

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Hatfield

29 November — 3 December 2010

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2011

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary	9
1 Arrival in custody	
<hr/>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	17
First days in custody	17
2 Environment and relationships	
<hr/>	
Residential units	21
Staff-prisoner relationships	24
Personal officers	25
3 Duty of care	
<hr/>	
Bullying and violence reduction	27
Self-harm and suicide	28
Applications and complaints	29
Legal rights	30
Faith and religious activity	30
Substance use	31
4 Diversity	
<hr/>	
Diversity	35
Race equality	35
Religion	37
Foreign nationals	37
Disability and older prisoners	38
Gender and sexual orientation	39
5 Health services	
<hr/>	
General	41
Clinical governance	42
Primary care	43
Pharmacy	43
Dentistry	44
Secondary care	45
Mental health	45

6	Activities	
	Learning and skills and work activities	47
	Physical education and health promotion	50
	Time out of cell	51
7	Good order	
	Security and rules	53
	Discipline	55
	Incentives and earned privileges	56
8	Services	
	Catering	59
	Prison shop	60
9	Resettlement	
	Strategic management of resettlement	63
	Offender management and planning	64
	Resettlement pathways	67
10	Recommendations and housekeeping points	73
	Appendices	
	I Inspection team	83
	II Prison population profile	84
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	87

Introduction

HMP Hatfield is a Category D open resettlement prison that, at the time of this announced inspection, held 243 adult prisoners and young offenders.

The inspection took place at a time when the normal regime of the prison was significantly disrupted by heavy snow. Prisoners who normally left the prison on temporary licence to attend work or other activities were unable to do so and remained in the prison unoccupied. The adverse weather conditions also disrupted the inspection and affected what we could see. We were told, for instance, that the prison grounds had won a prize from 'Doncaster in Bloom'. We took the prison's word for this – when we saw them, the grounds were covered in heavy snow.

Hatfield prison has been combined for management purposes with Moorland closed prison. The inspection covered both locations. However, we have reported on each location separately. Although some management processes and policies were common to both, the prisons were very different. We did not find any evidence that outcomes for prisoners had improved as a consequence of the merger in either location. There was little evidence, for instance, that resettlement processes were integrated across both sites, which might have had positive benefits. Indeed, in some areas we found that because the data or other information relating to both sites was combined, it was not possible to identify and therefore address issues that were specific to either location. Hatfield had the worst of the arrangement. Management attention was consistently – and probably rightly – focused on the larger closed prison with its more challenging population and so, in many areas, Hatfield appeared to be drifting without any clear strategic direction.

Staff were friendly enough when they booked prisoners in at reception but prisoners were then left to find their own room and get their bearings in the prison. Prisoners spent too much time in their first week hanging about with nothing to do. They were given an information pack but there was no organised induction, although a weekly drop in induction surgery was held. New arrivals had to rely on informal support from other prisoners to answer their questions and help them settle in. The assumption seemed to be that prisoners arriving at Hatfield had plenty of experience of the prison system and were low risk so needed little support. In fact, prisoners who had come to Hatfield from long periods in closed prisons told us they found their introduction to the open condition of Hatfield bewildering and stressful.

Accommodation was arranged in blocks. Prisoners had keys to their cells which were generally in good condition. There was no integral sanitation but prisoners had access at all times to communal showers and toilets. Some communal areas were shabby, with broken windows and in a poor state of repair. There was a communal dining room. Prisoners complained to us about the quantity and quality of food. What we saw was reasonable but the food budget at £1.70 per person per day was extremely low.

Prison staff told us that relationships with prisoners were good but this was at odds with prisoners' perceptions. Prison staff were not much in evidence at any time and, although we saw some good interactions and positive work being done, we witnessed discourteous and dismissive behaviour from staff. There was little interaction between staff and prisoners on association. More than one in five prisoners told us they had felt threatened or intimidated by staff. Too many staff had little knowledge of the prisoners for whom they were responsible. The personal officer scheme was, to all intents and purposes, non-existent. Staff had little knowledge of the procedures to support prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm but thankfully there was little call for these.

There was, in effect, no diversity strategy for Hatfield. The strategy related solely to Moorland and had little relevance to the conditions at Hatfield. There were no arrangements to support prisoners with disabilities and staff were not aware of prisoners who might need evacuation assistance in an emergency. I witnessed one frail, elderly prisoner shivering as he made his way across the grounds in the bitter cold to the dining hall for his evening meal. We were told older prisoners were not issued with coats because 'they did not work outside' and prisoners were not allowed hats.

Despite this, prisoners told us they generally felt safe. The adjudication and incentives and earned privileges processes were fair and well managed. Security was reasonable and there had been a welcome drop in the number of absconds. However, drug use was high and there was no evidence of an effective strategy to reduce supply.

The amount and quality of purposeful activity was a much better story. Prisoners were unlocked throughout the core day from 7.30am to 10pm. There was a good range of work, education and other activities available. Some prisoners had jobs in the community which they accessed on temporary licence. Although the number of paid employment opportunities had recently reduced, about a third of prisoners had some kind of community work placement.

At the time of the inspection prisoners were frustrated about being cooped up because of the bad weather. Some suggested to me that they would have welcomed the opportunity to work outside in the community clearing snow.

Resettlement processes were disappointingly weak for a resettlement prison. Although there were some good areas of work such as accommodation services, these were not drawn together in a coherent, effective, needs-based strategy. Staff were struggling to implement effective offender management processes.

Even allowing for the problems caused by the weather, this was a disappointing inspection. Hatfield was performing poorly. It needs more effective strategic direction and more intrusive management. The prison relied on the fact that it held low risk prisoners who appeared to just want to get through their sentence. This may not have been an unreasonable assumption but at worst it meant that risks were not effectively managed and at best that there was little proactive work to support prisoners in preparing for leading productive and law-abiding lives on release.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2011

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Hatfield is a category D open resettlement establishment holding sentenced adult prisoners and sentenced young offenders.

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

Public sector

Region/Department

Yorkshire and Humberside

Number held

243 on 27 October 2010

Certified normal accommodation

260

Operational capacity

260

Date of last full inspection

12–16 December 2005

Brief history

HMP Hatfield opened as a borstal in 1950. Over the years it changed to HMP & YOI Hatfield, housing 180 young offenders. In July 2000, one unit was converted to a category D unit, housing 60 adults with an emphasis on resettlement. In March 2002, services became shared with HMP & YOI Moorland, with one governor taking responsibility for both sites. On 1 September 2002, both sites merged and Hatfield was renamed HMP & YOI Moorland Open and two additional accommodation units were erected due to population pressures. It has now been renamed as HMP and YOI Hatfield, and the site has gradually expanded to the present state.

Short description of residential units

The units consist of 3x3-storey brick built units, housing 60 offenders each (20 offenders per landing). There is no integral cell sanitation but sinks and toilets are available on each landing, to which prisoners have 24-hour access, as they are not locked in their cells. Showering facilities are on the ground floor.

There are also 2x2-storey prefabricated-type buildings, housing 40 offenders each (20 offenders per landing). There is no integral in-cell sanitation but showers and toilet facilities are available on each landing, with 24-hour access to toilets and sinks.

Escort contractor

GSL

Health service commissioner and providers

Doncaster Primary Care Trust
Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust

Learning and skills providers

Manchester College

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 All inspection reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The criteria are:

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

HP2 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

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

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

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

There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.

- outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

- outcomes for prisoners are poor against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

Safety

HP3 Support for prisoners during their first days at the establishment was poor. Although violence reduction and suicide prevention measures were generally good, strategies

and governance arrangements were over-focused on Moorland. Prisoners generally reported feeling safe but too many said that they felt intimidated by staff. Some rules and regulations were over-restrictive but breaches of the rules were generally dealt with proportionately. Clinical management of substance misuse was good but drug use was high. Overall outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

- HP4 Good relationships between reception and escort staff were reported and prisoner escort records we examined had been completed correctly. Most journeys to the establishment were short but many prisoners arrived in secure vans, despite having been deemed suitable for open conditions.
- HP5 Although reasonably clean, the reception area was drab and unwelcoming. Staff were friendly but operated under the assumption that prisoners were experienced and confident in open conditions. New prisoners were over-reliant on other prisoners acting informally as buddies. Prisoners were assigned to a unit, issued with a key to their cell and then left to their own devices for the rest of the day and night. Induction consisted mainly of a written information pack, supported by a follow-up voluntary induction surgery. Prisoners were called up to see key staff during their first week but were not always aware of these appointments.
- HP6 A single violence reduction strategy covered both Hatfield and Moorland and was monitored through a single safer prisons committee based at Moorland. In reality, Hatfield was treated as an addendum. Most of the issues discussed were Moorland specific and had little relevance to the open prison. Levels of violence were low. Prisoner consultation in terms of bullying and general prisoner safety was underdeveloped. Although most prisoners said that they felt safe, too many reported that they had felt threatened or intimidated by staff.
- HP7 The number of prisoners requiring care under the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedure was small and staff were not sufficiently aware of the structures designed to minimise the risk of self-harm. A safer prisons committee was in place but Listeners from Hatfield were not involved and were generally underutilised.
- HP8 The security committee for Hatfield and Moorland met monthly. Representation was good but the information provided was not analysed sufficiently well. Security objectives prioritised absconding, perimeter security, drug and alcohol use. Links between security departments and other important functions were good. Many rules were too restrictive for a category D establishment and there were inappropriate controls on movement around the grounds in the evening and limitations on prisoners' clothing. There had been a reduction in the number of absconds but this had not been analysed.
- HP9 Adjudication records were generally well documented and punishments fair, proportionate and consistent with the published tariff. Underlying causes of behaviour were investigated and mitigating factors identified. Governance arrangements for individual adjudications were good but there was no trends analysis. Breaches of the rules did not result in a return to closed conditions in most cases.
- HP10 Escort handcuffs were used for prisoners who were being taken to reception. There were no proper governance arrangements around this practice and it resulted in an

under-recording of use of force, as the use of escort cuffs was not recorded in use of force paperwork.

- HP11 The integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) was well established, although few prisoners accessed the service. Only 5% of the population were tested under the random mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme, and the year-to-date random MDT rate was high. Suspicion tests averaged a positive rate of over 60%, indicating a good response to sound intelligence. No risk or compliance testing was carried out. Alcohol testing was carried out on a suspicion basis when prisoners returned from ROTL. Alcohol services were adequate.

Respect

HP12 Living conditions were generally good but too many prisoners were in prison clothing. Prisoner perceptions of relationships with staff were poor. Prisoners had problems in sending and receiving mail. Application of the personal officer scheme was mixed. The incentives and earned privileges scheme operated effectively. Diversity provision was generally poor. Prisoners had little confidence in the complaint process. Chaplaincy services were limited. Prisoners complained about food portion sizes. Primary health care services had improved and mental health services were developing. Overall outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

HP13 Living conditions were generally good but the modular temporary units were in need of refurbishment. Communal areas were generally clean and well decorated, although contained broken panes of glass. Showers were reasonable and access to them good. Too many prisoners were in prison clothing. Young adults were located on two dedicated landings and were not allowed to mix there.

HP14 There were sufficient public telephones but prisoners said that they had problems getting to use them, and they also had problems in sending and receiving mail.

HP15 Most prisoners were on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme but demotion to the standard level was used as part of a strategy for managing behaviour. Prisoners whose behaviour warranted demotion to basic were considered for removal to closed conditions but it was not automatic.

HP16 Prisoner perceptions of relationships with staff were poor across the prison. They reported unfavourably against comparator prisons about being treated with respect and having someone they could approach. ¹ While there were clearly some good and

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

highly motivated staff, we observed staff being discourteous and dismissive towards prisoners. There was mixed interaction between staff and prisoners on association, with most staff based in offices.

- HP17 Personal officers were allocated to prisoners by caseload, and contact with them varied from regular and helpful to non-existent. Perceptions of the value of the scheme were generally poor. Some staff we spoke to knew the prisoners in their care well, while others could give no information about those on their caseload.
- HP18 Prisoners were negative about the food, particularly about what they regarded as small portion sizes. The quantity and quality of the food we tasted and observed being served were reasonable. The dining room arrangements were good. A cooked breakfast was provided on Sundays. Prisoners had no opportunity to prepare food for themselves. The consultation arrangements concerning food were limited. Reasonable provision was made for special diets.
- HP19 Outcomes for prisoners around diversity were generally poor. A lone race and equalities manager from Moorland was also responsible for the delivery of all diversity strands at Hatfield, with limited support from an officer based there. Issues were predominantly reacted to as they arose, although the needs of older prisoners had not been considered. The role of the prisoner diversity representatives was underdeveloped.
- HP20 Although nearly a quarter of the population came from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, the number of racist incident report forms was extremely small. Prisoners expressed little faith in the system and no consultation with this group of prisoners had been undertaken.
- HP21 Foreign national prisoners made up a very small proportion of the population. The race and equalities manager from Moorland was also the foreign nationals coordinator. Prisoners who did not speak English were reliant on prisoner interpreters, including for confidential matters such as health care.
- HP22 The small chaplaincy team ensured that prisoners had the opportunity to worship in the reasonably well-equipped faith areas. Not all faiths represented in the prison had ministers, and survey results relating to access to religious leaders and respect for religious beliefs were poorer than at other open prisons, although black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were more positive about respect for their religious beliefs. Although pastoral support was provided, community links were poor.
- HP23 Applications were logged but progress was not tracked and too many prisoners said that they were not dealt with promptly or fairly. Too many complaint responses were limited and the internal quality assurance system had highlighted this.
- HP24 Health services were functional but the health centre required modernisation and refurbishment. Clinical governance arrangements were sound. There was a range of appropriate clinics for primary care and lifelong conditions. The waiting time to see a physiotherapist was too long. Prisoners generally received good pharmacy and dentistry services, although there was poor access to the dentist. There were gaps in psychological services and group therapies.

is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.
(Adapted from the *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*: HM Inspectorate of Prisons.)

Purposeful activity

HP25 Time out of cell and levels of purposeful activity were good. All prisoners had the opportunity to be engaged in some form of work, vocational training or education. A third of the population worked in the community. Accreditation of skills gained through work was poor. The range of vocational training was limited. The quality of the learning and skills provision was good and achievement rates on courses were mostly high. The small library was reasonable, although access limited. Access to the gym had improved and prisoner orderlies were qualified to refer prisoners to support services. Overall, outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP26 Prisoners had a reasonable amount of time out of cell, and a range of activities was available during association, although access to outside areas was excessively limited during the winter.

HP27 A coherent prison structure placed all learning and skills activities under the management of the head of learning and skills. This allowed all work, training and education to be planned to meet need. Prisoner placements in outside paid employment had reduced but the number of volunteer placements had actively been increased to compensate for this, and over a third of the population was working in the community.

HP28 Useful skills were developed in work areas in the prison but most did not result in any recognised qualifications. Prisoners engaging in learning and skills received lower wages than those in other work areas, acting as a disincentive for prisoners to undertake courses. There were sufficient places for all prisoners to work or undergo training or education. There was a limited range of vocational training available and some of it did not offer sufficient opportunities for progression. There was a satisfactory range of courses in education. Achievement rates were generally high and the quality of teaching and learning was good. Teaching was well managed. Prisoners appointed as peer mentors were enthusiastic and supported education staff and prisoners during their studies.

HP29 The library was small but well planned and provided a satisfactory environment. Access for all prisoners was limited. The library actively promoted a range of activities and the development of literacy, although there was little take-up.

HP30 Access to the gym had improved. Two orderlies working in the gym were qualified to refer prisoners to organisations to support them in a range of issues. Facilities were reasonable and, although ageing, were well maintained. A limited range of vocationally accredited PE programmes was offered throughout the year.

Resettlement

HP31 The resettlement strategy was weak and the completed needs analysis was limited. Staff were struggling to implement layered offender management. Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were managed well by their offender supervisors. Pathway provision was mixed, with some excellent accommodation support but unimaginative

provision around contact with families. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

- HP32 Arrangements for the strategic management of resettlement covered both Hatfield and Moorland, although Hatfield had a separate resettlement strategy. This was based on a limited resettlement needs analysis, which had not been informed by offender assessment system (OASys) data. The document detailed current provision under the resettlement pathways but did not give any indication of future priorities or developments. There was only a basic action plan, which was not structured in line with the resettlement pathways. There was limited monitoring of the action plan at the bimonthly resettlement meetings, which covered both Hatfield and Moorland. These meetings were attended by staff from appropriate departments and external service providers.
- HP33 The offender management unit was under-resourced fully to implement layered offender management. An offender supervisor was allocated to all prisoners, and they carried large caseloads. All prisoners in scope of offender management had either an up-to-date or reviewed OASys assessment and sentence plan. Those who were out of scope received an OASys assessment. Sentence plans showed appropriate interventions and referrals to resettlement services where required, although some lacked in-depth targets to address all aspects of offending and other behaviour. Video conferencing was not available. Prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection were managed well by offender supervisors, although there was no additional support in place.
- HP34 Public protection arrangements did not comprehensively ensure that all risks were identified and managed appropriately for those out of scope of offender management, as prisoners were not all routinely screened on arrival.
- HP35 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used extensively for resettlement purposes but there were some concerns over the purposefulness of some town visits for prisoners from out of area whose families were unable to meet them.
- HP36 Prisoners received effective advice and guidance on housing from a part-time professional. The service was well advertised and accessible but prisoners had to self-refer for support. Our survey results indicated that not all prisoners were aware of the support available to them.
- HP37 Prisoners received effective support from prison staff in claiming state benefits and entitlements. Work had been done to help a small number of prisoners to open bank accounts. A local analysis had indicated that a large number of prisoners needed help with financial problems but, apart from one or two notable successes, this problem had not been addressed.
- HP38 A preparation for work course was available, which provided well-structured support using a wide range of agencies for prisoners before release. Outwork was well managed. Education prepared men well for entry onto the task force voluntary work and subsequent employment. There was insufficient engagement with employers and potential employers were not risk assessed quickly enough. Seventy prisoners worked out on a wide range of community projects, some of which had resulted in employment.

