonable time. In our survey, only 28% of respondents, against the 36% comparator, said that it was easy for friends and families to get to the prison, probably reflecting the fact that the prison served courts from a large geographical area, although public transport links were good.
- 4.47** There was a small but comfortable visitors centre outside the prison, with toilets and refreshment facilities, managed by Choices, a voluntary family support organisation. Prisoners' families could obtain advice and support, or referrals to other agencies from the family workers based there. It was open in good time before visits started but not after visits finished.
- 4.48** Visits staff were welcoming and searching was respectful. The visits hall was light and clean but it was noisy and hot when full. There was a good refreshments bar, a children's play area (supervised by volunteers) and information notices about prisoner safety and support. Prisoners were not required to wear distinguishing clothing, except for a lanyard with their identification card.
- 4.49** Provision of family visits was good, with 'child-centred visits' open to all prisoners who were not on the basic regime. They were held every school holiday for a full day and included family games sessions. Further family visits, also held during the school holidays, were open to prisoners on the enhanced regime and were based in the visits hall.
- 4.50** The Choices organisation provided a range of family support to prisoners. They saw all new prisoners in reception and responded to applications for family support, including contact with social services, family courts and local support organisations. They also provided the 'Dad's Diary' project for prisoners who did not have contact with their children, which involved the prisoner creating a diary which could be given to their children if contact was resumed.
- 4.51** The education department provided certificated courses in family relationships and parenting skills which ran continuously. The library ran Storybook Dads (a scheme whereby detainees record stories for their children) for more than 60 prisoners a year (see also section on learning and skills and work activities).

Housekeeping point

- 4.52** The visitors centre should remain open after social visits have finished.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.53** No accredited offending behaviour programmes were delivered at the prison, and the focus, appropriately, was on transferring prisoners to other establishments to undertake this work.
- 4.54** Non-accredited provision included alcohol awareness work, victim awareness through the Sycamore Tree programme, an arts-based programme and a programme delivered through the education department by the YMCA, called 'Perspectives'. A needs analysis had not been undertaken, so it was difficult to see if this range of provision was appropriate. However, the head of reducing reoffending was aware that there was no provision for the large number of prisoners with domestic violence issues, and he had struggled to source an appropriate intervention.

- 4.55** Supply did not meet demand for some of the interventions. For example, the Sycamore Tree programme was funded to run only twice a year, with 20 men on each course, but many more needed it.
- 4.56** We saw evidence of offender supervisors providing structured offence-focused work to some prisoners presenting a high risk of harm. For example, one offender supervisor had delivered 10 sessions of the sex offender treatment programme to one young adult, and another prisoner had been helped to participate more meaningfully in a psychological assessment. In a third case, 20 offence-focused sessions had been delivered to a young man serving just six months for sex offences.

Recommendation

- 4.57** **The type and amount of provision to challenge attitudes, thinking and behaviour should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis.**

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 The support prisoners receive through the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) processes should be better reflected through good quality case management documentation and recording by case managers. (S51)
- 5.2 Opportunities for association should be increased and all prisoners should have access to association every day and during the evenings. (S52)
- 5.3 The number of activity places should be increased and fully utilised. (S53)
- 5.4 The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be eliminated. (S54)

Recommendations

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.5 Prisoners should be returned to prison quickly after court appearances. (1.6)
- 5.6 Prisoners' property should accompany them on transfer. (1.7)

Early days in custody

- 5.7 Night staff should introduce themselves to, and make regular checks on, newly arrived prisoners. (1.14)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.8 Prisoners should be consulted about bullying and violence reduction regularly and systematically, and this should be used to develop a local strategy which focuses on reducing the number of violent incidents. (1.24)
- 5.9 Support for victims of violent and antisocial behaviour should be improved. (1.25)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.10 Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management procedures should only be segregated when there are exceptional circumstances to justify it. (1.36)
- 5.11 The use of cells with closed-circuit television coverage should be carefully managed and used sparingly. (1.37)

5.12 There should be an appropriate Listener suite for use by prisoners in crisis. (1.38)

Safeguarding

5.13 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.44)

Security

5.14 The risk of ingress of drugs should be appropriately evaluated in order to provide a cohesive and coordinated drug supply reduction strategy. (1.54)

5.15 All requested suspicion tests should be completed within the set timescales. (1.55)

Incentives and earned privileges

5.16 Targets for all prisoners on the basic level of the IEP scheme should be individualised and should promote improvements in behaviour. (1.61)

Discipline

5.17 The regime in the segregation unit should be improved. (1.79)

5.18 Segregation unit staff should be trained in mental health awareness. (1.80)

Substance misuse

5.19 Health care, mental health and substance misuse service managers should ensure that communication and joint working is enhanced between all their departments, which should be demonstrated through improved prisoner satisfaction and outcomes. (1.88)

Residential units

5.20 All cells should be clean and well maintained, with a properly screened toilet and decent furniture, including a lockable cupboard. (2.7)