- HP39 There were regular pre-release health clinics and good multidisciplinary care programme approach working.
- HP40 The drug strategy was not up to date but an alcohol strategy was in place. A needs analysis conducted earlier in 2010 lacked detail. There was no service user consultation. Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services included an alcohol worker, who offered one-to-one interventions. CARAT workers focused mainly on crisis intervention
- HP41 There was no visitors centre and the prison was difficult to reach by public transport. Although the visits areas was bright and clean, prisoners were required to wear prison clothing, making for an institutional experience. There were no family days and provision to support family ties was underdeveloped.
- HP42 A small number of prisoners participated in courses run by the Probation Service in the community. The lack of a comprehensive needs analysis meant that it was not possible to be sure whether resources were being targeted to meet need.

Main recommendations

- HP43 The arrangements for managing the Moorland and Hatfield sites should ensure that sufficient strategic management resource is available to distinguish and address the specific issues relating to a small open prison such as Hatfield.
- HP44 Prisoners should be properly supported during reception, their first night at the prison and induction.
- HP45 The dynamic between staff and prisoners should be analysed and action taken to improve staff–prisoner relationships.
- HP46 Security restrictions and rules for prisoners should be appropriate to open conditions.
- HP47 Resources in the offender management unit should ensure that the full implementation of layered offender management is achievable.
- HP48 Support for prisoners to maintain contact with their family members and friends should be prioritised and better family pathway provision developed.

Section 1: Arrival in custody

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Most prisoners arrived in secure vans. There were good relationships between reception and escort staff. Information was shared properly and prisoner escort records had been completed correctly.
- 1.2 Nearly all prisoners arrived in cellular vans, despite having been recategorised as suitable for open conditions, but most journeys to the establishment were short. The vans we examined were clean, and escort staff were friendly and respectful to prisoners.
- 1.3 Reception staff reported good working relationships with escort staff. There was evidence that information was shared properly, and escort documents we saw had been completed correctly and were legible.

Recommendation

- 1.4 Cellular vans should not be used routinely when transferring category D prisoners to Hatfield.

First days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.5 The reception area was small and cramped, and prisoners were not interviewed in private. Staff were friendly and welcoming but appeared to assume that prisoners had experienced reception routines before, and prisoners reported a poor experience of reception across a range of indicators. New arrivals were helped informally by other prisoners. There were no systems to identify the location of new prisoners on their first night and handover procedures for staff coming on duty were underdeveloped. All new prisoners were given a written information pack describing the establishment's policies, procedures and rules, and giving information about education and resettlement services. There was also a weekly voluntary induction surgery held by prison staff, where prisoners could get further information. Prisoners spent too much time in their first week with little to do.

Reception

- 1.6 All receptions were planned, with most new prisoners arriving from other prisons in Humberside and Yorkshire at prearranged times. Reception could be busy at times, with approximately 15 new receptions each week and about 40 prisoners being released on temporary licence.
- 1.7 The reception area was small and cramped and there were no rooms where prisoners could be interviewed in private. Although it was adequately clean, the floors in many places were in a poor state of repair and the area as a whole was old, worn and unwelcoming. Apart from a staff office and three small rooms used to strip-search prisoners, the reception area comprised a single open room. A fixed bench in the middle of the room provided a waiting area for prisoners and there was a large desk opposite the main entrance where they were interviewed, in the full view and hearing of other prisoners.
- 1.8 All new arrivals were met by one of two reception officers, who checked their warrant and other relevant paperwork before completing a locally devised reception checklist. Staff were friendly and welcoming but operated under the assumption that prisoners had experienced reception routines before. Some of the procedures designed to inform prisoners about what to expect from initial processes were perfunctory and did not necessarily deal with their immediate needs. Questions about how they felt and what they understood, for example, were read through quickly by reception officers and there was little time for a prisoner to discuss any issues. A comprehensive information pack was issued to all prisoners as they left reception, and explained most of the prison's procedures and services, but there were no special procedures for those who could not read or write sufficiently well or for whom English was not their first language. There was no evidence that staff checked that prisoners had understood what had been said or issued to them.
- 1.9 Two prisoner orderlies informally helped to guide prisoners in reception through the process, and during the inspection we saw many examples where prisoners advised and helped new arrivals in terms of information sharing and general support. However, we were unsure about the overall governance of peer support and observed an over-reliance by staff on prisoners to inform new arrivals about issues that they should have dealt with themselves, both in reception and on the residential units (see also section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- 1.10 Prisoners reported a poor experience of reception across a range of indicators that was significantly more than comparator prisons. In our survey, 34% against a comparator of 63% said that they had been given enough information about what was going to happen to them, 29% against a comparator of 53% that they had been informed about how to make routine requests, 47% against a comparator of 67% that they had been given information about health services and 57% against a comparator of 80% that they had been treated well by staff in reception.

Recommendation

- 1.11 The condition of the reception area should be improved.

First night

- 1.12 There was no dedicated first night or induction unit. Prisoners were allocated to a residential unit from reception according to the availability of space. They made their own way to their allocated unit, often accompanied by one of the reception orderlies.
- 1.13 There were no systems to identify the location of new prisoners, and handover procedures to ensure that staff coming on duty, particularly night staff, were aware of the locations and any special needs of new prisoners were underdeveloped. During our night visit, we found that officers working on the residential units were unaware of the locations of recently arrived prisoners.
- 1.14 There were no specific first night arrangements on residential units and there was little focus on safety for new prisoners. We observed that newly arrived prisoners were issued with a key to their cell and then left to their own devices for the rest of the day and night. Staff did not routinely interview new prisoners, and those we spoke to showed little awareness or interest in any possible anxiety associated with a prisoner's first night in a new prison.

Induction

- 1.15 All prisoners were issued with a written information pack when they arrived in reception. This was the foundation of the induction; it described the establishment's policies, procedures and rules and gave information about education and resettlement services and how to access them. This was supported by a voluntary induction surgery held by prison staff each Friday, where prisoners could get further information.
- 1.16 In reality, prisoners spent too much time in their first week with little to do. There was no schedule of induction events and little structure. Prisoners were called up to see key staff during their first week but were not always aware of these appointments and typically waited idly on residential units for a number of days.

Section 2: Environment and relationships

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions.

2.1 Living conditions were generally good but the modular temporary units were in need of refurbishment. The older accommodation was in good order. Communal areas were generally clean and well decorated but there were broken panes of glass in offices and on landings. Showers were in a reasonable state and access to them was good. Only enhanced prisoners could wear their own clothes, and even then there were too many restrictions on what was permissible. Young adults were located on two dedicated landings and they were not allowed to mix between them. Many prisoners said that they found it difficult to keep in touch with their family and friends by using telephones and the mail system.

Accommodation and facilities

- 2.2 Cells were in good condition. There was good natural light in the older living accommodation and reasonable light in the newer modular temporary units. They were all of a reasonable size and contained adequate furniture, and none was shared. Prisoners had keys to their cells but were required to hang them up in the offices on the older accommodation as a means of accounting for who was on the unit. This was a matter of concern to prisoners we spoke to, as keys had been taken and property stolen.
- 2.3 Prisoners who were more trusted, by virtue of the length of time they had been at the establishment and who were working out, tended to be located in the modular temporary units, D and E wings. These did not have integral sanitation but toilets and showers were available on each landing throughout the day and night. Young adults were located on two dedicated landings in the older accommodation and they were not allowed to mix between them.
- 2.4 Internal communal areas were in a reasonable state of repair but despite the very poor weather, panes of glass were broken in association areas and landings on the older wings and staff told us that they had been waiting for several weeks for the work to be done. The fabric of the modular temporary units was in poorer condition than the more robust, brick-built older units and there were many holes in the plaster board and parts of the wall covering missing. The association areas on D and E wings were less pleasant and less well used than those on A, B and C wings. Prisoners who worked out told us that they were happy just to relax in their cells after work.
- 2.5 The external communal areas had won awards, including Doncaster in Bloom most recently, but we were unable to see them owing to a thick carpet of snow covering the grounds during the inspection.
- 2.6 There was no in-cell emergency call bell system. Any requests for assistance had to be made in person but offices were fairly easily accessible. All prisoners had televisions in their cells. There was no policy covering the display of offensive material. The first night pack told

prisoners not to display sexually explicit material but 'page three'-type pictures were not excluded and were therefore on display in cells.

- 2.7 Prisoner forums had started to be held bimonthly from August 2010, when the new head of site had taken up post. The meetings had yet to develop into an effective tool for consultation. Minutes to date revealed a list of requests, some of which had been taken on board, but there had yet to be any evidence of discussion on how to take forward key issues such as reducing drug use and improving employment opportunities.
- 2.8 Residential units were calm and well ordered at night during the inspection. However, in our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that it was normally quiet enough for them to relax or sleep in their cells at night (68% compared with 79%). All prisoners had access to drinking water and kettles in the residential areas.
- 2.9 There were sufficient telephones available on all of the residential units and prisoners were able to use them until 10pm. There was no queuing system and prisoners used them on a first come, first served basis. However, prisoners told us that it was difficult to get access to the telephones because they were often busy, particularly on days when PIN telephone credit was issued. In our survey, 17% of respondents, against the 10% comparator, said that they had problems getting access to telephones.
- 2.10 All prisoners received one free letter a week. Five per cent of incoming mail was randomly checked, and in some public protection cases all mail was checked. All incoming mail was checked for enclosures. An 'email a prisoner' scheme was advertised throughout the establishment but we found few prisoners making use of this facility.
- 2.11 In our survey, 33% of prisoners, poorer than the 21% comparator, said that they had difficulty in sending or receiving mail.

Recommendations

- 2.12 Prisoners should be able to keep possession of their cell keys and an alternative method for roll-keeping introduced.
- 2.13 An offensive display policy should be introduced, publicised and policed.
- 2.14 D and E wings should be refurbished.
- 2.15 Prisoner forums should be developed into an effective tool for consultation and different groups should be consulted specifically about issues particular to them.
- 2.16 Prisoners should be able to rely on a prompt and efficient mail service.
- 2.17 Prisoners should have access to telephones at busy times of the week.
- 2.18 Prisoners should be encouraged to make greater use of the email service.

Clothing and possessions

- 2.19 Only prisoners on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme could wear their own clothes inside the prison and even this was prohibited before 4.30pm and on visits. Those on the standard level could not wear their own clothes at all, including on town

visits or for hospital appointments. The type and amount of clothing allowed, even for those who could wear their own clothes, was over-restrictive. Clothes could not be handed in by friends and family on visits, which further restricted what prisoners could afford to wear.

- 2.20 Prisoners were positive about being able to have their clothing cleaned, although only prisoners on D and E wings, which contained laundries, could do their own washing. Ironing boards and irons were available on the residential units. In our survey, more prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection (84% compared with 76%) said that they received clean sheets every week. Prisoners told us that the prison-issue clothing they were required to wear was often dirty, ill-fitting and in a poor state of repair.
- 2.21 In our survey, only 35% of prisoners, compared with 51% in other open prisons and 50% at the time of the previous inspection, said that they could access their stored property when they needed to. We received many complaints that items that had been allowed in other prisons had been removed from them on arrival at Hatfield. There was no generic list detailing the possessions allowed for open prisons but we were told that the Yorkshire and Humberside area office was in the process of compiling a list for the region, with an addendum of additional items allowed at the open prison. Volumetric property arrangements were used proportionately.

Recommendations

- 2.22 All prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes and these should be allowed to be brought in on visits.
- 2.23 Long-term prisoners should be able to do their own laundry.
- 2.24 A planned list creating consistency across Yorkshire and Humberside prisons of allowed possessions should be introduced and additional items allowed for prisoners at Hatfield.

Hygiene

- 2.25 The general prison environment was reasonably clean. There was evidence from the measuring the quality of prison life (MQPL) survey carried out in March 2010, and the prisoner forum notes, that cleanliness had been a concern, so this had clearly been addressed. The cells we saw were clean and most communal areas were also well kept. We were told that the cleaners resided on the unit that they were responsible for keeping clean, to promote investment in their role. Most cells we saw contained duvets and curtains.
- 2.26 Communal toilets and showers were available. The showers were in a reasonable state and accessible until 8.30pm on A, B and C wings, and all day and all night on D and E wings. Privacy was offered by separate cubicles and shower curtains on D and E wings and by separate cubicles on A, B and C wings. Toilets were accessible 24 hours a day. Prisoners with disabilities were more negative than their able-bodied counterparts about daily access to showers.

Staff–prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions. Healthy prisons should demonstrate a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of security, control and justice are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness.

- 2.27 Despite staff reporting good staff–prisoner relationships, prisoner perceptions were poor across the prison. Prisoners reported unfavourably against comparator prisons about being treated with respect and having someone they could approach if they had a problem. We observed some poor staff attitudes towards prisoners, as well as some positive interactions. Too many uniformed staff were aloof with prisoners and seen as unhelpful. On association, some staff mixed well with prisoners but most were based in offices.
- 2.28 There was a disjuncture between the views of staff and prisoners concerning the relationships between them. Staff generally felt that relationships with prisoners were good and did not recognise either the negative perception of prisoners in the MQPL survey earlier in 2010 or those in our survey. Some relationships clearly were good, with staff having a good understanding of their role, building relationships with prisoners and offering them support. However, others were negative towards prisoners and spoke of them generically and dismissively. They were mixed in their dealings with prisoners, with some clearly at ease with and respectful to them, while others were curt and abrupt. We mostly heard staff referring to prisoners by surname. Written use of names varied from the completely impersonal, to surnames, to first names. Prisoners in our groups complained of being treated disrespectfully and of petty rules being enforced. In our survey, fewer than the comparator and than at the time of the previous inspection (54% compared with 76% and 67%, respectively) said that most staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff they could turn to for support (64% compared with 76% and 74%, respectively). The ratio of staff to prisoners was low, which meant that even a minority of negative staff had a large influence on prisoners.
- 2.29 Staff had not received formal pro-social modelling training and some appeared to be unaware of the importance of modelling the behaviour they expected to see in others. Prisoners told us that staff broke rules that they then required prisoners to abide by, such as smoking inside. There were televisions in the offices. On association, we saw staff predominantly based in offices or on ground floors, rather than in the upstairs residential areas (see also section on security and rules), although we also saw some staff talking to prisoners.
- 2.30 There was insufficient emphasis on preparing prisoners for life beyond the prison gates and an over-restrictive approach towards rules and regulations, rather than supporting prisoners to take responsibility for themselves and their environment.
- 2.31 There was limited use of peer supporters and, where peers offered support, it was often informal. In spite of this, there was a good collegiate atmosphere and prisoners appeared to work collaboratively. The young adults had unelected spokesmen through whom they channelled concerns.

Recommendations

- 2.32 Joint training in pro-social modelling should be run for staff and prisoners.
- 2.33 The poor perceptions of prisoners about their treatment by staff should be explored and action taken on the findings.
- 2.34 There should be greater formal use of prisoners as peer supporters.
- 2.35 All staff should routinely use prisoners' titles and surnames or preferred names.

Personal officers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.36 All uniformed staff were personal officers and had a caseload randomly allocated to them. The personal officer scheme was largely ineffectual and prisoner perceptions of its value were generally poor, although some prisoners had regular contact, and reported good relationships, with their personal officers. Some staff we spoke to could give no information about those on their caseload and some history sheets contained no personal officer entries.
- 2.37 All staff were personal officers and prisoners were allocated to them randomly. Officers described light caseloads of around seven prisoners at any one time but staff rarely worked in the residential areas in which the prisoners in their care were located.
- 2.38 The scheme was largely ineffectual and depended on the motivation of the individual personal officer. In 10 out of 18 case notes we examined, there were no personal officer entries at all. Even where entries had been made, they were sporadic and most were just factual, about release on temporary licence or community visit approvals. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection (39% compared with 66% and 57%, respectively) said that they had a personal officer and fewer than at comparator prisons (63% compared with 77%) said that they found them helpful. Prisoners told us that their personal officers were unlikely to introduce themselves or spend time with them, although contact with some staff was regular and helpful and some prisoners reported good relationships with their personal officers.
- 2.39 Some personal officers we spoke to knew a reasonable amount about the prisoners on their caseload but others appeared to have no knowledge of those in their care. Most personal officer involvement was limited to completing relevant paperwork. There was little evidence, either in files or in conversation with officers, of involvement in supporting prisoners' resettlement in the community. None of the wing history sheets we sampled showed any engagement by the personal officer in family issues and few staff we spoke to knew about prisoners' personal circumstances. There was no evidence of managerial commitment to the scheme and we saw no evidence of any management checks.

Recommendations

- 2.40 The personal officer scheme should be evaluated and lessons drawn to design and deliver an effective scheme.
- 2.41 All personal officers should introduce themselves and get to know the prisoners on their caseload.
- 2.42 There should be clear management support for the personal officer scheme, including regular, effective management checks which lead to action when weaknesses are identified.

Section 3: Duty of care

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1 Most prisoners reported that they felt safe but many said that they felt intimidated by staff. The anti-bullying/violence reduction strategy was not specific to the needs of an open prison and staff were not aware of relevant issues.
- 3.2 A single homogenised violence reduction policy had been published for Moorland and Hatfield but it was based exclusively on an ongoing analysis of the pattern of recorded and suspected violence at Moorland. Although it explained the principles, procedures and management arrangements that underpinned the strategy for both prisons, it clearly emphasised issues at Moorland and set out the responsibilities of staff and managers there. Interventions described in the overarching policy document were not relevant to Hatfield, and the structures described in the three-stage strategy to deal with bullying behaviour using the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme combined with segregation were not workable in the open prison.
- 3.3 A violence reduction coordinator had been appointed at Hatfield and he attended the safer prisons meetings at Moorland. In reality, Hatfield was treated as an addendum at these meetings and nearly all of the issues discussed there were specific to Moorland.
- 3.4 Staff awareness of bullying and the anti-bullying procedures was generally poor. There was little evidence that bullying issues were picked up by staff or that inappropriate behaviour was identified. We observed that staff did not often walk about the communal corridors or living areas of residential units and that their level of engagement with prisoners was poor (see also section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- 3.5 Levels of violence were low. In our survey, only 6% of respondents said that they felt unsafe. However, 22% said that they had felt intimidated or threatened by staff, which was worse than the 14% comparator. Consultation with prisoners in this area was underdeveloped, as was prisoner consultation generally (see section on residential units).

Recommendations

- 3.6 A violence reduction and anti-bullying strategy, based on an analysis of the pattern of bullying specific to Hatfield, should be introduced. It should be further informed through prisoner consultation, including a prisoner survey.
- 3.7 Staff should receive anti-bullying training.
- 3.8 Staff supervision of residential areas should improve.

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.9 The suicide prevention policy was not properly understood by staff and the Listeners scheme was not sufficiently supported. Although there had been no recent incidents of self-harm, systems to support prisoners in crisis were underdeveloped.
- 3.10 A suicide prevention and self-harm management policy had been published that covered both Moorland and Hatfield. Although its content was fairly comprehensive in terms of general explanations about self-harming behaviour and Prison Service Instructions concerning the management of prisoners with self-harming thoughts, it was not specific to Hatfield and some of its content had not been implemented there. A statement of local policy had not been published and copies of the generic policy were not found on any of the residential units.
- 3.11 The violence reduction coordinator also acted as the suicide prevention coordinator (safer prisons coordinator). Although his role was familiar to staff, prisoners we spoke to had little knowledge of it. The monthly safer prisons meeting was attended by the coordinator but not by a range of staff or managers, or by Listeners. Minutes of meetings showed that discussions there were exclusively about issues at Moorland.
- 3.12 The Listener group was small (three at the time of the inspection), and there was no rota for them. They did not play a role in staff or prisoner induction and prisoners we spoke to did not know who they were; they told us that if they wanted to speak to a Listener, they would ask a fellow prisoner from the same unit to fetch one. In our survey, only 3% of respondents, against the 35% comparator, said that they had met a Listener or a member of the Samaritans on the day of their arrival, and only 13%, against the 66% comparator, said that they were able to speak to a Listener if they wanted to.
- 3.13 Despite this, there had been no incidents of self-harm in 12 months before the inspection and the number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents opened was small. Although we were unable to analyse recorded incidents and there were no aggregated data for patterns and trends, our observations showed that staff had little insight about potential problem areas.

Recommendations

- 3.14 A suicide prevention policy document specific to the needs of Hatfield should be developed and promoted around the prison.
- 3.15 The safer prisons meeting should be better attended by a range of staff, including Listeners, and the meeting should cover issues relevant to Hatfield.

- 3.16 The Listeners scheme should be properly supported and advertised better through the prison.

Applications and complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.17 Few prisoners said that applications and complaints were dealt with fairly or promptly. Neither applications nor complaints were tracked to confirm that an outcome had been achieved. We had concerns about the impartiality of staff opening the complaints box and too many prisoners said that their complaints went missing. Some replies to complaints were incomplete.
- 3.18 In our survey, almost all prisoners said that it was easy to get an application form and most had made an application. However, only 49% said that they were dealt with fairly and 48% that they were dealt with promptly, both of which were considerably worse than the comparators of 76% and 71%, respectively, and than the figures obtained at the time of the previous inspection (66% and 62%, respectively).
- 3.19 Applications were logged in the wing book but there was no evidence of tracking outcomes, and some prisoners said that they had completed a number of applications about the same subject before receiving a response. There was no complaints policy.
- 3.20 Seventy-nine per cent of respondents to our survey said that it was easy to get a complaint form, against the 86% comparator. Yellow complaint boxes were available on each wing. Envelopes were provided, so that complaints could be submitted confidentially. Just over 200 complaints had been made in 2010 to date – 185 by adults and 22 by young adults. Prison data suggested that all but two had received a reply within three days. However, only 18% of respondents to our survey, against the 44% comparator and 55% at the time of the previous inspection, said that complaints were dealt with fairly, and 22%, against the 51% comparator and 53% at the time of the previous inspection, that they were dealt with promptly. Far fewer prisoners had made a complaint than at the time of the previous inspection, which may have reflected their lack of confidence in the system. Prisoners we spoke to said that they often did not receive a reply to their applications or complaints. Only 10% of prisoners said that they had been told how to make an appeal.
- 3.21 Complaints were quality assured on a 10% sampling basis each month by the deputy governor. She had reviewed 14 complaints in the previous month from Moorland and Hatfield. Six had not received a comprehensive response. The level of complaints from black and minority ethnic prisoners was monitored through Systematic Monitoring and Analysing of Race Equality Template (SMART) data. This was discussed at the bimonthly race equality meeting and the safer prisons meeting but there was little evidence of positive outcomes.
- 3.22 The system of complaints being collected by the night orderly officer and the operational support grade had been introduced in 2005 as an interim measure, pending a review of administration. However, this was still in place at the time of the inspection. We had concerns about the impartiality of staff opening the complaints box and too many prisoners said that their complaints went missing.

- 3.23 Applications to the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) across both Hatfield and Moorland totalled 613 for 2008/09, 471 in 2009/10 and 119 in the year to date. The most common reasons for applying to the IMB over the previous three years involved property, sentence-related issues and transfers. The IMB had a rota of visits, with each house block being visited four times a year and some aspects – for example, catering – checked weekly. Only 23% of prisoners replying to our survey said that it was easy to see the IMB, against the 45% comparator and 49% at the time of the previous inspection.

Recommendations

- 3.24 The application and complaint systems should be improved to increase prisoner confidence in them.
- 3.25 Replies to complaints should be comprehensive and fully address the issues.

Housekeeping point

- 3.26 Responses to applications should be tracked and followed up if not received.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.27 Limited staff time was allocated to the provision of legal services but there was no backlog of applications. Monitoring of the number and type of requests was not undertaken.
- 3.28 Two members of staff were allocated a small number of hours per week for the provision of legal services. The focus of the work was therefore limited but covered the main needs of prisoners and there was no backlog of applications. A leaflet advertising the services was available on the wings, with more detailed information kept in the library. Applications were logged, including the reason, but no formal monitoring of the number or type of requests was undertaken.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.29 The Moorland-based team attended to carry out statutory duties and to carry out worship sessions. More prisoners than at other open prisons said that their religious beliefs were not respected and that they could not access a religious leader of their faith in private.

- 3.30 The most recent monitoring data showed that 32% of prisoners had no religion. Of the remainder, the main denominations were Anglican, Muslim, Roman Catholic and Sikh. Most prisoners we spoke to were positive about the chaplaincy team, although in our survey only 44% of prisoners, against the 58% comparator, said that their religious beliefs were respected, and only 40%, against the 64% comparator, that they had private access to religious leaders. Fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons and that at the time of the previous inspection said that they had access to a minister of their faith within the first 24 hours (30% versus 45% and 53%). The experiences of black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were more positive, with 61% and 72% of prisoners, respectively, saying that their religious beliefs were respected.
- 3.31 The chaplaincy team was based at the nearby Moorland prison; it consisted of four whole-time-equivalent staff and was led by the full-time Anglican coordinating chaplain, supported by a multi-denominational team, although there was no Buddhist minister. The process of applying for access to the chapel was relatively simple and there were no restrictions on the number of prisoners that could attend for worship. Some prisoners (mainly Sikh) took the opportunity to worship in the community while released on temporary licence.
- 3.32 Anglican services were timed to allow the minister to lead the main worship before leaving to lead the services at Moorland. Muslim classes and services were held on Tuesdays and Fridays and were led by one of the two Muslim chaplains. The duty chaplain attended all areas in support of pastoral care but there was little community engagement.

Recommendations

- 3.33 Prisoners should be seen by a member of the chaplaincy team within 24 hours of arrival.
- 3.34 Prisoners' negative perception of respect for religious beliefs should be explored and action taken where appropriate.

Substance use

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.35 Prisoners could continue methadone treatment at the establishment and their treatment was reviewed regularly, but clinical substance misuse nurses and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) workers did not provide a coordinated service. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) figures were high and there was no risk assessment MDT programme in place.

Clinical management

- 3.36 The integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) was well established and prisoners could continue their methadone regime. At the time of the inspection, only three prisoners were being prescribed methadone – one on a reducing and two on a maintenance basis.

- 3.37 IDTS was provided by the clinical team based at Moorland and comprehensive clinical management protocols had been developed. Methadone was administered from the health care department by an IDTS and a general nurse. Regular treatment reviews were undertaken by the IDTS GP following nurse triage. Substance misuse nurses liaised with counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) workers but individual care plans were not shared and treatment reviews were rarely conducted jointly.
- 3.38 CARAT workers offered structured one-to-one support to prisoners receiving methadone treatment. Any prisoners requiring secondary detoxification could access this, and appropriate protocols were in place, but this happened rarely. Treatment options also included the opiate blocker naltrexone, which could be prescribed before release.
- 3.39 Throughcare links with community agencies were well developed and there were no problems in ensuring treatment continuity on release. IDTS nurses provided each prisoner with a safety care plan to prevent the risk of overdose.

Recommendation

- 3.40 **Clinical substance misuse and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services should undertake joint care planning and treatment reviews.**

Drug testing

- 3.41 Only 5% of the population were tested under the random mandatory drug testing (MDT) programme, and MDT fell under the auspices of the drug strategy rather than the security department. The random MDT rate was high, averaging 18.1% in the first seven months of 2010, against an annual target of 9%, and it had been as high as 28.5%. Suspicion tests resulted in an over 60% positive rate, pointing towards good security information and prompt testing. Testing was conducted by reception officers and facilities were satisfactory.
- 3.42 All prisoners who tested positive received a repeat risk assessment and were referred to the CARAT service; only class A drug use resulted in removal to a closed site.
- 3.43 There was no risk or a frequent testing programme in place and compliance testing (previously conducted as part of the voluntary drug testing scheme) had ceased in line with regional policy. The main drug of use was cannabis but there had also been several finds of anabolic steroids and injecting equipment. Health services staff ensured that safe disposal facilities were available to prisoners.
- 3.44 The drug strategy manager, rather than the security department, had been tasked with developing a supply reduction action plan for both Hatfield and Moorland.
- 3.45 The establishment also carried out alcohol testing, which could be undertaken when prisoners returned from release on temporary licence. Those who failed the test were referred to the alcohol worker.

Recommendations

- 3.46 **The establishment should introduce a risk assessment and a frequent testing programme.**

3.47 The security department should develop and implement a supply reduction action plan.

Section 4: Diversity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 There were no Hatfield-specific policies covering any of the diversity strands and we found no evidence of any proactive support work for prisoners with diverse needs.
- 4.2 The race and equalities policy, meeting and strategy had been drawn up in accordance with the requirements at Moorland, despite the differences in the population from the closed Moorland site. There was no reference to Hatfield in the race and equalities action plan, which had no strategic focus, with little or no attention given to addressing the needs of prisoners in relation to diversity.
- 4.3 The race equalities manager (REM) was based at Moorland and, although there was an officer with some profiled time to support him at Hatfield, we found no evidence of any proactive support work for prisoners with diverse needs.

Recommendation

- 4.4 There should be a complete overhaul of the race and equalities strategy and policy, to take into account the specific needs of prisoners at Hatfield and address all the strands of diversity, with a race equality action plan formulated to support them.

Race equality

- 4.5 Only one racist incident report form had been submitted at the time of the inspection and prisoners had little faith in the system. The poor experience of some prisoners had not been identified by the race and equalities team. There were three prisoner race representatives but they were unclear of their role.
- 4.6 Nearly 25% of prisoners were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. Responses to our survey by this group were largely poor in relation to victimisation, safety on the first night, reception searching and access to work and health care.
- 4.7 The race equality data were reviewed at bimonthly meetings, although these were not Hatfield specific and resulted in no action at the site.
- 4.8 There were three prisoner race representatives but they were unclear of their role, with one of the prisoners being adamant that he represented only black prisoners. We were told by some prisoners (both black and minority ethnic and white) that access to outside working and other popular work places was difficult to attain for black prisoners. There was no analysis of access to work or other regime activities by race or religion that could either support or disprove this theory.

- 4.9 Black and minority ethnic prisoners we spoke to had little faith in the allocation of work and felt that they were discriminated against.
- 4.10 Around 1% of prisoners (two) had declared themselves as being from Gypsy or Traveller backgrounds but there was no support available to them.

Managing racist incidents

- 4.11 Only one racist incident report form (RIRF) had been submitted in the year to date, against a full-year total of 14 in 2009. Prisoners we spoke to on the residential units reported having little or no faith in the RIRF system and were concerned that they would be transferred out of open conditions if they complained.
- 4.12 Quality assurance of RIRFs was carried out as part of a tripartite arrangement (at Moorland) with other prisons in the area, which included representatives of external agencies and prisoners from the hosting establishment.

Race equality duty

- 4.13 The race equality impact assessment system had been updated to the new NOMS Equality Impact Assessment Tool (NEIAT). To date, three areas had been identified at the race and equalities meeting: access to release on temporary licence (ROTL), access to ROTL for prisoners with mobility issues and access to complaints. They were completed at Moorland and covered both sites, so were not specific to Hatfield.
- 4.14 There were no specific data relating to staff training in race and diversity at Hatfield, although staff were not cross-deployed between the sites; the overall figure (Moorland and Hatfield) was around 25%, which was low.
- 4.15 Celebration of cultural events was limited and consisted of a written quiz, a Caribbean meal option, a display in the library for Black History Month, and a display in the library with one food selection per week on the menu for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller month.
- 4.16 There was no evidence of consultation with black and minority ethnic prisoners about issues specific to them (see recommendation 2.15).

Recommendations

- 4.17 **Regular Systematic Monitoring and Analysing of Race Equality Template (SMART) data specific to Hatfield should be produced and used to monitor and ensure equality of access to regime provision by both race and religion.**
- 4.18 **The role of the prisoner race representatives should be made clear and they should be supported in their work.**
- 4.19 **Staff at Hatfield should have the training and capacity to ensure that all areas of diversity are supported.**
- 4.20 **Managers should explore the reasons for prisoners' lack of faith in the racist incident reporting system and take action accordingly.**

- 4.21 Staff should be appropriately trained in race and diversity.
- 4.22 Impact assessments should be specific to HMP Hatfield.
- 4.23 Prisoners should be encouraged to celebrate their own culture and heritage and understand and respect that of others as part of the communal life of the prison.

Religion

- 4.24 There was no monitoring of treatment of prisoners by religion and no specific policy or action plan to ensure equal access to regime activities.
- 4.25 There was no specific policy or action plan relating to religion and there were no Hatfield-specific SMART data available to measure access to regime activities by religion (see recommendation 4.17).

Foreign nationals

- 4.26 There was a foreign national policy but this was not specific to Hatfield and was out of date. The race equalities manager was responsible for the management of foreign nationals. There were no focus groups and there was no active foreign nationals committee.
- 4.27 Only around 2% of the population (five) were foreign national prisoners. We were told that the criteria set for foreign national prisoners to remain at Hatfield included the requirement that the UK Border Agency (UKBA) had declared no interest in them.
- 4.28 There was a foreign national policy but this was not specific to Hatfield and was out of date. There had been no needs analysis completed to identify how foreign national prisoners could be further supported.
- 4.29 The REM from Moorland was the designated foreign nationals officer and there was also an officer at Hatfield who assisted him in dealing with foreign national issues as they arose.
- 4.30 We were told that there were no non-English speakers in custody at the establishment at the time of the inspection but we came across an older Pakistani prisoner who had difficulty in expressing himself in English and relied on other prisoners to help in dealing with issues such as health care, ordering meals and the shop.
- 4.31 Professional interpreting services were available but we found no evidence of their use.

Recommendations

- 4.32 There should be a Hatfield-specific foreign nationals policy/strategy, informed by an up-to-date needs analysis.
- 4.33 The needs of individual foreign national prisoners should be identified and appropriate culturally sensitive support provided from within the prison or the local community.

Disability and older prisoners

- 4.34 There was no monitoring or assessment process and there were no care plans in place for older prisoners or those with disabilities. Any support given to these prisoners was informally offered. There was no specific disabilities committee and no focus groups had been held to identify and discuss the needs of older prisoners or those with disabilities.
- 4.35 The REM from Moorland carried out the role of liaison officer for older prisoners and those with disabilities.
- 4.36 There were 24 prisoners over the age of 50 at the establishment at the time of the inspection, 11 of whom were over 60. There was no special accommodation unit for older prisoners, no monitoring or assessment process and there were no care plans in place, either for this group or for those with disabilities. There was no system for social care to be provided by paid prisoners. Any support given to older prisoners or those with disabilities was informally offered. Night staff were unaware of any specific needs for this group and told us that in the event of a fire they would simply clear units entirely.
- 4.37 Some older prisoners told us that they were not issued with coats because they did not work outside, and were not allowed to wear hats, despite the blizzard conditions at the time. Older prisoners also told us that they found the cells damp and cold, as they had to leave the windows open during the day to prevent condensation forming.
- 4.38 One retired prisoner we interviewed, who was 68 years of age, told us that he was charged each week for his television despite having no wage. Older prisoners were allowed to attend the remedial gym session but this was on request and not part of any well-man or health support scheme.
- 4.39 Facilities for prisoners with disabilities were limited and there were no specially adapted cells. The site was readily accessible by prisoners with mobility problems, and accommodation was available at ground level. However, awareness of prisoners with particular needs was limited; there was no system for identifying and supporting such prisoners and staff did not have a comprehensive understanding of their needs. There was no specific disabilities committee and no focus groups had been held to identify and discuss the needs of older prisoners or those with disabilities (see recommendation 2.15).