5.21 All prisoners should have access to sufficient clean clothes and bedding. (2.8)

5.22 Prisoners should be able to shower every day and showers should be adequately maintained and screened. (2.9)

5.23 Application procedures should be improved. (2.10)

Equality and diversity

5.24 The equality strategy should provide a detailed outline of how the needs of prisoners under each protected characteristic will be met and outcomes for them should be monitored by the equality action team. (2.21)

5.25 Prisoner equality representatives should be fully trained and provided with a clear job description. (2.22)

- 5.26** All protected characteristics should be identified on arrival. (2.37).
- 5.27** The needs of Gypsy/Romany/Traveller prisoners should be identified and met. (2.38)
- 5.28** Essential written information about the prison should be available in languages understood by all prisoners. (2.39)
- 5.29** The prison should investigate the reasons for prisoners with disabilities reporting more negatively than their able-bodied counterparts, and take action accordingly. (2.40)
- 5.30** There should be a policy for meeting the needs of young adult prisoners which includes consultation with them and risk assessments to determine their location. (2.41)

Legal rights

- 5.31** Bail information and support services should be improved. (2.60)
- 5.32** Arrangements should be made to enable prisoners to contact their solicitors during the day. (2.61)

Health services

- 5.33** The pharmacist should provide pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication reviews. (2.71)
- 5.34** Medicines that are not in-possession should be administered directly to the patient from an appropriate container. Any medicines that are removed from the container but not administered should be destroyed. Administration of medication should always be supervised by a prison officer. (2.83)
- 5.35** Full and complete records of medicines administration should be made. (2.84)
- 5.36** A risk assessment of both the prisoner and his medication should be undertaken. It should be recorded on SystemOne and reviewed as necessary. (2.85)
- 5.37** All dental equipment should be serviceable and any repairs required should be carried out quickly. (2.91)

Catering

- 5.38** Dinner should always be served after 5pm. (2.102)
- 5.39** Serveries should be supervised. (2.103)

Purchases

- 5.40** Prisoners should not have to wait two weeks to receive their first shop order. (2.109)

Time out of cell

- 5.41** Prisoners should have access to sufficient good-quality association equipment. (3.7)
- 5.42** Prisoners should have access to at least one hour's outdoor exercise per day. (3.8)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.43** The prison should make better use of the quality assurance arrangements to improve learning and skills provision. (3.14)
- 5.44** Pay rates should be equitable so that prisoners doing the same work are paid at the same rate. (3.20)
- 5.45** Prisoner access to the virtual campus should be broadened and the system speed increased. (3.27)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.46** The reducing reoffending strategy should be informed by a comprehensive needs analysis, monitoring of outcomes and an action plan that is closely monitored, with remedial action taken as required. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.47** Offender supervisors should have regular and structured contact based on risk and need with those on their caseload. (4.18)
- 5.48** The timeliness of release on home detention curfew should be monitored and appropriate action taken to release prisoners on time. (4.19)

Reintegration planning

- 5.49** The resettlement services available, and how to access them, should be more widely publicised across the prison. (4.33)
- 5.50** The discharge board should be held earlier to ensure that issues can be dealt with; attendance by prisoners should be monitored and feedback given to the offender supervisor. (4.34)
- 5.51** Individual support for managing finance, benefits and debts should be improved and prisoners should be able to open a bank account before release. (4.45)
- 5.52** The type and amount of provision to challenge attitudes, thinking and behaviour should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis. (4.57)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.53** Induction material should be available in an appropriate range of languages. (1.15)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.54** The verbal abuse of prisoners on B wing should be addressed. (1.26)
- 5.55** The minutes of the safer custody committee should better reflect the key issues and actions from the meeting. (1.27)

Self-harm and suicide

5.56 All staff should carry anti-ligature knives. (1.39)

Security

5.57 The mandatory drug testing suite urinal should be suitably screened. (1.56)

Incentives and earned privileges

5.58 Information to prisoners on the purpose and function of the IEP scheme should be improved. (1.62)

Discipline

5.59 Completed F213 forms should be included with each use of force dossier. (1.72)

5.60 The quality of video-recorded incidents should be improved to ensure a contiguous and clear record of any planned incidents. (1.73)

Equality and diversity

5.61 External equality groups should attend the equality action team meeting. (2.23)

5.62 Discrimination incident report forms should be readily available on all wings and quality checked by an external organisation. (2.24)

5.63 Free foreign national telephone calls for a set duration should be provided. (2.42)

5.64 Retired prisoners should be unlocked during the working day and should not have to pay for a television. (2.43)

5.65 Links should be established with external gay support groups. (2.44)

5.66 The prison should have a policy for meeting the needs of transgender prisoners. (2.45)

Complaints

5.67 The full range of complaint forms should be readily available to prisoners on all residential units. (2.54)

5.68 Where necessary, the investigator of a complaint should record a discussion with the complainant and try to resolve the underlying problem. (2.55)

Health services

5.69 All occasions of clinical supervision provided should be recorded. (2.72)

5.70 A record of daily checks should be made for all automated external defibrillators. (2.73)

5.71 Prisoners should have access to health care information and health promotion material and this should be available in a range of languages. (2.74)