Recommendations

- 4.40 All older prisoners and those with disabilities should be assessed to establish the requirements for individual care plans, which should be regularly updated.
- 4.41 There should be an appropriate support scheme for older prisoners where required.
- 4.42 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be in place for all relevant prisoners, and all staff made aware of procedures relating to them.
- 4.43 Prisoners should be issued with clothing appropriate to the weather conditions, regardless of where they work.
- 4.44 Retired prisoners should not have to pay for their televisions.

Gender and sexual orientation

- 4.45 Sexual orientation was not identified in the main equalities policy and consideration of gender was restricted to a series of definitions. Staff awareness of the needs of gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners was very limited.
- 4.46 There was no formal support for gay or bisexual prisoners and no sexuality awareness information on any of the residential units. Staff awareness of gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners was very limited. The previous HMIP report had referred to plans to provide support for gay and/or bisexual prisoners but these had yet to be introduced at the close of 2010.
- 4.47 The equalities policy provided a long list of definitions but did not include how prisoners presenting with gender issues would be supported.

Recommendation

- 4.48 There should be a clear policy for the management of prisoners presenting with gay, bisexual and gender (including transgender) issues, and this should be publicised on residential units.

Section 5: Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

- 5.1 The health services provided were functional but the health centre required modernisation and the flooring and sinks did not meet infection control standards. Clinical governance arrangements were sound. There was a range of appropriate clinics for primary care and lifelong conditions. The waiting time to see a physiotherapist was too long. Prisoners generally received good pharmacy and dentistry services, although there was poor access to the dentist. There were gaps in psychological services and group therapies.

General

- 5.2 Health services were provided by Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust (Notts NHS) and were commissioned by Doncaster Primary Care Trust. Health service provision operated as a satellite service to that offered at HMP Moorland and was managed by the Moorland health centre clinical nurse manager/matron. Relationships between the prison, commissioner and provider were said to be good.
- 5.3 Bimonthly partnership board meetings for Hatfield and Moorland prisons combined were well attended. The Department of Health prison health quality and performance indicators were used as part of the prison health development plan. There had been no health needs analysis.
- 5.4 The health centre was located on the periphery of the prison, in a stand-alone building. It was dated in appearance but was in a good state of decoration and regularly cleaned. There were two consultation rooms, a treatment room and a clinical records store. There was also an inpatient area that was no longer in use. The waiting area was small and contained uncomfortable wooden slatted bench seating. The flooring and sinks in the health centre did not meet infection control standards.
- 5.5 Lone working in the health centre was standard practice for portions of the working day, and at the time of the inspection the nurse on duty was working alone. The geography of the prison and layout of the health centre meant that lone workers were isolated. Although the nurse on duty carried a radio, we were told that, occasionally, staff members felt vulnerable.
- 5.6 We observed friendly interactions between the prisoners, the part-time orderly and staff. The health centre manager/matron at HMP Moorlands was the lead for the care of older adults at Hatfield.
- 5.7 On arrival at the establishment, prisoners were given information about how to access health services, and this was contained in the induction booklet.

Recommendations

- 5.8 There should be a health needs analysis.

- 5.9 The flooring and sinks in the health centre should meet infection control standards.
- 5.10 The personal safety of lone workers in the health centre should be subject to risk assessment.

Housekeeping point

- 5.11 Bench seating in the waiting area should be replaced with more comfortable seating.

Clinical governance

- 5.12 There were regular clinical governance meetings for Moorland and Hatfield prisons combined. Meetings were minuted and well attended.
- 5.13 Nursing staff from HMP Moorland worked at Hatfield on a rotational basis. GPs and allied health professionals worked on a sessional basis. Nurses had access to clinical supervision at HMP Moorland. Nurses told us that there had been a recent lack of training but that they were now being offered training opportunities from the Notts NHS training department brochure.
- 5.14 Resuscitation equipment, an emergency anaphylaxis pack and an automatic external defibrillator were available in the health centre. The equipment was regularly checked. Not all nurses who work at Hatfield were in date for resuscitation training. The equipment was unavailable for use out of hours. Uniformed officers relied on the public emergency services during these times.
- 5.15 The electronic clinical record system SystemOne was in use; it was live-linked to the computer system at HMP Moorland, from which most prisoner transfers occurred. Archived (paper) clinical records were stored in compliance with the Data Protection Act and Caldicott principles. Several clinical audits had been completed in 2010 for Hatfield and Moorland prisons combined.
- 5.16 There was no prisoner health forum. The service was in transition from using the established complaints system to adopting the Notts NHS patient advice and liaison service. Written complaints concerning care and treatment were infrequent; most prisoner concerns were dealt with face to face.
- 5.17 Notts NHS policies and guidance on the control of communicable diseases and the Nottinghamshire health and social care agencies information-sharing procedure and protocol were in use.

Recommendations

- 5.18 All registered nurses should receive training in resuscitation at least annually.
- 5.19 Resuscitation and automatic defibrillation equipment should be available throughout the 24-hour period, and staff should be trained in its use.
- 5.20 There should be a patient forum that is representative of the prison population.

Primary care

- 5.21 In our survey, the overall quality of health services was rated less favourably than by prisoners at comparator open prisons (40% versus 69%). Some prisoners we spoke to complained about delays to the supply of repeat medications. Others told us that health care was an accessible and helpful department.
- 5.22 A prisoner's arrival was planned in advance and a visit to the health centre was part of the reception process. Prisoners received an initial health screening, with enhanced questions related to lifelong conditions. Most prisoners brought with them extensive medical records from the feeder prisons. Prisoners with ongoing medical needs were seen by a GP. Secondary assessment occurred in primary care clinics or long-term condition reviews following reception. Health services were available from 7.45am to 7.30pm on weekdays. There were special sick clinics on weekend mornings. Out-of-hours cover was provided by a local GP practice, which was said to be supportive.
- 5.23 Health promotion materials were on display in the health centre. There was no health promotion group. Vaccinations were available as clinically indicated and the availability of the 'flu vaccine was being advertised at the time of the inspection. Barrier protection was available to prisoners only at the time of their release.
- 5.24 There was a timetable of regular primary care, lifelong condition and specialist clinics. These included long-term condition review clinics, physiotherapy, podiatry, optometry, smoking cessation and vaccination clinics. The waiting time to see the physiotherapist was too long, at 16 weeks. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons told us that it was easy to see a doctor (52% against 62%). However, GP clinics occurred three times a week and appointments were available within 72 hours, following nurse triage. Serco (the previous health care provider) triage algorithms were available but nurses were not familiar with them and used their experience to perform triage.
- 5.25 To access health services, prisoners self-referred at the health centre in the morning and were seen by the nurse or given an appointment. Prisoners could also access services by completing a written application form, which was posted to the health centre. Failure to attend for appointments was a rare occurrence but when it happened it was followed up with a repeat appointment.

Recommendations

- 5.26 There should be a health promotion group.
- 5.27 Barrier protection should be freely available to all prisoners.
- 5.28 Waiting times to see a physiotherapist should be reduced.
- 5.29 Staff should be trained in the use of triage algorithms.

Pharmacy

- 5.30 Pharmacy supplies were held in a locked cabinet in the treatment room. Standard operating procedures and policy documents developed for Moorland and Hatfield prisons were in use.

Heat-sensitive products were stored in a refrigerator, which was equipped with a maximum/minimum thermometer. Temperatures were checked daily and a record was maintained. Nurses provided the pharmacy service at the time of the inspection; a pharmacy technician had been recruited but had not yet started.

- 5.31 Medicines were supplied from the health centre treatment room via a gated doorway. Most prisoners had medication in possession. Some received medications administered by nurses from stock. Medicines administration occurred in the morning, at lunchtime and in the evening. There was no audit of general stock usage. A limited number of medicines were available to supply as special sick. There were no patient group directions, so only medication which could be bought in general stores could be supplied. There was appropriate provision of medication for patients being discharged or transferred.
- 5.32 A medicines and therapeutics committee for Hatfield and Moorland prisons met regularly but did not routinely receive aggregated prescribing data. There was a formulary in use.
- 5.33 Nurses re-ordered stock items by faxing copies of prescriptions to the supplier for dispensing. Ordered medicines were usually received later the same day. There was no system to audit the faxed prescriptions against the original prescriptions held at the prison. Medicine stocks were checked weekly by nursing staff.

Recommendations

- 5.34 Use of general stock should be audited, so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions and agreed stock levels.
- 5.35 The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the special sick policy, to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied.
- 5.36 Patient group directions should be produced, to allow the supply of more potent medicines by the nursing staff, where appropriate.
- 5.37 Prescribing data should be collated and used to demonstrate value for money, and to promote effective medicines management.
- 5.38 The fax system for ordering re-ordering medications should be subject to audit.

Dentistry

- 5.39 Prisoners requiring the attention of a dentist made use of the service at HMP Moorland. Staff told us that the nearest community dental service was in a town some distance away and that public transport was infrequent. The waiting time to see a dentist was six weeks, with a maximum of 43 weeks for follow-up; these wait times were substantially longer than those at HMP Moorland (six days, with a maximum of eight weeks for follow-up), although urgent appointments could be obtained. Our survey showed that fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons found it easy to see a dentist (8% against 31%).

Recommendation

- 5.40 Prisoners should have prompt access to dental services and at least have equivalence with prisoners at HMP Moorland.

Secondary care

- 5.41 Prisoners had good access to secondary care appointments. They used public transport to attend appointments, or the prison driver was available to assist prisoners who required it. Where possible, staff avoided arranging secondary care appointments during prisoners' home leave times. Ongoing care was coordinated with secondary services in the prisoner's home area, to ensure continuity post-release.

Mental health

- 5.42 Primary and secondary mental health services were provided by Notts NHS. We were told that training in mental health awareness was available for uniformed officers via HMP Moorland training services but we were not provided with any evidence that training had been delivered.
- 5.43 In our survey, a similar number of prisoners with emotional well-being issues as at comparator prisons rated the service as good, except for access to a counsellor (0% against 10%). More such prisoners than at comparator prisons rated GPs as helpful (53% against 36%).
- 5.44 Mental health primary care staff saw prisoners with mental illnesses individually, as did chaplaincy staff (who offered bereavement and loss counselling). Primary care mental health nurses held a weekly clinic but also saw prisoners individually at other times. Community support workers from MIND visited weekly and prisoners had access to self-help activities. Improving access to psychological therapies (IAPT) services were to be supplied as part of the new provider contract but had not yet started. There were no therapeutic group support opportunities.
- 5.45 Members of the mental health in-reach team saw clients individually, and the forensic psychiatrist visited to review the treatment of individual prisoners as required. The in-reach team coordinated care with community agencies and arranged appointments for those who might benefit from being assessed by NHS mental health services. NHS transfers, although rare, occurred within target transfer times.

Recommendations

- 5.46 Uniformed staff should have the training to recognise and take appropriate action when a prisoner may have mental health problems.
- 5.47 Group therapies should be available to prisoners who need support for emotional and mental health problems.

Section 6: Activities

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

6.1 The management of learning and skills was good and there was effective partnership working between the different functions in the prison. Quality improvement processes were effective in bringing about improvement but there was insufficient observation of teaching and learning in vocational training. Activity places met the demands of the population. The management of programmes in education, vocational training and outwork provided an effective progression route for prisoners and developed their skills well. There were insufficient external paid work placements. The range of vocational training was limited but the quality of what was offered was good. An extensive range of personal and social development courses was offered. Achievement of qualifications was generally good. Teaching and learning were well planned. The library offered satisfactory facilities but opening times were too limited.

Leadership and management

- 6.2 The prison structure placed all learning and skills and regime activities under the management of the head of learning and skills, providing a coherent approach to planning all work, training and education.
- 6.3 Partnership working between Manchester College and the prison was well developed. Courses were well planned and managed. Shared processes, such as the management of awarding body verification visits and shared staff training to improve staff skills, had improved the provision, reducing duplication of effort and ultimately saving on costs. Staff training in safeguarding had recently taken place and this had included library and education orderlies and peer mentors. Partnership working with other prisons was helping to develop provision. In horticulture, staff from regional prisons met regularly to share expertise and develop programmes.
- 6.4 Quality improvement processes were good overall. The self-assessment process was well embedded and the resulting report reflected most of the strengths and areas for improvement in the provision. The quality improvement group meetings were well attended and dealt effectively with operational issues. Data systems had improved and prison data were recorded in the same format as for the education provision. However, data were not input in a timely way. For example, no outcomes were recorded for vocational training catering courses and some data were incorrect. Data were not used sufficiently well for quality improvement and to inform planning. Learners' and employers' views were not systematically sought to inform improvements to provision.

- 6.5 The observation of teaching and learning processes was well developed but in workshops and PE, where accredited training was offered, it was not quality assured and best practice was not identified and shared or poor performance identified and improved.

Recommendations

- 6.6 Data should be input more efficiently, checked for accuracy and used to inform quality improvement and planning.
- 6.7 Systems should be developed to gain the views of prisoners and employers, to inform planning.
- 6.8 Quality improvement activities should be systematically applied to ensure that all vocational instructors are included in the observation of teaching and learning processes.

Induction

- 6.9 The education induction attended by all prisoners was satisfactory and provided information on the courses and activities available. The careers information and advice service (CIAS) was provided by Working Links. Group and individual interviews were carried out by CIAS workers to review prisoners' training, skills and work history and to establish new objectives for training and work.

Work

- 6.10 There were sufficient places for all prisoners who were available to access work or education activities. The prison provided a realistic range of activities, including work in the gardens, industrial cleaning, the kitchen, residential cleaning, recycling, painting, the stores and as orderlies. However, the work skills that prisoners developed were not accredited. Those engaging in learning and skills received lower wages than those in other work areas, acting as a disincentive to undertake courses.
- 6.11 At the time of the inspection, 97 prisoners were working out on community projects or in paid employment but there were insufficient external paid work placements (see section on resettlement pathways).
- 6.12 The progression route for prisoners through education, community projects and into employment was well planned and managed and instilled a good work ethic. Prisoners were allocated to work and other activities at a weekly labour allocation meeting.

Recommendations

- 6.13 Work skills developed through activities should be accredited.
- 6.14 The pay structure should be improved, to ensure that those on learning and skills courses are not on less pay than those in work activities.

Vocational training

- 6.15 A limited range of vocational training was available and there were 34 prisoners on vocationally related courses at the time of the inspection. Training in horticulture and industrial cleaning had recently started and, with the addition of catering, provided well-structured training, although the range of provision in industrial cleaning programmes was limited and did not offer sufficient opportunities for progression. Materials and equipment were to industry standards. Training was well planned and instructors provided support to enable prisoners to achieve their qualifications, and they made satisfactory progress. Retention rates on catering courses were generally good but no achievement had been recorded, so no prisoners had attained any qualifications to date. Prisoners on the horticulture and gardens party were given responsibility for different areas in the prison, which encouraged ownership and developed pride in their work and training.

Recommendations

- 6.16 **The level and range of qualifications in industrial cleaning programmes should be increased.**
- 6.17 **Achievements on catering courses should be recorded so qualifications can be achieved.**

Education

- 6.18 Manchester College provided places for 65 prisoners. The range of information and communications technology (ICT) and literacy and numeracy courses was satisfactory. The range of personal and social development courses was extensive and included assertiveness and decision making, victim awareness, drug and alcohol misuse and a wide range of visual arts programmes. During the inspection, around 22% of the prison population were enrolled on courses and the average class attendance rate was 70%.
- 6.19 Achievement rates were high on most courses, with prisoners completing their courses on time. Overall pass rates were satisfactory for literacy and numeracy courses but low on entry level literacy and level 1 numeracy.
- 6.20 The quality of teaching and learning was good. Teachers planned their sessions well, and paid good attention to checking prisoners' knowledge and understanding. Progress made during teaching sessions was good and well recorded. Teachers provided effective individual coaching and support, and timely and constructive guidance. Resources were satisfactory and well used by prisoners. Six peer mentors enthusiastically supported education staff and prisoners during their studies.

Recommendations

- 6.21 **Classroom attendance should be improved.**
- 6.22 **The pass rates for entry level literacy and level 1 numeracy courses should be increased.**

Library

- 6.23 Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council provided the library service. The library was managed and operated by a library manager, a library assistant and three orderlies. The library manager also managed library provision at Moorland and Lindholme. The library was situated in the education block, where it was easily accessible to prisoners attending education courses. All prisoners received an induction to the facilities.
- 6.24 The library was small but well planned and provided a satisfactory environment in which to read, study or seek information on a range of learning opportunities. A satisfactory range of easy reading-, audio- and illustrated books was available. The range of magazines and local and national newspapers was limited. The foreign national book stock was small but prisoners could order a range of books through the library service. There was a full range of Prison Service Orders and these were updated regularly. The selection of relevant textbooks to support the development of work-related skills in the prison was satisfactory. Four computers were available for the use of prisoners in a range of activities.
- 6.25 Access to the library for all prisoners was limited. The recent addition of an evening session had extended the opening hours to 17 hours each week but this was still insufficient. The library was closed on three mornings, two afternoons and three evenings a week, and at the weekend.
- 6.26 The library actively promoted a range of activities, including reading champions, a reading group and library focus groups. The Toe by Toe reading scheme had recently been introduced but few prisoners were participating at the time of the inspection.