5.72 Old reference books should be discarded, and only the most recent copy should be kept. (2.86)

5.73 Prisoners should have prompt access to appropriate medication through patient group directions and their use should be monitored. (2.87)

5.74 There should be a continual programme of mental health awareness training for staff. (2.96)

Catering

5.75 Halal food should be served properly to avoid contamination. (2.104)

Purchases

5.76 Prisoners should be regularly consulted about the prison shop. (2.110)

5.77 There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders. (2.111)

Learning and skills and work activities

5.78 Prisoners should arrive at vocational training sessions on time. (3.21)

Physical education and healthy living

5.79 Vulnerable prisoners should have evening and weekend gym sessions. (3.37)

Strategic management of resettlement

5.80 The links between the offender management unit and all resettlement services should be improved. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

5.81 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should include relevant information about the prisoner's behaviour while in custody. Risk management plans and sentence plans should be comprehensive. (4.20)

5.82 Relevant prisoners should have initial and regular contact with their offender manager in the community. (4.21)

5.83 Prisoners should always be informed of the outcome of the initial categorisation process. (4.26)

Reintegration planning

5.84 The visitors centre should remain open after social visits have finished. (4.52)

Examples of good practice

Safeguarding

- 5.85** The social care unit on F wing was an impressive facility that offered a therapeutic environment and individualised care for prisoners identified as requiring safeguarding services. (1.45)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Alice Reid	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Lucy Higgins	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Michael Bowen	Health services inspector
Deborah Hyland	Pharmacist
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Neil Edwards	Ofsted inspector
Tim Brackpool	CQC inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	17	265	55.2
Recall	0	29	5.7
Convicted unsentenced	7	55	12.1
Remand	11	118	25.2
Civil prisoners	0	1	0.2
Detainees	0	1	0.2
Other	1	6	1.4
Total	36	475	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	19	191	41
Less than 6 months	4	83	17
6 months to less than 12 months	3	28	6
12 months to less than 2 years	4	48	10.3
2 years to less than 4 years	4	35	7.6
4 years to less than 10 years	1	58	11.6
10 years and over (not life)	0	18	3.5
ISPP	1	4	1
Life		10	2
Total	36	475	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age 18		
Under 21 years	36	7.0
21 years to 29 years	189	37.0
30 years to 39 years	129	25.2
40 years to 49 years	98	19.2
50 years to 59 years	37	7.2
60 years to 69 years	17	3.3
70 plus years	5	1.0
Please state maximum age 80		
Total	511	100

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	34	458	96.3
Foreign nationals	2	15	3.3
Not stated	0	2	0.4
Total	36	475	100

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	19	181	39.1
Uncategorised sentenced	1	18	3.8
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	27	5.3

Category C	0	243	47.6
Category D	0	5	1.0
YOI closed	15	1	3.1
YOI open	1	0	0.2
Total	36	475	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
<i>White</i>			
British	33	428	90.2
Irish	0	2	0.4
Other white	1	6	1.4
Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	1	0.2
<i>Mixed</i>			
White and black Caribbean	0	2	0.4
White and black African	2	3	1.0
White and Asian	0	0	0
Other mixed	0	1	0.2
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>	0	2	0.4
Indian	0	2	0.4
Pakistani	0	0	0
Bangladeshi	0	0	0
Other Asian	0	2	0.4
<i>Black or black British</i>			
Caribbean	0	4	0.8
African	0	2	0.4
Other black	0	3	0.6
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>			
Chinese			
Arab	0	2	0.4
Other ethnic group	0	4	0.8
<i>Not stated</i>	0	13	2.5
Total	36	475	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	2	0.4
Church of England	8	128	26.6
Roman Catholic	3	64	13.1
Other Christian denominations	9	86	18.6
Muslim	1	18	3.7
Sikh	0	1	0.2
Hindu	0	0	0
Buddhist	0	6	1.2
Jewish	0	0	0
Other	0	6	1.2
No religion	15	160	34.2
Total	36	471	99.2

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Gypsy/Romany/ traveller	0	1	0.2
Total	0	1	0.2

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	4	0.8	98	19.2
1 month to 3 months	8	1.6	98	19.2
3 months to 6 months	3	0.6	60	11.7
6 months to 1 year	1	0.2	22	4.3
1 year to 2 years	1	0.2	15	2.9
2 years to 4 years	0	0	1	0.2
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	17	3.3	294	57.5

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	1	0.2
Public protection cases			
Total	0	1	0.2

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	9	1.8	65	12.7
1 month to 3 months	5	1.0	61	11.9
3 months to 6 months	0	0	37	7.2
6 months to 1 year	3	0.6	12	2.3
1 year to 2 years	2	0.4	5	1
2 years to 4 years	0	0	1	0.25
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	19	3.8	181	35.35

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

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

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 29 July 2013 the prisoner population at HMP Exeter was 527. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 191 prisoners.

We received a total of 174 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 91%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Six respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, four questionnaires were not returned and seven were returned blank.

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

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	63
B	26
C	60
D	21
F	2
Segregation unit	2

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

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

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Exeter in 2013 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 36 local prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Exeter in 2013 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Exeter in 2009.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between responses of prisoners who considered themselves to be a veteran and those who did not.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the vulnerable prisoner wing (B) and the rest of the establishment.