Recommendations

- 6.27 The range of newspapers and magazines should be increased.
- 6.28 Access to the library should be improved by extending the opening hours further.

Physical education and health promotion

Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.29 Prisoners had open access to recreational PE. Indoor facilities were reasonable but ageing. Two full-size football pitches and an Astroturf cricket facility provided good facilities for outdoor team games. The range of remedial programmes and the promotion of health and well-being through PE were good. Achievement rates were high on the limited number of vocational courses offered.
- 6.30 The PE department had been reorganised in April 2010. Three well-qualified PE officers staffed the gym, which was open every weekday, four evenings a week and at weekends. Four

orderlies worked there, two of whom were qualified to refer prisoners to organisations to support them in a range of issues, including smoking cessation, sexual health, health care and drug support. A fitness management club delivered regularly by gym staff supported prisoners in assessing their health and provided them with information on health improvement and well-being. Participation, risk assessments, safe working practices and data monitoring were well recorded.

- 6.31 A weekly induction provided prisoners with information on recreational and vocational training programmes in PE. Information on gym activities was displayed in the gym and on the house units. Before attending the gym, all prisoners were required to complete a questionnaire to self-assess their fitness levels and to provide details on physical problems.
- 6.32 Access to the gym was good. Remedial sessions were offered for older, overweight or injured prisoners, and for those recovering from substance misuse. Apart from remedial sessions, all prisoners were entitled to use the gym on a drop-in basis and approximately 50% of the population used the facilities. A wide range of recreational activities was available, including circuit training, football, volleyball, basketball, badminton and table tennis. Gym kit was freely available daily. Showers were clean and overseen by a member of staff but most prisoners chose to return to their house units for showers. There were few accidents, injuries and assaults and these were monitored and recorded thoroughly.
- 6.33 Facilities were reasonable and, although ageing, were well maintained and included a weights room and cardiovascular area, a warm-up area, a sports hall and a dedicated classroom. Outside, two full-size football pitches and an AstroTurf cricket facility and pavilion provided good facilities for team games. Prisoners had access to a range of external sporting activities and internal football games against local visiting teams. They regularly took part in a weekly session of PE activities with a local special needs school.
- 6.34 The range of vocationally accredited PE programmes was limited but included a level 2 fitness instructors course, treatment of injuries course, first-aid at work and a non-certificated manual handling programme. These courses were run regularly, with small group sizes, and achievement rates were high. Around 56 prisoners had participated in vocationally related courses in the previous 12 months. At the time of the inspection, there were no prisoners working towards a vocational qualification. Arrangements to assess the quality of training activities were insufficient to support quality improvement.

Recommendations

- 6.35 The quality of gym equipment should be assessed with a view to updating the facilities.
- 6.36 The number of prisoners working towards a PE vocational qualification should be increased.
- 6.37 Learning sessions should be observed, to support improvement.

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

6.38 All prisoners were unlocked during the core day, which began at 7.30am and ended at 10pm. Association was open until 8pm, when prisoners were restricted to associating in billets only. Prisoners were not allowed in the grounds after dark.

6.39 The core day started at 7.30am and ended at 10pm. This provided slightly less than the 16 hours of time out of cell that we reported at the time of the previous inspection. All prisoners were unlocked during the core day and association was open, with access to a range of activities. Almost all prisoners responding to our survey (84%) said that they had association more than five times a week. It took place on the house units but from 8pm to 10pm it was limited to locked billets (small landings of about six cells) only. Prisoners spoke negatively about this restriction.

6.40 Prisoners had free access to the grounds in the summer but were not allowed in the grounds after dark, which meant that time out in the fresh air was prohibited during the winter months, even though lights had been introduced on pathways. However, far more prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection (67% versus 23%) said that they went outside for exercise three or more times a week, similar to the comparator group.

Recommendation

6.41 Prisoners should be allowed to associate outside their billets in the evening.

Section 7: Good order

Security and rules

Expected outcomes:

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

7.1 Some inappropriate restrictions were placed on prisoners for security reasons and dynamic security was affected adversely by some poor staff–prisoner relationships. Security information reports were received from most parts of the establishment and intelligence was shared effectively. Information was responded to promptly but there was little analysis of trends. The level of absconding was reducing. The rules of the establishment were provided in a booklet on reception but there was no further explanation, which left some prisoners uncertain about the boundaries of behaviour. Rules were applied which were not contained in the formal list, including some harsh restrictions.

Security

- 7.2 A single security committee for HMP Moorland and Hatfield was in place and met monthly. Representation was adequate, as were the links between the security department and other functions. The security department was run by two senior officers, assisted by residential staff. While physical and procedural security was mainly well managed, there were some restrictions on prisoners which were inappropriate for a category D establishment. The most significant was the lack of outdoor association on dark evenings, which had a particular impact on prisoners who were working outside the prison during the day (see section on time out of cell). Other examples included the prohibition on taking washing home to be done during home leave, the requirement for Muslim prisoners to show their identification card at prayers (which did not apply to other religions) and a restriction on taking home models which had been made in the prison.
- 7.3 The dynamic security of the prison was affected by the low staffing level and an apparent lack of interaction with prisoners. In our survey, just 12% of respondents, compared with an open prison average of 21%, said that staff spoke to them during association. Prisoners in our groups told us that only a minority of staff were helpful to them (see also section on staff–prisoner relationships).
- 7.4 Security intelligence was reported from around the establishment, and an average of 42 security information reports (SIRs) a month had been received in the six months before the inspection. Security information was shared by means of monthly security bulletins issued to staff and there were good direct links with the violence reduction coordinator. In the monthly security bulletins, action to achieve security objectives focused on gathering intelligence from specific sources rather than improving dynamic security measures, for example by staff fostering good relationships with prisoners and being aware of issues affecting them.
- 7.5 In the SIRs we examined, action had been taken promptly after assessment by the security senior officer. The main issues were unauthorised possessions, threats to prisoners or staff, and drug use.

- 7.6 The security committee covered both Hatfield and Moorland, and the Hatfield senior officer provided a report. Separate security objectives had been set for Hatfield, and these were appropriate to the nature of the prison, prioritising absconding, perimeter security, drug and alcohol use. Although the range of information provided was extensive, there was little analysis of trends or patterns which could improve security practice.
- 7.7 Absconding or failure to return from temporary leave was reducing. In 2009 there had been 24 absconds and in the year to date there had been 15, which projected to an annual figure of 18, representing a reduction of 25%. The action specified in the monthly security bulletin to reduce absconds was mainly concerned with identifying prisoners unsuitable for temporary release, rather than an analysis of the causes of absconds which might identify ways to work with prisoners to reduce their risk.
- 7.8 There were systematic searches for hooch and staff were advised to be vigilant for drop offs. There were also routine searches of the perimeter. There was suspicion based testing of prisoners returning from ROTL. The other main concern was the abuse of medication. Responses included searches and the supervision of dispensation.

Rules

- 7.9 Although they were provided with a booklet explaining the prison rules on arrival at the establishment, prisoners told us that they had not been well enough informed of the rules and felt uncertain about behaviour which might get them into trouble with staff.
- 7.10 We found some examples of rules applied which were not in the published booklet, such as the one prohibiting prisoners on the standard regime from wearing their own clothing on town visits (see section on residential units). Another particularly harsh unpublished rule was that prisoners who had booked a town visit but had pre-ordered a meal for the same weekend had to stay at the prison and take the meal. Prisoners told us this was applied on the authority of catering staff. Prison managers told us that this action had been taken on a single occasion because food was being wasted and that prisoners were given adequate notice that they would miss the visit if they had ordered a meal.

Recommendations

- 7.11 **Dynamic security should be improved.**
- 7.12 **Information provided for the security committee should be analysed to identify trends and anticipate developments.**
- 7.13 **The reasons underlying prisoner absconds should be analysed and measures put in place according to the findings.**
- 7.14 **Prisoners' understanding of the rules of the establishment should be checked when they arrive and staff should only enforce agreed and publicised rules.**

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

7.15 The number of adjudications was consistent with that in the previous year. An adjudication standards committee covering both Moorland and Hatfield reviewed practice but attendance from Hatfield was poor. Some prisoners were returned to closed conditions for serious breaches of prison rules. Some collective punishments had been applied. No uses of force had been recorded but escort handcuffs were used. There was no segregation unit; prisoners who required separation from the rest of the population were removed to closed conditions.

Disciplinary procedures

- 7.16 There was no designated room for adjudications; they were held in the boardroom, which was spacious and had adequate furnishing. In the six months before the inspection, there had been 156 adjudications, which was similar to the number for the same period in the previous year (160).
- 7.17 Records were well documented and mitigation was recorded. In the cases we examined, adjudicators had explored the reasons for prisoners' behaviour and the punishments had been proportionate. The most common matters adjudicated on were late returns from temporary release, drug use or possession, and possession of unauthorised items. Cases in which there was a suspicion of bullying or where a prisoner was found to be vulnerable were referred to appropriate departments in the establishment.
- 7.18 There was a three-monthly adjudications standards group, held jointly with Moorland, chaired by the deputy governor. Adjudications from Hatfield were included and the meeting considered a report by the deputy governor on the monitoring of adjudications, identifying any aspects of procedure which might leave the case open to appeal. Representation from Hatfield was poor.
- 7.19 A number of prisoners were returned directly to closed conditions for serious transgressions, and adjudications were held at the receiving establishment. In the six months before the inspection, 57 prisoners had been transferred to closed conditions. These included automatic removal for possession of mobile telephones and positive opiate drug tests. Other reasons for transfer to closed conditions included recommendation from the offender manager, offending while on temporary release, the discovery of outstanding serious charges and persistent breaches of the rules regarding temporary release. However, more minor breaches did not result in a return to closed conditions.
- 7.20 Prisoners told us of examples where collective punishments had been applied, such as cancelling all home leave because a suspicious parcel had been received and refusing night work because of the misbehaviour of one prisoner.

Recommendations

- 7.21 Hatfield should be represented at all the meetings of the adjudications standards meeting.

7.22 **Collective punishments should not be applied.**

The use of force

7.23 No use of force had been recorded at the establishment in the previous six months and we were told that it was never required.

7.24 We were told that prisoners escorted from residential units to reception for return to closed conditions were restrained. As escort handcuffs were used, rather than full handcuffs, a record was not kept of the use of force, making it difficult to provide adequate governance of this practice.

Recommendation

7.25 **A use of force record should be made of any use of restraints and this use properly authorised and monitored.**

Segregation unit

7.26 There was no segregation unit. Prisoners who required separation from the rest of the population were removed to closed conditions. We were told that in these circumstances most prisoners were called to reception, where they were told that they were being transferred (see paragraph 7.24, for exceptions to this practice). They were then held in a locked waiting room, which was large and comfortable, until paperwork and property had been prepared. The prison had its own transport and transfers were usually effected within two hours.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

7.27 Most prisoners were on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme and there was a well-structured published policy.

7.28 At the time of the inspection, there were 221 prisoners on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, which represented 91% of the population. Prisoners retained the privilege level which applied at their previous establishment. There were no prisoners on the basic level.

7.29 The published IEP scheme was well structured and included a system of warnings to encourage prisoners to improve their behaviour and to avoid demotion. Those demoted to the basic level were moved to closed conditions.

7.30 There were clear distinctions between the standard and enhanced levels, which provided a strong incentive to progress. Enhanced level prisoners were allowed access to considerably more money, a wider range of their own clothing and personal leisure equipment. However,

prisoners told us that the operation of the system was too restrictive for the small number of prisoners on the standard level, who were not allowed to wear their own clothing (see section on residential units). These restrictions were not set out in the IEP section of the prison rules (see section on rules).

Recommendation

- 7.31 All restrictions applied as part of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should be published.

Section 8: Services

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.1 Prisoners complained about the standard of the food. The kitchen was well run and prisoners ate communally. The consultation arrangements were limited and prisoners were not given the opportunity to prepare food for themselves.
- 8.2 Meals were served at around 8am, noon and 5pm. Prisoners ate together in the large dining hall. The hall was never full and there were several different sittings. The atmosphere in the hall was calm and orderly. Prisoners were not able to use plates and were required to eat from institutionalised, large blue trays.
- 8.3 We were told that approximately £1.70 was allocated for food for each prisoner daily. The number of food items available had recently been reduced because of rising costs. However, there was still a reasonably wide range of food available on the four-week pre-select menu. Breakfast consisted of cereal or porridge, toast, orange juice and tea. Cooked food was provided for breakfast on Sundays. Lunch was normally a filled baguette. Fresh fruit and salads were available every day and there was also a halal, vegetarian and healthy option every day. Adequate provision was made, on request, for religious and medical diets.
- 8.4 Only 25% of prisoners responding to our survey said that they thought the food was either good or very good, against the 42% comparator. We received complaints about the food constantly during the inspection, particularly about the small portion sizes, but also about the quality and range of food provided. We agreed that there was limited variety but found the food we sampled to be of an adequate standard and sufficient in quantity.
- 8.5 Prisoners had some opportunities to express their views about the food but this was not carried out in an organised way. There was a food comments book in the dining room, containing a mixture of positive and negative entries, but not all of them had been responded to. The catering manager said that most changes to the catering arrangements, such as the recent increased use of pasta and the introduction of hot water boilers to allow prisoners to have hot drinks, resulted from verbal feedback that he had received from prisoners. There had been no recent food survey.
- 8.6 The kitchen was well equipped. Standards of hygiene and cleanliness were satisfactory, both in the kitchen and the servery. However, the kitchen was untidy. Staff and prisoners working in these areas wore 'whites' and hats, and cleaning schedules were followed.
- 8.7 Halal and non-halal products were kept separate, with different refrigerators and freezers, as well as cooking and serving utensils. Separate equipment was also used to prepare and serve vegetarian items.
- 8.8 Twenty-two prisoners worked in the kitchen and they had all completed basic food and hygiene training but none had undertaken National Vocational Qualification training. The catering

manager had just completed his own training as an internal verifier and he hoped to begin carrying out vocational training with prisoners soon.

- 8.9 Prisoners who worked outside the prison were provided with packed lunches. Prisoners were not given the opportunity to prepare food for themselves.

Recommendations

- 8.10 The range of items on the menu should be broadened.
- 8.11 Prisoners should be fully consulted about their views on the food, including an annual prisoner survey, and the issues identified addressed.
- 8.12 Prisoners working in the kitchen should be offered the opportunity to undertake vocational training.
- 8.13 Prisoners should be given the opportunity to prepare food for themselves.
- 8.14 The food budget should be sufficient to provide an adequate standard of food.

Housekeeping points

- 8.15 Prisoners should be able to eat from plates.
- 8.16 All entries in the food comments book should be responded to.
- 8.17 The kitchen should be kept tidy.

Prison shop

Expected outcomes:

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

8.18 The range of goods available for purchase was decided by consultation with prisoners but there was still widespread dissatisfaction with the shop list. Prices we checked were considerably higher than those on the high street. Order forms were issued on Fridays, leaving insufficient time for corrections to be made to prisoners' accounts. There was a wide range of catalogues available and administration charges were not applied.

- 8.19 The prison shop supplier was DHL and quarterly consultation with prisoner representatives was held to choose the range of goods available for purchase.
- 8.20 In our survey, far fewer respondents than at comparator establishments (34% versus 52%) said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, and this negative view was reflected by prisoners in our groups, who complained about the lack of choice of items such as toiletries and certain foods. Prisoners also complained about high prices but DHL maintained that they were comparable with major supermarkets. Our check comparing

the prices of a random selection of toiletries and groceries found the DHL prices to be higher than those of the supermarket.

- 8.21 Shop order forms were issued on Fridays and orders were delivered on the following Thursday, during association. Prisoners, especially those who worked outside the prison during the day, complained that they did not have time to correct any errors in their account statement before they submitted their orders. DHL provided boxes of popular items so that some errors or damage could be rectified immediately.
- 8.22 Prisoners arriving at the establishment were provided with credit and could purchase smokers' and grocery packs but they could wait up to 10 days for the first delivery of orders from the shop. They also told us of delays in the transfer of their money from previous establishments. They could buy up to three smokers' packs while waiting for their first order.
- 8.23 A wide range of catalogues was available, from which prisoners could purchase goods such as clothing, electrical items, hobby materials and imported books and music, but in our groups some prisoners told us that they were not aware of the catalogues they could order from. An administration charge was not imposed for orders and the only delivery charge passed on was for imported goods.
- 8.24 A full range of newspapers, including foreign language editions, was available through the library.

Recommendations

- 8.25 The prison should explore the reasons for prisoners' dissatisfaction with the shop list and take remedial action.
- 8.26 Prices charged to prisoners for shop purchases should be in line with those on the high street.
- 8.27 Shop order sheets and statements of prisoners' accounts should be issued in good time for corrections to be notified and implemented before purchases are ordered.