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

Survey summary

Section I: About You

Q1.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See Prisoner Survey Methodology		
Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		14 (8%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		63 (36%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		47 (27%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		27 (16%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		16 (9%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		6 (3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		100 (58%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		34 (20%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		26 (15%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced		60 (36%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		36 (22%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		15 (9%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		16 (10%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		20 (12%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>Life</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>No</i>		157 (93%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		169 (99%)
	<i>No</i>		2 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		169 (99%)
	<i>No</i>		2 (1%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	150 (86%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (1%)

<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)		

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

Yes	7 (4%)
No	165 (96%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	69 (40%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	63 (37%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	17 (10%)	<i>Muslim</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Protestant</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Other</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	4 (2%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>	168 (97%)
<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	2 (1%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)

Yes	56 (33%)
No	115 (67%)

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

Yes	17 (10%)
No	156 (90%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	57 (33%)
No	117 (67%)

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

Yes	89 (51%)
No	85 (49%)

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	128 (74%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	40 (23%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)

Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	128 (74%)
Yes	21 (12%)
No	25 (14%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	128 (74%)
Yes	7 (4%)
No	36 (21%)

	<i>Don't remember</i>		1 (1%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?		
	Yes		137 (79%)
	No		32 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		4 (2%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?		
	Yes		134 (78%)
	No		38 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		0 (0%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?		
	<i>Very well</i>		54 (31%)
	<i>Well</i>		76 (44%)
	<i>Neither</i>		30 (17%)
	<i>Badly</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		1 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply)		
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>		128 (74%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>		35 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		4 (2%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?		
	Yes		139 (82%)
	No		26 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		5 (3%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?		
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>		83 (48%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>		77 (45%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		13 (8%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?		
	Yes		148 (86%)
	No		21 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		4 (2%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?		
	<i>Very well</i>		36 (21%)
	<i>Well</i>		94 (55%)
	<i>Neither</i>		24 (14%)
	<i>Badly</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		4 (2%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		1 (1%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply)		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	24 (14%)	<i>Physical health</i> 31 (18%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	32 (19%)	<i>Mental health</i> 41 (24%)

Contacting employers	9 (5%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	8 (5%)
Contacting family	55 (32%)	Getting phone numbers	48 (28%)
Childcare	3 (2%)	Other	11 (6%)
Money worries	36 (21%)	Did not have any problems	43 (25%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal	49 (29%)		

Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?

Yes	46 (28%)
No	78 (47%)
Did not have any problems	43 (26%)

Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply)

Tobacco	136 (79%)
A shower	50 (29%)
A free telephone call	58 (34%)
Something to eat	124 (72%)
PIN phone credit	106 (61%)
Toiletries/ basic items	113 (65%)
Did not receive anything	6 (3%)

Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply)

Chaplain	65 (39%)
Someone from health services	105 (63%)
A Listener/Samaritans	77 (46%)
Prison shop/ canteen	40 (24%)
Did not have access to any of these	35 (21%)

Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply)

What was going to happen to you	76 (46%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	76 (46%)
How to make routine requests (applications)	73 (44%)
Your entitlement to visits	64 (39%)
Health services	90 (54%)
Chaplaincy	64 (39%)
Not offered any information	36 (22%)

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

Yes	136 (79%)
No	32 (18%)
Don't remember	5 (3%)

Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course	53 (31%)
Within the first week	66 (39%)
More than a week	42 (25%)
Don't remember	9 (5%)

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

Have not been on an induction course	53 (31%)
Yes	57 (34%)
No	47 (28%)

Don't remember 12 (7%)

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

Did not receive an assessment 41 (25%)
 Within the first week 45 (27%)
 More than a week 68 (41%)
 Don't remember 13 (8%)

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?	12 (7%)	35 (22%)	26 (16%)	43 (27%)	22 (14%)	24 (15%)
Attend legal visits?	16 (10%)	63 (40%)	23 (15%)	12 (8%)	11 (7%)	31 (20%)
Get bail information?	3 (2%)	16 (11%)	26 (17%)	26 (17%)	31 (21%)	49 (32%)

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 25 (15%)
 Yes 59 (36%)
 No 82 (49%)

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

Yes 63 (37%)
 No 14 (8%)
 Don't know 94 (55%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	54 (32%)	114 (67%)	3 (2%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	112 (65%)	57 (33%)	2 (1%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	105 (63%)	58 (35%)	5 (3%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	103 (62%)	57 (34%)	7 (4%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36 (21%)	109 (64%)	24 (14%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	84 (50%)	81 (48%)	3 (2%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	23 (14%)	90 (53%)	57 (34%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good 5 (3%)
 Good 36 (21%)
 Neither 42 (25%)
 Bad 45 (26%)
 Very bad 43 (25%)

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

Have not bought anything yet/ don't know 12 (7%)
 Yes 96 (57%)
 No 60 (36%)

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

Yes 105 (63%)
 No 10 (6%)
 Don't know 53 (32%)

Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	69 (41%)
	No	18 (11%)
	Don't know/ N/A	83 (49%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	92 (54%)
	No	11 (6%)
	Don't know/ N/A	68 (40%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend	41 (25%)
	Very easy	33 (20%)
	Easy	42 (25%)
	Neither	8 (5%)
	Difficult	8 (5%)
	Very difficult	6 (4%)
	Don't know	27 (16%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	137 (81%)
	No	25 (15%)
	Don't know	7 (4%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	17 (11%) 88 (55%) 54 (34%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	17 (11%) 72 (48%) 60 (40%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	74 (45%)
	No	23 (14%)
	Don't know	66 (40%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	100 (62%) 15 (9%) 47 (29%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	100 (63%) 26 (16%) 33 (21%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	20 (13%)
	No	135 (87%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	Don't know who they are	98 (58%)
	Very easy	5 (3%)
	Easy	16 (10%)
	Neither	21 (13%)
	Difficult	19 (11%)
	Very difficult	9 (5%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	22 (13%)
	Yes	80 (47%)
	No	43 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	26 (15%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	22 (13%)
	Yes	83 (50%)
	No	44 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	18 (11%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	12 (7%)
	No	155 (93%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	146 (86%)
	Very well	6 (4%)
	Well	8 (5%)
	Neither	3 (2%)
	Badly	3 (2%)
	Very badly	3 (2%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	133 (79%)
	No	35 (21%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	129 (76%)
	No	41 (24%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	52 (31%)
	No	118 (69%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	15 (9%)
	Never	44 (26%)
	Rarely	38 (23%)
	Some of the time	51 (31%)
	Most of the time	17 (10%)
	All of the time	2 (1%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	101 (60%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	23 (14%)

More than a week	33 (20%)
Don't remember	12 (7%)

Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her	101 (60%)
	Very helpful	16 (10%)
	Helpful	21 (13%)
	Neither	12 (7%)
	Not very helpful	15 (9%)
	Not at all helpful	3 (2%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	59 (35%)
	No	111 (65%)

Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	21 (13%)
	No	144 (87%)

Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply)	
	Never felt unsafe	111 (67%)
	Everywhere	16 (10%)
	Segregation unit	3 (2%)
	Association areas	17 (10%)
	Reception area	6 (4%)
	At the gym	11 (7%)
	In an exercise yard	22 (13%)
	At work	3 (2%)
	During movement	17 (10%)
	At education	2 (1%)
	At meal times	15 (9%)
	At health services	3 (2%)
	Visits area	4 (2%)
	In wing showers	22 (13%)
	In gym showers	8 (5%)
	In corridors/stairwells	11 (7%)
	On your landing/wing	20 (12%)
	In your cell	15 (9%)
	At religious services	2 (1%)

Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	50 (29%)
	No	120 (71%)

Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply)	
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	19 (11%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	10 (6%)
	Sexual abuse	4 (2%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	23 (14%)
	Having your canteen/property taken	14 (8%)
	Medication	7 (4%)
	Debt	3 (2%)
	Drugs	6 (4%)
	Your race or ethnic origin	5 (3%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	2 (1%)
	Your nationality	5 (3%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others	8 (5%)
	You are from a traveller community	3 (2%)
	Your sexual orientation	4 (2%)
	Your age	5 (3%)
	You have a disability	13 (8%)
	You were new here	10 (6%)
	Your offence/ crime	3 (2%)

	<i>Gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	44 (26%)
	No	125 (74%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Medication</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Debt</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	105 (68%)
	Yes	13 (8%)
	No	37 (24%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	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	26 (15%)	4 (2%)	31 (18%)	30 (18%)	50 (30%)	27 (16%)
	The nurse	24 (15%)	15 (10%)	49 (32%)	30 (19%)	25 (16%)	12 (8%)
	The dentist	47 (30%)	1 (1%)	10 (6%)	19 (12%)	40 (25%)	41 (26%)
Q9.2	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	34 (21%)	16 (10%)	43 (26%)	27 (16%)	26 (16%)	18 (11%)
	The nurse	19 (12%)	27 (17%)	49 (31%)	36 (23%)	13 (8%)	14 (9%)
	The dentist	65 (44%)	12 (8%)	19 (13%)	20 (13%)	15 (10%)	18 (12%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	Not been					14 (9%)	
	<i>Very good</i>					12 (8%)	
	<i>Good</i>					52 (33%)	
	<i>Neither</i>					29 (18%)	
	<i>Bad</i>					27 (17%)	
	<i>Very bad</i>					26 (16%)	
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes					79 (47%)	
	No					88 (53%)	

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?	
	Not taking medication	88 (53%)
	Yes, all my meds	17 (10%)
	Yes, some of my meds	22 (13%)
	No	39 (23%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	84 (51%)
	No	81 (49%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)	
	Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	81 (51%)
	Yes	20 (13%)
	No	59 (37%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	49 (30%)
	No	117 (70%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	48 (29%)
	No	117 (71%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	28 (17%)
	Easy	22 (13%)
	Neither	18 (11%)
	Difficult	4 (2%)
	Very difficult	10 (6%)
	Don't know	81 (50%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	8 (5%)
	Easy	10 (6%)
	Neither	19 (12%)
	Difficult	9 (5%)
	Very difficult	23 (14%)
	Don't know	96 (58%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	11 (7%)
	No	155 (93%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	14 (8%)
	No	152 (92%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem	107 (68%)
	Yes	27 (17%)
	No	24 (15%)

Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?)	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	117 (72%)
	Yes	31 (19%)
	No	15 (9%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	109 (70%)
	Yes	39 (25%)
	No	7 (5%)

Section II: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>
						<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	24 (15%)	3 (2%)	23 (14%)	20 (13%)	55 (35%)
	Vocational or skills training	35 (22%)	4 (3%)	27 (17%)	39 (25%)	36 (23%)
	Education (including basic skills)	27 (17%)	16 (10%)	44 (27%)	34 (21%)	26 (16%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	62 (40%)	3 (2%)	18 (12%)	30 (19%)	25 (16%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply)					
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					74 (48%)
	Prison job					53 (35%)
	Vocational or skills training					8 (5%)
	Education (including basic skills)					32 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes					5 (3%)
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?					
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	70 (48%)	24 (16%)	41 (28%)		12 (8%)
	Vocational or skills training	69 (53%)	23 (18%)	26 (20%)		11 (9%)
	Education (including basic skills)	51 (38%)	38 (29%)	34 (26%)		10 (8%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	72 (60%)	10 (8%)	25 (21%)		14 (12%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					18 (11%)
	Never					30 (18%)
	Less than once a week					49 (30%)
	About once a week					51 (31%)
	More than once a week					15 (9%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?					
	<i>Don't use it</i>					38 (23%)
	Yes					79 (49%)
	No					45 (28%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					34 (21%)
	0					37 (23%)
	1 to 2					62 (38%)
	3 to 5					29 (18%)
	More than 5					2 (1%)

Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	25 (15%)
	0	18 (11%)
	1 to 2	21 (13%)
	3 to 5	43 (26%)
	More than 5	56 (34%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	12 (7%)
	0	7 (4%)
	1 to 2	114 (70%)
	3 to 5	22 (13%)
	More than 5	8 (5%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	80 (49%)
	2 to less than 4 hours	20 (12%)
	4 to less than 6 hours	24 (15%)
	6 to less than 8 hours	14 (9%)
	8 to less than 10 hours	4 (2%)
	10 hours or more	12 (7%)
	Don't know	9 (6%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	38 (24%)
	No	119 (76%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	57 (35%)
	No	104 (65%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	60 (37%)
	No	101 (63%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (17%)
	Very easy	11 (7%)
	Easy	34 (21%)
	Neither	7 (4%)
	Difficult	35 (22%)
	Very difficult	35 (22%)
	Don't know	12 (7%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	Not sentenced	60 (36%)
	Yes	63 (38%)
	No	43 (26%)

Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply)	
	Not sentenced/ NA	103 (63%)
	No contact	32 (20%)
	Letter	18 (11%)
	Phone	2 (1%)
	Visit	14 (9%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	89 (58%)
	No	65 (42%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	60 (37%)
	Yes	25 (15%)
	No	78 (48%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	138 (85%)
	Very involved	2 (1%)
	Involved	8 (5%)
	Neither	4 (2%)
	Not very involved	4 (2%)
	Not at all involved	6 (4%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply)	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	138 (86%)
	Nobody	13 (8%)
	Offender supervisor	5 (3%)
	Offender manager	3 (2%)
	Named/ personal officer	2 (1%)
	Staff from other departments	4 (3%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	138 (85%)
	Yes	7 (4%)
	No	8 (5%)
	Don't know	9 (6%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	138 (84%)
	Yes	7 (4%)
	No	8 (5%)
	Don't know	11 (7%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	138 (85%)
	Yes	8 (5%)
	No	7 (4%)
	Don't know	10 (6%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	12 (8%)
	No	64 (40%)
	Don't know	83 (52%)

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

Yes	14 (9%)
No	137 (91%)

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

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	33 (22%)	25 (17%)	93 (62%)
Accommodation	37 (25%)	28 (19%)	85 (57%)
Benefits	33 (22%)	31 (21%)	86 (57%)
Finances	32 (22%)	22 (15%)	93 (63%)
Education	41 (28%)	26 (18%)	77 (53%)
Drugs and alcohol	44 (31%)	40 (28%)	59 (41%)

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

Not sentenced	60 (38%)
Yes	38 (24%)
No	61 (38%)

Appendix IV: Photographs

Broken windows in an occupied cell.



Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Exeter 2013

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

Key to tables

		HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		174	5895	174	119
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	8%	6%	8%	12%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	65%	68%	65%	67%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	9%	7%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	31%	21%	31%	17%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	1%	3%	1%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	13%	7%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	98%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	96%	99%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	9%	25%	9%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	5%	4%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	12%	4%	3%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	33%	21%	33%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	6%	10%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	30%	33%	29%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	51%	54%	51%	53%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	23%	19%	23%	23%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	46%	40%	46%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	16%	10%	16%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	79%	64%	79%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	78%	78%	78%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	75%	68%	75%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	66%	75%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%	5%	5%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	82%	82%	82%	85%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	48%	50%	48%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	76%	86%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	62%	76%	62%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	75%	73%	75%	69%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	14%	14%	14%	11%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	19%	23%	19%	16%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	5%	6%	5%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	32%	31%	32%	29%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	5%	2%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	21%	22%	21%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	29%	21%	29%	15%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	18%	17%	18%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	24%	19%	24%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	5%	8%	5%	13%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	29%	28%	22%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	37%	38%	37%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	79%	87%	79%	89%
3.6	A shower?	29%	33%	29%	24%
3.6	A free telephone call?	34%	59%	34%	51%
3.6	Something to eat?	72%	77%	72%	84%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	61%	59%	61%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	65%	61%	65%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	39%	49%	39%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	63%	71%	63%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	46%	37%	46%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	24%	17%	24%	17%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	46%	49%	46%	50%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	46%	48%	46%	47%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	44%	42%	44%	36%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	39%	46%	39%	44%
3.8	Health services?	54%	52%	54%	49%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	39%	47%	39%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	74%	79%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	69%	80%	69%	54%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	49%	59%	49%	48%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	76%	72%	76%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	29%	41%	29%	33%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	51%	58%	51%	58%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	22%	13%	21%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	36%	39%	36%	50%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	37%	37%	37%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	32%	55%	32%	28%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	65%	81%	65%	76%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	63%	81%	63%	75%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	62%	61%	62%	72%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	21%	37%	21%	31%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	50%	64%	50%	50%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	14%	26%	14%	22%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	24%	24%	24%	19%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	57%	46%	57%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	63%	58%	63%	70%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	41%	53%	41%	51%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	54%	54%	54%	50%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	45%	47%	45%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	79%	81%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	62%	58%	62%	55%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	55%	47%	55%	54%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	45%	52%	45%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	24%	33%	24%	27%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	44%	36%	44%	38%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	13%	17%	13%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	13%	21%	13%	16%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	47%	47%	47%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	45%	50%	39%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	7%	7%	10%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	61%	38%	61%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	74%	79%	71%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	76%	74%	76%	75%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	31%	32%	31%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	12%	19%	12%	6%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	40%	45%	40%	31%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	55%	65%	55%	70%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	30%	23%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	7%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	13%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	8%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	4%

HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
35%	40%
13%	18%
30%	26%
11%	14%
6%	6%
2%	4%
14%	
8%	6%
4%	
2%	
4%	6%
3%	4%
1%	5%
3%	
5%	4%
2%	
2%	2%
3%	3%
8%	2%
6%	6%
2%	5%
3%	5%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	26%	26%	27%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	11%	10%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	5%	4%	4%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	11%	5%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	5%	5%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%	4%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	5%	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	5%	3%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	26%	32%	26%	44%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	27%	21%	28%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	41%	51%	41%	59%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	7%	10%	7%	12%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	45%	44%	45%	37%
9.2	The nurse?	55%	56%	55%	60%
9.2	The dentist?	37%	32%	37%	26%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	44%	39%	44%	36%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	50%	47%	52%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	50%	61%	50%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	51%	34%	51%	32%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	25%	40%	25%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	29%	36%	29%	40%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	29%	27%	29%	36%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31%	29%	31%	25%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	11%	12%	11%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	8%	7%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%	8%	8%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	53%	64%	53%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	68%	59%	68%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	85%	79%	85%	84%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	16%	32%	16%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	20%	29%	20%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	37%	42%	37%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	14%	18%	14%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	35%	44%	35%	33%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	5%	9%	5%	6%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	21%	27%	21%	30%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	3%	8%	3%	4%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	52%	70%	52%	62%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	31%	42%	31%	41%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	47%	55%	47%	47%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	39%	50%	39%	42%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	62%	67%	62%	65%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	46%	56%	46%	59%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	40%	52%	40%	47%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	20%	47%	20%	46%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	41%	33%	41%	50%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	49%	33%	49%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	19%	32%	19%	19%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	61%	38%	61%	60%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	5%	47%	5%	4%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	7%	10%	7%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	24%	35%	24%	25%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	36%	46%	36%	40%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	37%	32%	37%	42%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	28%	36%	28%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Exeter 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Exeter 2013	HMP Exeter 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	60%	58%	60%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	53%	42%	53%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	30%	27%	30%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	3%	15%	3%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	23%	35%	23%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	58%	30%	58%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	24%	39%	24%	28%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	42%	58%	42%	36%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	59%	44%	59%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	22%	32%	22%	
13.6	Offender manager?	13%	26%	13%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	9%	13%	9%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	18%	20%	18%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	29%	61%	29%	44%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	27%	27%	27%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	32%	33%	32%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	8%	7%	8%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	9%	15%	9%	7%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	21%	31%	21%	
13.12	Accommodation?	25%	42%	25%	
13.12	Benefits?	27%	44%	27%	
13.12	Finances?	19%	26%	19%	
13.12	Education?	25%	32%	25%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	40%	47%	40%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	38%	46%	38%	42%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Exeter 2013