Section 9: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 9.1 Hatfield's resettlement strategy was separate to that of Moorland and made reference to the provision of offender management in the prison, giving details about the provision under the separate pathways, but was based on a limited needs analysis. The action plan, which covered both Hatfield and Moorland, was also limited in scope and it was not clear how this was monitored. The resettlement team met bimonthly and briefly considered statistics relating to resettlement outcomes for prisoners. There was extensive use of release on temporary licence to meet resettlement needs.
- 9.2 Hatfield's resettlement strategy was separate to that of Moorland. It made reference to what the offender management team would provide for prisoners and gave details of the current provision under the different resettlement pathways. However, it did not detail future priorities. One action plan covered both Hatfield and Moorland. The prison had not undertaken a systematic analysis of prisoner needs, for example by making use of available offender assessment system (OASys) or tiering data. Consequently, the resettlement strategy and plans for service provision were not based on robust evidence of prisoner needs. The action plan was not structured in line with the resettlement pathways and did not appear to be actively monitored at the bimonthly resettlement meetings. There was only limited monitoring of key performance targets, and the need to obtain and make better use of prisoner feedback had been recognised as an area for development.
- 9.3 Service Level Agreements were in place to deliver accommodation, employment and training, and benefits advice. External providers and other key managers attended the resettlement meetings.
- 9.4 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used extensively for resettlement purposes, mainly for town visits, with up to 40 prisoners released per week. Prisoners were required to pay their own fares and for their food on town visits, which disadvantaged those without access to sufficient funds. A third of prisoners at the establishment were not from local areas, and offender supervisors had questioned the purposeful use of town visits, particularly for prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP) whose families lived too far away to meet them for the visit.

Recommendations

- 9.5 A broader analysis of prisoner needs should be undertaken, utilising offender assessment system (OASys) data, in order to identify the most prevalent offending-related factors. This should be used to inform the resettlement strategy and action plan.
- 9.6 Prisoners who have insufficient savings to qualify for town visits should be given financial assistance to enable them to access the visits for which they are eligible.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

9.7 The offender management unit was under-resourced to fully implement layered offender management, with offender supervisors carrying large caseloads. Most assessments of likelihood of reoffending were of an acceptable standard, and used to prepare sentence planning objectives. The quality of sentence plans was inconsistent and there were long waiting times for accredited programmes. There was no single record of all contacts and activity, and the results of all the assessments relating to a particular individual were not necessarily collated within the offender management file.

Sentence planning and offender management

- 9.8 The offender management unit (OMU) comprised a mixture of prison and seconded probation officers working as offender supervisors, covering in- and out-of-scope cases, including lifers and IPP prisoners. Their work was supported by generic case administrators. All activities were located close together, which aided consistency. At the time of the inspection, each offender supervisor was carrying a caseload of over 80 prisoners, with one newly appointed supervisor gradually building up her caseload. These resources were insufficient to fully implement all aspects of offender management as required under layered offender management. The senior officer in offender management was too often diverted to other duties, which further affected implementation.
- 9.9 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor and an assessment was undertaken in all cases. Most prisoners received a full OASys assessment but there was a backlog following the implementation of layered offender management. Offender supervisors had met all newly arrived prisoners who had arrived since October 2010 but not all prisoners already in custody had been seen and assessed.
- 9.10 We read case files relating to prisoners at Hatfield, all in scope. Allocation to an offender supervisor had been timely but some case files we inspected did not contain sentence planning board papers. Offender supervisors kept a separate electronic contact log of emails and telephone calls and recorded high-level entries on P-Nomis. All inspected files had an OASys likelihood of reoffending assessment which was of an acceptable standard and most had been completed on time. All the cases inspected had allocated offender managers, who contributed to sentence planning boards. This included the use of telephone conference facilities. Video-conference facilities were not available.
- 9.11 Sentence plans were completed in a timely fashion and informed by relevant assessments. All the plans included objectives to address the likelihood of reoffending. However, not all were specific about the desired outcome or set out appropriate sequencing of objectives and activities.
- 9.12 There was evidence in all the files inspected that the prisoner had been engaged in the sentence planning process and it was clear what was expected of the prisoner in order to achieve the sentence plan objectives. For in-scope cases, only half of the likelihood of

reoffending assessments had been reviewed thoroughly and in line with the national standard timescale. Sentence plans were not all reviewed in line with the timescale. In our survey, 68% of prisoners, similar to the comparator, said that they had a sentence plan, and 60% that they had been involved in its development, which was lower than the comparator of 75%. Only 72% felt that it was possible to meet some or all sentence plan targets at Hatfield, which was, again, lower than the comparator of 85%. Only 18% of prisoners considered that staff had helped them to address their offending behaviour, which was considerably lower than the comparator of 39%.

- 9.13 An assessment of potential diversity issues (such as learning needs or learning styles) and discriminatory and disadvantaging factors and other individual needs was evident in most cases inspected, and also an assessment of potential suicide risk or any other vulnerability.
- 9.14 In most cases, the level of contact between offender manager and prisoner met the national standard and commitment to work with the prisoner was evident. Offender supervisors had developed positive and productive working relationships with the prisoner in all of the cases we inspected.
- 9.15 The governor had placed a limit of four prisoners being able to access any programme in the community at any one time, and this affected prisoners' ability to start or complete programmes before release. At the time of the inspection, there were three prisoners who had not yet been able to access accredited offending behaviour programmes in the community.

Recommendations

- 9.16 The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be cleared.
- 9.17 Sentence plans should contain outcome-focused objectives that are measurable, with a specific timescale for their achievement.
- 9.18 The likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm assessments should be reviewed thoroughly, and in line with the national standard timescales.
- 9.19 Prisoners' perceptions about the lack of involvement in sentence planning and ability to meet targets laid out there should be enquired into and appropriate action taken to remedy any gaps.
- 9.20 All prisoners should be able to access accredited programmes in the community identified as necessary for them under sentence planning.

Housekeeping point

- 9.21 Case files should contain a single record of all contact and activity relating to the management of the prisoner.

Public protection

- 9.22 The prison public protection manual was in the process of being updated to include the 2009 multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) guidance and document set. Public protection at the establishment was overseen by a manager at Moorland. A senior probation officer was due to attend one day a week to deal with public protection matters. All the offender

supervisors were fully trained in public protection but not all newly arrived prisoners underwent a full assessment for public protection concerns.

- 9.23 Those that were identified by the case administrators were reviewed at the weekly risk management meeting and those needing further monitoring were considered by the monthly risk management meeting. Prisoners posing a risk of harm to others were clearly identified in OASys assessments. Structured management oversight was in place for cases that presented a high risk of serious harm. A risk of harm screening had been completed in all cases we looked at and all were found to be accurate. A full analysis of the risk of harm to others had been completed in all cases where it was required. In some cases, there had been insufficient analysis of the factors that contributed to any continuing risks, and a failure to draw on all available sources of information. Some in-scope assessments had not been reviewed in line with the national standard timescale.
- 9.24 In all cases, the risk of harm to others had been communicated to all staff involved and a risk management plan completed where required. Risk management plans were not always of sufficient quality and not all described how the objectives in the sentence plan would address risk of harm. Sentence plans included objectives to manage risk of harm to others, where relevant.
- 9.25 One case of a prolific or priority offender that we inspected was found not to have enhanced levels of contact or intervention recorded in the sentence plan.

Recommendations

- 9.26 All newly arrived prisoners should be assessed for public protection issues.
- 9.27 All risk management plans should describe how the objectives of the sentence plan and other activities address the risk of harm to others and protect actual and potential victims.

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

- 9.28 There were no lifers or recalled prisoners at Hatfield. There were 31 IPP prisoners, but no formal support for them, and staff had recognised this as a need. They were seen weekly by offender supervisors for the first six weeks at the establishment, then monthly or bimonthly, according to need. When parole dates were approaching, contact was increased again to ensure that prisoners were fully prepared for parole board reviews. All parole assessments were up to date.

Recommendation

- 9.29 Formal support services for prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection should be developed and offered.

Resettlement pathways

Expected outcomes:

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

Reintegration planning

9.30 Prisoners with housing difficulties had the opportunity to receive support from a visiting professional worker, by referring themselves for assistance. Although the service was well advertised, prisoners appeared to be unclear about how to obtain this help. Outwork was well managed. Staff from a variety of agencies provided education, training and employment services to the establishment and were co-located, allowing effective joint working. External employment opportunities had declined and health and safety checks were not carried out sufficiently quickly. There were regular pre-release health clinics and there was good multidisciplinary care programme approach working. Prisoners received effective assistance from prison staff to help them to claim state benefits. Organised support was not available for prisoners who had debt problems or financial difficulties.

Accommodation

- 9.31 Prisoners could receive advice and guidance on housing from a part-time professional who worked for Shelter. They were given an information leaflet about this service on arrival at the establishment, and details were also advertised through a series of high-quality, informative leaflets and posters displayed in the resettlement unit.
- 9.32 The Shelter worker had an office in the resettlement unit and was available on a rota basis, two days in one week and three days the next. Prisoners could arrange to see her either by visiting the resettlement unit when she was present or by arranging an appointment in advance.
- 9.33 Despite the information that prisoners were provided with about how to access this service, only 31% of prisoners responding to our survey said that they knew how to get help with finding accommodation on release, which was significantly worse than the 54% comparator.

Recommendation

- 9.34 Staff should ensure that all prisoners are aware of how to obtain assistance with accommodation on release.

Education, training and employment

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

- 9.35 Outwork was well managed. Staff from all agencies providing services to the establishment, including the careers information and advice service, Supporting Others through Volunteer Action (SOVA), Jobcentre Plus, Shelter and the Minerva project, were situated together in the

resettlement unit, allowing effective joint working and good communication. The preparation for work course run by Manchester College prepared prisoners well for entry onto the task force community work and subsequent employment. The Liberty programme ran weekly and provided prisoners with well-structured multi-agency individual support.

- 9.36 External employment opportunities had declined over the year and currently only 26 local and regional employers were engaged in offering paid work, although community places had increased to compensate for this.
- 9.37 Health and safety checks were not carried out sufficiently quickly, which reduced the number of opportunities for prisoners to work with new employers. Only one prison officer was able to carry out health and safety risk assessments, and this was only part of his job. The resettlement unit had identified this issue, and four staff had been waiting for training in risk assessment for over a year, but the area office had yet to facilitate this. Two new staff had recently started to undertake these assessments, which was alleviating the problem.
- 9.38 Seventy prisoners worked out in a wide range of community projects, some of which had resulted in employment. Three prisoners were attending local colleges and one was participating in an Open University course.

Recommendations

- 9.39 The number of external employment opportunities should be increased.
- 9.40 Health and safety checks should be carried out promptly, to minimise delays for prisoners in obtaining paid work.

Mental and physical health

- 9.41 Prisoners in regular contact with the health care department were seen in the week before release, and a health review was undertaken. A GP letter was prepared and medication to take home was arranged.
- 9.42 Nurses were made aware of the release of prisoners not in contact with the health care department via a daily pre-release notification. Prisoners were invited to the health centre for a pre-release assessment by a nurse. The HMP Moorland pre-release checklist was used to check that prisoners had a GP or knew how to access one, and if assistance with health and social care issues was required.
- 9.43 The Nottinghamshire NHS palliative and end-of-life care policy was in place and provided for support by the local Macmillan nursing and other services, if required. The policy had not been used. A multi-agency case conference was carried out for prisoners subject to the care programme approach before their release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 9.44 A pre-release programme was run, which had been designed for prisoners to attend around three weeks before release. As part of this course, the resettlement manager, who was normally based at Moorland, advised prisoners about their welfare entitlements. They were given help individually to complete community care grant applications and also to make

appointments, so that they could claim job seekers allowance. The resettlement manager followed up each case, to make sure that the arrangements made were firm.

- 9.45 Earlier in the year, a piece of internal research had found that 32% of prisoners needed help with financial matters. The resettlement manager had established links with a local bank. Work had been done to help a small number of prisoners to open bank accounts but this had not met demand.
- 9.46 Prisoners were not assessed to establish if they had finance or debt problems. While it appeared that some prisoners were offered support on an ad hoc basis, these issues were not addressed systematically.

Recommendations

- 9.47 **Prisoners should be given the opportunity to open bank accounts.**
- 9.48 **All prisoners should be assessed to establish if they have financial difficulties or debt problems, and assistance should be offered where necessary.**

Drugs and alcohol

9.49 The drug strategy policy had not been informed by a needs analysis and lacked action plans and performance targets. Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) workers made initial contact with all new arrivals and the service was easily accessible. However, no cover for periods of leave was available. One-to-one support was offered but no group work. Prisoners with alcohol problems could access specialist support from an alcohol worker. Links had been established with two local drug intervention programme teams, and CARAT staff worked jointly with integrated drug treatment system nurses to ensure treatment continuity on release.

- 9.50 The drug strategy policy covered both Moorland and Hatfield. A needs analysis undertaken earlier in the year had not been sufficiently detailed; it had not informed the policy, which lacked action plans and performance targets and was overdue for review. A separate alcohol reduction policy for Hatfield was in place, and this mainly focused on alcohol testing.
- 9.51 Drug strategy meetings took place monthly and were chaired by the head of interventions. Relevant departments were represented. A designated drug strategy/programmes manager was the establishment drug coordinator. She chaired monthly integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) joint working meetings and was assisted by a drug strategy senior officer. Links had been forged with community planning bodies.
- 9.52 Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services were provided by a manager and 1.5 workers from Nottingham NHS Trust. There was no leave cover for the workers, and this could create gaps in service provision. Staff supervision arrangements were appropriate.
- 9.53 The service did not have a triage assessment target, which would be inappropriate for an open prison. CARAT workers made initial contact with all new arrivals and they had an open door policy, which made the service easily accessible. An evening session had been introduced for prisoners who worked outside of the prison. However, in our survey, only 61% of respondents

said that they had received help with a drug/alcohol problem, against a comparator of 87%, and out of those only 50% felt that the help or intervention had been useful, against a comparator of 81%.

- 9.54 The service offered one-to-one support and carried an active caseload of 36 clients, with another four files suspended. The nature of the work was described to us as 'crisis intervention', with the focus on relapse prevention. There was no group work support, either facilitated or on a self-help basis (such as through Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous) and no regular forum for service user consultation.
- 9.55 Prisoners with alcohol problems could access specialist support from an alcohol worker, who was also employed by Nottingham NHS Trust; the alcohol service was shortly due to merge with CARAT provision. The worker offered two half-day sessions per week and carried an active caseload of 12 clients, who were all seen on a one-to-one basis. At the time of the inspection, there were no prisoners waiting to be seen.
- 9.56 Links had been established with two local drug intervention programme teams to facilitate prisoners' throughcare, and CARAT staff worked jointly with IDTS nurses to ensure treatment continuity on release.

Recommendations

- 9.57 A comprehensive needs analysis of the prison population should be carried out to inform the drug and alcohol strategy and future service provision.
- 9.58 The drug strategy document should be updated, include alcohol services and contain detailed action plans and performance measures.
- 9.59 The CARAT service provider should ensure that leave cover is in place, so that there are no gaps in service provision.

Housekeeping point

- 9.60 The CARAT service should develop a mechanism for service user feedback.

Children and families of offenders

- 9.61 The facilities for visitors were generally adequate but no hot food was available. The consultation arrangements with visitors were poor.
- 9.62 All prisoners could have four visits each month. Those on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme received entitlement to a further two visits. Most visits were taken by prisoners who had yet to reach stage one of the resettlement process and were not yet eligible for ROTL. Family days were not facilitated
- 9.63 Visits took place only on Saturday and Sunday afternoons. There was no visitors centre but the visits hall was spacious, bright and airy. It was clean and fairly comfortable, with upholstered chairs and low wooden tables. The walls were decorated with art produced by prisoners and there was a reasonable amount of useful information on display. There was a small unstaffed children's play area. The only source of refreshments for visitors was a series

of vending machines which provided hot and cold drinks and sweets. There was wheelchair access to the visits hall and a toilet for those with disabilities.

- 9.64 An internal visitor survey had been carried out earlier in the year. With a return rate of only 6%, it was not possible to generalise from these findings. There was no straightforward method for visitors to comment on their experience.
- 9.65 In our survey, considerably fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments (54% versus 73%) said that their family and friends had been treated well or very well by visits staff. Only 36% of prisoners, against the 55% comparator, said that they had been helped to maintain contact with their family and friends while in prison.
- 9.66 The site was difficult to reach by public transport. It was approximately eight miles from the nearest mainline station, which involved a 30-minute bus journey, for which there was no Sunday service. The impact of this issue on visitors was not clear.
- 9.67 Despite being an open establishment, prisoners were not permitted to wear their own clothing while on visits (see recommendation 2.22).

Recommendations

- 9.68 Adequate refreshments should be available for visitors.
- 9.69 A visitors survey should be carried out, based on a representative sample. The results should be used to help to inform service development.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

9.70 No accredited or unaccredited offending behaviour courses were run.

- 9.71 No accredited or unaccredited offending behaviour courses were run at Hatfield and only a small number of prisoners participated in courses run by the Probation Service in the community (see also paragraph 9.15). It was difficult to confirm if adequate resources were provided, as a needs analysis had not been undertaken

Recommendation

- 9.72 Based on the findings of a needs analysis, timely access to relevant programmes should be ensured, to address prisoners' offending behaviour.

Section 10: Recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of recommendations and housekeeping points included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report.

Main recommendation

To NOMS

-
- 10.1 The arrangements for managing the Moorland and Hatfield sites should ensure that sufficient strategic management resource is available to distinguish and address the specific issues relating to a small open prison such as Hatfield. (HP43)

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 10.2 Prisoners should be properly supported during reception, their first night at the prison and induction. (HP44)
- 10.3 The dynamic between staff and prisoners should be analysed and action taken to improve staff-prisoner relationships. (HP45)
- 10.4 Security restrictions and rules for prisoners should be appropriate to open conditions. (HP46)
- 10.5 Resources in the offender management unit should ensure that the full implementation of layered offender management is achievable. (HP47)
- 10.6 Support for prisoners to maintain contact with their family members and friends should be prioritised and better family pathway provision developed. (HP48)

Recommendations

To NOMS

-
- 10.7 Cellular vans should not be used routinely when transferring category D prisoners to Hatfield. (1.4)
- 10.8 Prices charged to prisoners for shop purchases should be in line with those on the high street. (8.26)

Recommendation

To the deputy director

-
- 10.9 A planned list creating consistency across Yorkshire and Humberside prisons of allowed possessions should be introduced and additional items allowed for prisoners at Hatfield. (2.26)

Recommendations

To the governor

First days in custody: reception

-
- 10.10 The condition of the reception area should be improved. (1.11)

Residential units: accommodation and facilities

- 10.11 Prisoners should be able to keep possession of their cell keys and an alternative method for roll-keeping introduced. (2.12)
- 10.12 An offensive display policy should be introduced, publicised and policed. (2.13)
- 10.13 D and E wings should be refurbished. (2.14)
- 10.14 Prisoner forums should be developed into an effective tool for consultation and different groups should be consulted specifically about issues particular to them. (2.15)
- 10.15 Prisoners should be able to rely on a prompt and efficient mail service. (2.16)
- 10.16 Prisoners should have access to telephones at busy times of the week. (2.17)
- 10.17 Prisoners should be encouraged to make greater use of the email service. (2.18)

Residential units: clothing and possessions

- 10.18 All prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes and these should be allowed to be brought in on visits. (2.22)
- 10.19 Long-term prisoners should be able to do their own laundry. (2.23)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 10.20 Joint training in pro-social modelling should be run for staff and prisoners. (2.32)
- 10.21 The poor perceptions of prisoners about their treatment by staff should be explored and action taken on the findings. (2.33)
- 10.22 There should be greater formal use of prisoners as peer supporters. (2.34)
- 10.23 All staff should routinely use prisoners' titles and surnames or preferred names. (2.35)

Personal officers

- 10.24 The personal officer scheme should be evaluated and lessons drawn to design and deliver an effective scheme. (2.40)
- 10.25 All personal officers should introduce themselves and get to know the prisoners on their caseload. (2.41)
- 10.26 There should be clear management support for the personal officer scheme, including regular, effective management checks which lead to action when weaknesses are identified. (2.42)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 10.27 A violence reduction and anti-bullying strategy, based on an analysis of the pattern of bullying specific to Hatfield, should be introduced. It should be further informed through prisoner consultation, including a prisoner survey. (3.6)
- 10.28 Staff should receive anti-bullying training. (3.7)
- 10.29 Staff supervision of residential areas should improve. (3.8)

Self-harm and suicide

- 10.30 A suicide prevention policy document specific to the needs of Hatfield should be developed and promoted around the prison. (3.14)
- 10.31 The safer prisons meeting should be better attended by a range of staff, including Listeners, and the meeting should cover issues relevant to Hatfield. (3.15)
- 10.32 The Listeners scheme should be properly supported and advertised better through the prison. (3.16)

Applications and complaints

- 10.33 The application and complaint systems should be improved to increase prisoner confidence in them. (3.24)
- 10.34 Replies to complaints should be comprehensive and fully address the issues. (3.25)

Faith and religious activity

- 10.35 Prisoners should be seen by a member of the chaplaincy team within 24 hours of arrival. (3.33)
- 10.36 Prisoners' negative perception of respect for religious beliefs should be explored and action taken where appropriate. (3.34)

Substance use: clinical management

- 10.37 Clinical substance misuse and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services should undertake joint care planning and treatment reviews. (3.40)

Substance use: drug testing

- 10.38 The establishment should introduce a risk assessment and a frequent testing programme. (3.46)
- 10.39 The security department should develop and implement a supply reduction action plan. (3.47)

Diversity

- 10.40 There should be a complete overhaul of the race and equalities strategy and policy, to take into account the specific needs of prisoners at Hatfield and address all the strands of diversity, with a race equality action plan formulated to support them. (4.4)

Diversity: race equality

- 10.41 Regular Systematic Monitoring and Analysing of Race Equality Template (SMART) data specific to Hatfield should be produced and used to monitor and ensure equality of access to regime provision by both race and religion. (4.17)
- 10.42 The role of the prisoner race representatives should be made clear and they should be supported in their work. (4.18)
- 10.43 Staff at Hatfield should have the training and capacity to ensure that all areas of diversity are supported. (4.19)
- 10.44 Managers should explore the reasons for prisoners' lack of faith in the racist incident reporting system and take action accordingly. (4.20)
- 10.45 Staff should be appropriately trained in race and diversity. (4.21)
- 10.46 Impact assessments should be specific to HMP Hatfield. (4.22)
- 10.47 Prisoners should be encouraged to celebrate their own culture and heritage and understand and respect that of others as part of the communal life of the prison. (4.23)

Diversity: foreign nationals

- 10.48 There should be a Hatfield-specific foreign nationals policy/strategy, informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. (4.32)
- 10.49 The needs of individual foreign national prisoners should be identified and appropriate culturally sensitive support provided from within the prison or the local community. (4.33)

Diversity: disability and older prisoners

- 10.50 All older prisoners and those with disabilities should be assessed to establish the requirements for individual care plans, which should be regularly updated. (4.40)
- 10.51 There should be an appropriate support scheme for older prisoners where required. (4.41)
- 10.52 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be in place for all relevant prisoners, and all staff made aware of procedures relating to them. (4.42)
- 10.53 Prisoners should be issued with clothing appropriate to the weather conditions, regardless of where they work. (4.43)
- 10.54 Retired prisoners should not have to pay for their televisions. (4.44)

Diversity: gender and sexual orientation

- 10.55 There should be a clear policy for the management of prisoners presenting with gay, bisexual and gender (including transgender) issues, and this should be publicised on residential units. (4.48)

Health services: general

- 10.56 There should be a health needs analysis. (5.8)
- 10.57 The flooring and sinks in the health centre should meet infection control standards. (5.9)
- 10.58 The personal safety of lone workers in the health centre should be subject to risk assessment. (5.10)

Health services: clinical governance

- 10.59 All registered nurses should receive training in resuscitation at least annually. (5.18)
- 10.60 Resuscitation and automatic defibrillation equipment should be available throughout the 24-hour period, and staff should be trained in its use. (5.19)
- 10.61 There should be a patient forum that is representative of the prison population. (5.20)

Health services: primary care

- 10.62 There should be a health promotion group. (5.26)
- 10.63 Barrier protection should be freely available to all prisoners. (5.27)
- 10.64 Waiting times to see a physiotherapist should be reduced. (5.28)
- 10.65 Staff should be trained in the use of triage algorithms. (5.29)

Health services: pharmacy

- 10.66 Use of general stock should be audited, so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions and agreed stock levels. (5.34)
- 10.67 The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the special sick policy, to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied. (5.35)
- 10.68 Patient group directions should be produced, to allow the supply of more potent medicines by the nursing staff, where appropriate. (5.36)
- 10.69 Prescribing data should be collated and used to demonstrate value for money, and to promote effective medicines management. (5.37)
- 10.70 The fax system for ordering re-ordering medications should be subject to audit. (5.38)

Health services: dentistry

- 10.71 Prisoners should have prompt access to dental services and at least have equivalence with prisoners at HMP Moorland. (5.40)

Health services: mental health

- 10.72 Uniformed staff should have the training to recognise and take appropriate action when a prisoner may have mental health problems. (5.46)
- 10.73 Group therapies should be available to prisoners who need support for emotional and mental health problems. (5.47)

Learning and skills and work activities: leadership and management

- 10.74 Data should be input more efficiently, checked for accuracy and used to inform quality improvement and planning. (6.6)
- 10.75 Systems should be developed to gain the views of prisoners and employers, to inform planning. (6.7)
- 10.76 Quality improvement activities should be systematically applied to ensure that all vocational instructors are included in the observation of teaching and learning processes. (6.8)

Learning and skills and work activities: work

- 10.77 Work skills developed through activities should be accredited. (6.13)
- 10.78 The pay structure should be improved, to ensure that those on learning and skills courses are not on less pay than those in work activities. (6.14)

Learning and skills and work activities: vocational training

- 10.79 The level and range of qualifications in industrial cleaning programmes should be increased. (6.16)
- 10.80 Achievements on catering courses should be recorded so qualifications can be achieved. (6.17)

Learning and skills and work activities: education

- 10.81 Classroom attendance should be improved. (6.21)
- 10.82 The pass rates for entry level literacy and level 1 numeracy courses should be increased. (6.22)

Learning and skills and work activities: library

- 10.83 The range of newspapers and magazines should be increased. (6.27)

10.84 Access to the library should be improved by extending the opening hours further. (6.28)

Physical education and health promotion

10.85 The quality of gym equipment should be assessed with a view to updating the facilities. (6.35)

10.86 The number of prisoners working towards a PE vocational qualification should be increased. (6.36)

10.87 Learning sessions should be observed, to support improvement. (6.37)

Time out of cell

10.88 Prisoners should be allowed to associate outside their billets in the evening. (6.41)

Security and rules

10.89 Dynamic security should be improved. (7.11)

10.90 Information provided for the security committee should be analysed to identify trends and anticipate developments. (7.12)

10.91 The reasons underlying prisoner absconds should be analysed and measures put in place according to the findings. (7.13)

10.92 Prisoners' understanding of the rules of the establishment should be checked when they arrive and staff should only enforce agreed and publicised rules. (7.14)

Discipline: disciplinary procedures

10.93 Hatfield should be represented at all the meetings of the adjudications standards meeting. (7.21)

10.94 Collective punishments should not be applied. (7.22)

Discipline: the use of force

10.95 A use of force record should be made of any use of restraints and this use properly authorised and monitored. (7.25)

Incentives and earned privileges

10.96 All restrictions applied as part of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should be published. (7.31)

Catering

10.97 The range of items on the menu should be broadened. (8.10)

- 10.98 Prisoners should be fully consulted about their views on the food, including an annual prisoner survey, and the issues identified addressed. (8.11)
- 10.99 Prisoners working in the kitchen should be offered the opportunity to undertake vocational training. (8.12)
- 10.100 Prisoners should be given the opportunity to prepare food for themselves. (8.13)
- 10.101 The food budget should be sufficient to provide an adequate standard of food. (8.14)

Prison shop

- 10.102 The prison should explore the reasons for prisoners' dissatisfaction with the shop list and take remedial action. (8.25)
- 10.103 Shop order sheets and statements of prisoners' accounts should be issued in good time for corrections to be notified and implemented before purchases are ordered. (8.27)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 10.104 A broader analysis of prisoner needs should be undertaken, utilising offender assessment system (OASys) data, in order to identify the most prevalent offending-related factors. This should be used to inform the resettlement strategy and action plan. (9.5)
- 10.105 Prisoners who have insufficient savings to qualify for town visits should be given financial assistance to enable them to access the visits for which they are eligible. (9.6)

Offender management and planning: sentence planning and offender management

- 10.106 The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be cleared. (9.16)
- 10.107 Sentence plans should contain outcome-focused objectives that are measurable, with a specific timescale for their achievement. (9.17)
- 10.108 The likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm assessments should be reviewed thoroughly, and in line with the national standard timescales. (9.18)
- 10.109 Prisoners' perceptions about the lack of involvement in sentence planning and ability to meet targets laid out there should be enquired into and appropriate action taken to remedy any gaps. (9.19)
- 10.110 All prisoners should be able to access accredited programmes in the community identified as necessary for them under sentence planning. (9.20)

Offender management and planning: public protection

- 10.111 All newly arrived prisoners should be assessed for public protection issues. (9.26)

10.112 All risk management plans should describe how the objectives of the sentence plan and other activities address the risk of harm to others and protect actual and potential victims. (9.27)

Offender management and planning: indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

10.113 Formal support services for prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection should be developed and offered. (9.29)

Resettlement pathways: accommodation

10.114 Staff should ensure that all prisoners are aware of how to obtain assistance with accommodation on release. (9.34)

Resettlement pathways: education, training and employment

10.115 The number of external employment opportunities should be increased. (9.39)

10.116 Health and safety checks should be carried out promptly, to minimise delays for prisoners in obtaining paid work. (9.40)

Resettlement pathways: finance, benefit and debt

10.117 Prisoners should be given the opportunity to open bank accounts. (9.47)

10.118 All prisoners should be assessed to establish if they have financial difficulties or debt problems, and assistance should be offered where necessary. (9.48)

Resettlement pathways: drugs and alcohol

10.119 A comprehensive needs analysis of the prison population should be carried out to inform the drug and alcohol strategy and future service provision. (9.57)

10.120 The drug strategy document should be updated, include alcohol services and contain detailed action plans and performance measures. (9.58)

10.121 The CARAT service provider should ensure that leave cover is in place, so that there are no gaps in service provision. (9.59)

Resettlement pathways: children and families of offenders

10.122 Adequate refreshments should be available for visitors. (9.68)

10.123 A visitors survey should be carried out, based on a representative sample. The results should be used to help to inform service development. (9.69)

Resettlement pathways: attitudes, thinking and behaviour

10.124 Based on the findings of a needs analysis, timely access to relevant programmes should be ensured, to address prisoners' offending behaviour. (9.72)

Housekeeping points

Applications and complaints

10.125 Responses to applications should be tracked and followed up if not received. (3.26)

Health services: general

10.126 Bench seating in the waiting area should be replaced with more comfortable seating. (5.11)

Catering

10.127 Prisoners should be able to eat from plates. (8.15)

10.128 All entries in the food comments book should be responded to. (8.16)

10.129 The kitchen should be kept tidy. (8.17)

Offender management and planning: sentence planning and offender management

10.130 Case files should contain a single record of all contact and activity relating to the management of the prisoner. (9.21)

Resettlement pathways: drugs and alcohol

10.131 The CARAT service should develop a mechanism for service user feedback. (9.60)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Sara Snell	Team leader
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Ian MacFadyen	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Sigrid Engelen	Substance use inspector
Steve Gascoigne	Pharmacy inspector
Martin Wall	Dental inspector
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
John Grimmer	Ofsted inspector
Ian Hanscombe	Ofsted inspector
Alan Hatcher	Ofsted inspector
Helen Davies	Probation inspector
Ian Simpkins	Probation inspector
Adrienne Penfield	Guest inspector
Louise Falshaw	Senior researcher
Joseph Simmonds	Researcher
Helen Wark	Researcher
Michael Skidmore	Researcher

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	27	203	99
Recall		1	0.5
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand			
Civil prisoners			
Detainees		1	0.5
Total	27	205	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced			
Less than 6 months	2	1	0.1
6 months to less than 12 months	1	3	0.1
12 months to less than 2 years	5	20	10.7
2 years to less than 3 years	4	15	8.2
3 years to less than 4 years	3	19	9.5
4 years to less than 10 years	10	95	45.2
10 years and over (not life)		21	9.1
ISPP	2	28	12.9
Total	27	205	96

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age		
Under 21 years	27	11.64
21 years to 29 years	87	37.5
30 years to 39 years	63	27.16
40 years to 49 years	31	13.36
50 years to 59 years	13	5.6
60 years to 69 years	10	4.31
70 plus years	1	0.43
Please state maximum age		
Total	232	100

Nationality	21 and over	%
British	199	97.4
Foreign nationals	6	2.6
Total	205	100

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B			
Category C		3	0.1

Category D	2	200	87.1
Other	25	2	11.7
Total	27	205	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	24	146	73.3
Irish			
Other white		3	0.1
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	1	3	0.1
White and black African		3	0.1
White and Asian		1	0.03
Other mixed			
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	1	5	0.25
Pakistani		12	0.5
Bangladeshi		2	0.1
Other Asian		12	0.5
Black or black British			
Caribbean	1	8	0.4
African		1	0.03
Other black		4	0.2
Chinese or other ethnic group			
Chinese		1	0.03
Other ethnic group		1	0.03
Not stated		3	0.1
Total	27	205	76

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England	8	58	28.4
Roman Catholic	3	29	13.8
Other Christian denominations	1	12	0.56
Muslim		32	13.8
Sikh		5	0.2
Hindu			
Buddhist		2	0.1
Jewish			
Other		2	0.1
No religion	15	54	29.7
Total	27	205	87

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	6	22.2	27	13.2
1 month to 3 months	10	37	46	22.4
3 months to 6 months	4	14.8	43	20.9
6 months to 1 year	6	22.2	52	25.4
1 year to 2 years	1	0.3	35	17.1
2 years to 4 years			1	0.5
4 years or more				
Total	27		205	100

Unsentenced prisoners only

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

Main offence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	8	35	18.5
Sexual offences			
Burglary	4	12	6.9
Robbery	4	42	19.8
Theft and handling	1	2	1.3
Fraud and forgery		5	2.1
Drugs offences	3	31	14.7
Other offences	5	29	14.7
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	2	59	26.7
Total	27	205	100

PLEASE NOTE this report is produced from information gained from MIS from P-Nomis. Despite lots of investigative work, as yet we are unable to produce a breakdown of length of stay.

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.

Choosing the sample size

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

At the time of the survey on 25 October 2010, the prisoner population at HMP Hatfield was 239. The sample size was 150. Overall, this represented 63% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

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

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, one respondent was interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 101 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 42% of the prison population. The response rate was 67%. In addition to the eight respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 35 questionnaires were not returned and six were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following details the results from the survey. Data from each establishment were weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2010 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since 2005.
- The current survey responses in 2010 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Hatfield in 2005.
- A comparison within the 2010 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2010 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2010 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Summary of prisoner survey results

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	44 (44%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	27 (27%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	16 (16%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?	
	Yes	2 (2%)
	No.....	95 (98%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	8 (8%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	18 (18%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	50 (50%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	9 (9%)
	<i>IPP (Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection)</i>	11 (11%)
	<i>Life</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.5	Approximately, how long do you have left to serve? (If you are serving life or IPP, please use the date of your next board.)	
	<i>6 months or less</i>	43 (47%)
	<i>More than 6 months</i>	48 (53%)
Q1.6	How long have you been in this prison?	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i>	9 (9%)
	<i>1 to less than 3 months</i>	18 (18%)
	<i>3 to less than 6 months</i>	20 (20%)
	<i>6 to less than 12 months</i>	19 (19%)
	<i>12 months to less than 2 years</i>	15 (15%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 years</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>4 years or more</i>	10 (10%)
Q1.7	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not hold UK citizenship)?	
	Yes	3 (3%)
	No.....	96 (97%)
Q1.8	Is English your first language?	
	Yes	91 (90%)
	No.....	10 (10%)

Q1.9 What is your ethnic origin?