Prisoner survey responses (missing data has 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		Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details					
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		56	115		22	151
1.3	Are you sentenced?	62%	66%		64%	65%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	9%		5%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%		100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	99%		100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	9%	9%		0%	10%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	4%		0%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	5%		0%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	-	-		55%	29%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	15%	7%		18%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	23%	37%		50%	30%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	77%		82%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	68%	78%		71%	75%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	88%		100%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	75%		91%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	95%	66%		76%	74%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	63%	63%		71%	62%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	82%		78%	79%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	58%	74%		57%	70%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	20%	33%		37%	28%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Prisoners aged 50 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	29%	34%	50%	29%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	69%	63%	86%	62%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25%	20%	33%	19%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	27%	22%	43%	22%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	61%	55%	84%	54%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	63%	70%	61%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	51%	37%	60%	38%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	69%	48%	60%	53%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	72%	85%	90%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	41%	39%	46%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	43%	49%	43%	47%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	40%	56%	25%	53%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	13%	5%	0%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	78%	95%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	76%	91%	74%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	15%	10%	9%	11%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	39%	41%	29%	42%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	44%	30%	43%	33%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	12%	10%	13%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	43%	23%	40%	28%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	25%	8%	25%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	2%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	3%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	7%	1%	20%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	23%	0%	25%	5%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	37%	21%	24%	27%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	7%	4%	5%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	2%	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	2%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	1%	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	4%	1%	9%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	7%	1%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	27%	18%	29%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	47%	39%	44%	41%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	74%	35%	71%	44%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	83%	34%	55%	50%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	29%	10%	34%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	25%	40%	25%	35%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	4%	6%	6%	5%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	25%	20%	31%	19%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	2%	4%	0%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	36%	67%	37%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	13%	22%	10%	20%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	67%	58%	85%	58%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	4%	6%	5%	5%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	6%	7%	5%	8%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	31%	38%	11%	39%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	45%	34%	29%	39%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (veterans) HMP Exeter 2013

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	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		17	156
1.3	Are you sentenced?	59%	66%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	10%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	50%	31%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	24%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	82%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	63%	76%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	94%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	88%	75%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	75%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	75%	62%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	79%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	68%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	28%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	38%	31%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	63%	66%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19%	22%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	19%	25%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	60%	57%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	60%	63%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	40%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	53%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	38%	46%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	56%	46%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	51%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	7%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	94%	78%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	88%	75%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	19%	11%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	44%	40%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	35%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	14%	13%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	38%	28%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	19%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	13%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	25%	6%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	25%	26%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	6%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	6%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	13%	22%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	43%	41%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	44%	47%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	62%	50%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	25%	31%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	14%	37%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	7%	5%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	29%	20%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	3%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	44%	40%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	13%	20%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	40%	63%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	0%	5%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	7%	7%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	27%	36%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38%	37%

Wing comparator



Prisoner survey responses (vulnerable prisoner wing) HMP Exeter 2013

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

Key to tables

Key to tables		Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	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		26	144
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	8%	8%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	46%	68%
1.3	Are you on recall?	4%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	19%	34%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	8%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	4%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	8%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	30%	32%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	15%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	54%	29%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	42%	53%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	11%	25%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	73%	78%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	81%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	76%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	80%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	46%	48%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	96%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	75%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	85%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	19%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	46%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	30%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	42%	26%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	27%	16%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	39%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	19%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	46%	24%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	73%	81%
3.6	A shower?	30%	29%
3.6	A free telephone call?	11%	39%
3.6	Something to eat?	73%	71%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	27%	67%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	66%	66%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	30%	40%
3.7	Someone from health services?	66%	62%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	46%	47%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	15%	25%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	46%	47%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	46%	45%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	42%	45%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	30%	40%
3.8	Health services?	50%	55%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	39%	40%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	79%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	66%	70%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	80%	76%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	26%	30%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	58%	50%
4.1	Get bail information?	0%	15%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	27%	38%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	50%	34%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	77%	23%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	60%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	96%	55%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	72%	59%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	27%	21%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	62%	48%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	11%	14%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	23%	23%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	64%	56%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	80%	60%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	38%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	48%	55%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	50%	45%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	45%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	12%	12%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	15%	11%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	47%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	34%	54%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	7%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	89%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	77%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	15%	32%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	12%	10%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	46%	40%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.2	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	42%	33%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	12%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	39%	27%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	23%	8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	30%	10%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	8%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	11%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	8%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	27%	25%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	9%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	4%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	27%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	40%	42%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	12%	6%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	58%	46%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	58%	49%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	15%	33%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	34%	28%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	4%	36%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	8%	12%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%	8%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:			
11.1	A prison job?	16%	17%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	25%	19%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	36%	39%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	16%	13%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:			
11.2	A prison job?	38%	35%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	4%	6%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	29%	20%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	0%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	38%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	46%	50%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	8%	22%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	62%	60%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	0%	5%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	0%	9%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	24%	24%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	24%	37%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	46%	34%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	24%	29%

Wing comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (B wing)	A, C and D wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	52%	59%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	12%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	9%	9%