<i>White - British</i>	76 (75%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)
<i>White - Irish</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other...</i>	1 (1%)
<i>White - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black Caribbean</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Mixed heritage - white and black African</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed heritage - white and Asian</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Black or black British - other ...</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed heritage - other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	10 (10%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	3 (3%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	1 (1%)
<i>No</i>	99 (99%)

Q1.11 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	37 (37%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	23 (23%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	14 (14%)	<i>Muslim</i>	18 (18%)
<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	4 (4%)	<i>Other</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)		

Q1.12 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	101 (100%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other</i>	0 (0%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	13 (13%)
<i>No</i>	88 (87%)

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

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
57 (56%)	16 (16%)	21 (21%)	7 (7%)

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

<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
4 (4%)	86 (88%)	8 (8%)

Q1.16 Do you have any children under the age of 18?

<i>Yes</i>	51 (51%)
<i>No</i>	49 (49%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

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

	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>	<i>N/A</i>
The cleanliness of the van?	3 (3%)	46 (46%)	23 (23%)	20 (20%)	7 (7%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Your personal safety during the journey?	9 (9%)	44 (44%)	32 (32%)	7 (7%)	6 (6%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
The comfort of the van?	1 (1%)	12 (12%)	15 (15%)	31 (31%)	40 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
The attention paid to your health needs?	2 (2%)	18 (18%)	38 (38%)	15 (15%)	17 (17%)	3 (3%)	6 (6%)
The frequency of toilet breaks?	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	17 (17%)	25 (25%)	31 (31%)	3 (3%)	17 (17%)

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

<i>Less than 1 hour</i>	<i>Over 1 hour to 2 hours</i>	<i>Over 2 hours to 4 hours</i>	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
34 (34%)	37 (37%)	24 (24%)	5 (5%)	1 (1%)

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

<i>Very well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Badly</i>	<i>Very badly</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
8 (8%)	48 (48%)	34 (34%)	8 (8%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)

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

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	85 (84%)	15 (15%)	1 (1%)
Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	10 (10%)	84 (86%)	4 (4%)
When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	98 (99%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

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

<i>Didn't ask about any of these.....</i>	51 (54%)	<i>Money worries.....</i>	7 (7%)
<i>Loss of property.....</i>	9 (9%)	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal..</i>	20 (21%)
<i>Housing problems.....</i>	9 (9%)	<i>Health problems.....</i>	32 (34%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	7 (7%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	6 (6%)
<i>Contacting family.....</i>	25 (26%)	<i>Accessing phone numbers.....</i>	23 (24%)
<i>Ensuring dependants were being looked after</i>	9 (9%)	<i>Other.....</i>	2 (2%)

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

<i>Didn't have any problems</i>	35 (43%)	<i>Money worries</i>	17 (21%)
<i>Loss of property</i>	9 (11%)	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> ..	10 (12%)
<i>Housing problems</i>	16 (20%)	<i>Health problems</i>	19 (23%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	6 (7%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	3 (4%)
<i>Contacting family</i>	17 (21%)	<i>Accessing phone numbers</i>	17 (21%)
<i>Ensuring dependants were looked after</i>	4 (5%)	<i>Other</i>	4 (5%)

Q3.3 Please answer the following questions about reception:

	Yes	No	Don't remember
Were you seen by a member of health services?	72 (73%)	22 (22%)	5 (5%)
When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	69 (71%)	16 (16%)	12 (12%)

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

Very well	Well	Neither	Badly	Very badly	Don't remember
8 (8%)	48 (49%)	30 (31%)	6 (6%)	6 (6%)	0 (0%)

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

<i>Information about what was going to happen to you</i>	32 (34%)
<i>Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	27 (28%)
<i>Information about how to make routine requests</i>	28 (29%)
<i>Information about your entitlement to visits</i>	42 (44%)
<i>Information about health services</i>	45 (47%)
<i>Information about the chaplaincy</i>	34 (36%)
Not offered anything	35 (37%)

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

<i>A smokers/non-smokers pack</i>	92 (94%)
<i>The opportunity to have a shower</i>	46 (47%)
<i>The opportunity to make a free telephone call</i>	15 (15%)
<i>Something to eat</i>	58 (59%)
Did not receive anything	4 (4%)

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

<i>Chaplain or religious leader</i>	29 (30%)
<i>Someone from health services</i>	71 (72%)
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	3 (3%)
Did not meet any of these people	21 (21%)

Q3.8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours of your arrival at this prison?	
	Yes	5 (5%)
	No	93 (95%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	93 (93%)
	No	4 (4%)
	Don't remember.....	3 (3%)
Q3.10	How soon after your arrival did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	8 (8%)
	Within the first week	77 (79%)
	More than a week after my arrival.....	10 (10%)
	Don't remember.....	2 (2%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	8 (8%)
	Yes	42 (43%)
	No	42 (43%)
	Don't remember.....	6 (6%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	12 (12%)	36 (36%)	17 (17%)	14 (14%)	6 (6%)	15 (15%)
	Attend legal visits?	12 (13%)	21 (22%)	24 (26%)	8 (9%)	2 (2%)	27 (29%)
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						22 (23%)
	Yes						41 (43%)
	No						33 (34%)
Q4.3	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>N/A</i>		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	83 (84%)	8 (8%)	4 (4%)	4 (4%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	75 (76%)	19 (19%)	4 (4%)	1 (1%)		

Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	67 (68%)	32 (32%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	35 (35%)	40 (40%)	18 (18%)	7 (7%)

Q4.4 What is the food like here?

<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
1 (1%)	23 (24%)	21 (22%)	45 (46%)	7 (7%)

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

<i>Have not bought anything yet</i>	5 (5%)
Yes.....	34 (34%)
No.....	61 (61%)

Q4.6 Is it easy or difficult to get:

	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
A complaint form	36 (36%)	44 (44%)	4 (4%)	9 (9%)	1 (1%)	7 (7%)
An application form	42 (43%)	46 (47%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)

Q4.7 Have you made an application?

Yes.....	92 (93%)
No.....	7 (7%)

Q4.8 Please answer the following questions concerning applications:

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with fairly?	7 (7%)	43 (45%)	45 (47%)
Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	7 (7%)	43 (45%)	46 (48%)

Q4.9 Have you made a complaint?

Yes.....	39 (39%)
No.....	61 (61%)

Q4.10 Please answer the following questions concerning complaints:

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with fairly?	61 (61%)	7 (7%)	32 (32%)
Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	61 (62%)	8 (8%)	29 (30%)
Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	61 (62%)	10 (10%)	28 (28%)

Q4.11 Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?
Not made a complaint..... 61 (61%)
 Yes 15 (15%)
 No 24 (24%)

Q4.12 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?
Don't know who they are *Very easy* *Easy* *Neither* *Difficult* *Very difficult*
 25 (25%) 5 (5%) 18 (18%) 28 (28%) 16 (16%) 7 (7%)

Q4.13 Please answer the following questions about your religious beliefs?

	Yes	No	<i>Don't know/N/A</i>
Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	42 (44%)	15 (16%)	38 (40%)
Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	36 (40%)	12 (13%)	42 (47%)

Q4.14 Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?

	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
	13 (13%)	14 (14%)	72 (73%)

Q4.15 Please answer the following questions about staff in this prison?

	Yes	No
Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	63 (64%)	36 (36%)
Do most staff treat you with respect?	51 (54%)	44 (46%)

Section 5: Safety

Q5.1 Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?
 Yes 12 (12%)
 No 88 (88%)

Q5.2 Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?
 Yes 6 (6%)
 No 93 (94%)

Q5.3 In which areas of this prison do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Never felt unsafe</i> 88 (92%)	<i>At mealtimes</i> 2 (2%)
<i>Everywhere</i> 2 (2%)	<i>At health services</i> 1 (1%)
<i>Segregation unit</i> 0 (0%)	<i>Visit's area</i> 0 (0%)
<i>Association areas</i> 2 (2%)	<i>In wing showers</i> 2 (2%)
<i>Reception area</i> 0 (0%)	<i>In gym showers</i> 1 (1%)
<i>At the gym</i> 1 (1%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> 3 (3%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i> 0 (0%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> 4 (4%)
<i>At work</i> 1 (1%)	<i>In your cell</i> 1 (1%)
<i>During movement</i> 1 (1%)	<i>At religious services</i> 0 (0%)
<i>At education</i> 1 (1%)	

Q5.4 Have you been victimised by another prisoner or group of prisoners here?

Yes 8 (8%)
No 90 (92%) **If No, go to question 5.6**

Q5.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	4 (4%)	<i>Because of your sexuality.....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Because you have a disability....</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Because of your age.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Because of drugs.....</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because of your offence/crime...</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Because you were new here.....</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Because of gang related issues.</i>	0 (0%)

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

Yes 20 (20%)
No 80 (80%) **If No, go to question 5.8**

Q5.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	10 (10%)	<i>Because you have a disability....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because of your age.....</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Because of drugs.....</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Because of your offence/crime...</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Because you were new here.....</i>	7 (7%)	<i>Because of gang related issues.</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Because of your sexuality.....</i>	0 (0%)		

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

Not been victimised 72 (74%)
Yes 9 (9%)
No 16 (16%)

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

Yes 8 (8%)
No 90 (92%)

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

Yes 22 (22%)
 No 77 (78%)

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

Very easy *Easy* *Neither* *Difficult* *Very difficult* *Don't know*
 27 (28%) 9 (9%) 9 (9%) 4 (4%) 0 (0%) 48 (49%)

Section 6: Health services

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

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	8 (8%)	10 (10%)	42 (42%)	12 (12%)	24 (24%)	4 (4%)
The nurse	8 (8%)	19 (19%)	55 (55%)	8 (8%)	9 (9%)	1 (1%)
The dentist	20 (20%)	1 (1%)	7 (7%)	7 (7%)	29 (29%)	35 (35%)
The optician	34 (35%)	2 (2%)	9 (9%)	8 (8%)	23 (23%)	22 (22%)

Q6.2 Are you able to see a pharmacist?

Yes 31 (33%)
 No 62 (67%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	7 (7%)	22 (22%)	39 (39%)	16 (16%)	11 (11%)	5 (5%)
The nurse	6 (6%)	12 (12%)	34 (34%)	16 (16%)	19 (19%)	13 (13%)
The dentist	41 (44%)	2 (2%)	17 (18%)	15 (16%)	11 (12%)	8 (9%)
The optician	45 (48%)	3 (3%)	19 (20%)	14 (15%)	6 (6%)	6 (6%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
3 (3%)	4 (4%)	33 (34%)	24 (25%)	27 (28%)	6 (6%)

Q6.5 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes 54 (55%)
 No 44 (45%)

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

Not taking medication 44 (44%)
 Yes 50 (51%)
 No 5 (5%)

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

Yes 20 (20%)
 No 79 (80%)

- Q6.8 Are your emotional well-being/ mental health issues being addressed by any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| <i>Do not have any issues/not receiving any help</i> | 85 (87%) |
| <i>Doctor</i> | 12 (12%) |
| <i>Nurse</i> | 4 (4%) |
| <i>Psychiatrist</i> | 1 (1%) |
| <i>Mental health in-reach team</i> | 5 (5%) |
| <i>Counsellor</i> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>Other</i> | 1 (1%) |
- Q6.9 Did you have a problem with either of the following when you came into this prison?**
- | | Yes | No |
|---------|----------|----------|
| Drugs | 7 (7%) | 89 (93%) |
| Alcohol | 10 (10%) | 87 (90%) |
- Q6.10 Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?**
- | | |
|-----------|----------|
| Yes | 3 (3%) |
| No..... | 95 (97%) |
- Q6.11 Do you know who to contact in this prison to get help with your drug or alcohol problem?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Yes | 12 (13%) |
| No..... | 1 (1%) |
| <i>Did not / do not have a drug or alcohol problem</i> | 83 (86%) |
- Q6.12 Have you received any intervention or help (including, CARATs, Health Services etc.) for your drug/alcohol problem, while in this prison?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Yes | 8 (8%) |
| No..... | 5 (5%) |
| <i>Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem</i> | 83 (86%) |
- Q6.13 Was the intervention or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Yes | 5 (5%) |
| No..... | 5 (5%) |
| <i>Did not have a problem/have not received help</i> | 87 (90%) |
- Q6.14 Do you think you will have a problem with either of the following when you leave this prison?**
- | | Yes | No | Don't know |
|---------|--------|----------|------------|
| Drugs | 1 (1%) | 86 (90%) | 9 (9%) |
| Alcohol | 2 (2%) | 83 (87%) | 10 (11%) |
- Q6.15 Do you know who in this prison can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?**
- | | |
|-----------|----------|
| Yes | 8 (8%) |
| No..... | 4 (4%) |
| N/A..... | 86 (88%) |

Section 7: Purposeful activity

- Q7.1 Are you currently involved in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| Prison job | 59 (61%) |
| Vocational or skills training..... | 10 (10%) |
| Education (including basic skills)..... | 22 (23%) |
| Offending behaviour programmes..... | 4 (4%) |
| Not involved in any of these | 20 (21%) |
- Q7.2 If you have been involved in any of the following while in this prison, do you think it will help you on release?**
- | | Not been
involved | Yes | No | Don't know |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Prison job | 12 (14%) | 33 (39%) | 34 (40%) | 5 (6%) |
| Vocational or skills training | 18 (24%) | 34 (46%) | 14 (19%) | 8 (11%) |
| Education (including basic skills) | 10 (13%) | 40 (51%) | 22 (28%) | 6 (8%) |
| Offending behaviour programmes | 19 (28%) | 21 (31%) | 20 (29%) | 8 (12%) |
- Q7.3 How often do you go to the library?**
- | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| Don't want to go | 8 (8%) |
| <i>Never</i> | 6 (6%) |
| <i>Less than once a week</i> | 39 (40%) |
| <i>About once a week</i> | 21 (22%) |
| <i>More than once a week</i> | 18 (19%) |
| <i>Don't know</i> | 5 (5%) |
- Q7.4 On average how many times do you go to the gym each week?**
- | <i>Don't want to go</i> | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 to 5 | More than 5 | Don't know |
|-------------------------|----------|--------|--------|----------|-------------|------------|
| 12 (12%) | 13 (13%) | 4 (4%) | 8 (8%) | 24 (25%) | 33 (34%) | 3 (3%) |
- Q7.5 On average how many times do you go outside for exercise each week?**
- | <i>Don't want to go</i> | 0 | 1 to 2 | 3 to 5 | More than 5 | Don't know |
|-------------------------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|------------|
| 2 (2%) | 7 (7%) | 23 (24%) | 32 (33%) | 33 (34%) | 0 (0%) |
- Q7.6 On average how many hours do you spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)**
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| <i>Less than 2 hours</i> | 2 (2%) |
| <i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> | 4 (4%) |
| <i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> | 4 (4%) |
| <i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> | 16 (16%) |
| <i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> | 25 (25%) |
| <i>10 hours or more</i> | 45 (45%) |
| <i>Don't know</i> | 3 (3%) |
- Q7.7 On average, how many times do you have association each week?**
- | <i>Don't want to go</i> | 0 | 1 to 2 | 3 to 5 | More than 5 | Don't know |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|------------|
| 1 (1%) | 2 (2%) | 4 (4%) | 1 (1%) | 81 (84%) | 7 (7%) |

Q7.8	How often do staff normally speak to you during association time?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Never</i>	22 (22%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	38 (38%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	25 (25%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	2 (2%)

Section 8: Resettlement

Q8.1	When did you first meet your personal officer?	
	<i>Still have not met him/her</i>	60 (61%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	16 (16%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	16 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (6%)

Q8.2	How helpful do you think your personal officer is?					
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ still have not met him/her</i>	<i>Very helpful</i>	<i>Helpful</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Not very helpful</i>	<i>Not at all helpful</i>
	60 (61%)	7 (7%)	17 (17%)	7 (7%)	3 (3%)	4 (4%)

Q8.3	Do you have a sentence plan/OASys?	
	<i>Yes</i>	66 (68%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (32%)

Q8.4	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>	31 (32%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	17 (17%)
	<i>Involved</i>	23 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	11 (11%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	10 (10%)

Q8.5	Can you achieve all or some of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>	31 (33%)
	<i>Yes</i>	46 (48%)
	<i>No</i>	18 (19%)

Q8.6	Are there plans for you to achieve all/some of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>	31 (33%)
	<i>Yes</i>	8 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	56 (59%)

Q8.7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to address your offending behaviour whilst at this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	77 (82%)

- Q8.8 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?**
 Yes 10 (10%)
 No..... 86 (90%)
- Q8.9 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?**
 Yes 32 (33%)
 No..... 61 (64%)
 Don't know..... 3 (3%)
- Q8.10 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?**
 Yes 17 (18%)
 No..... 79 (81%)
 Don't know..... 1 (1%)
- Q8.11 Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?**
Not been here a week yet 5 (5%)
 Yes 54 (56%)
 No..... 33 (34%)
 Don't remember..... 4 (4%)
- Q8.12 How many visits did you receive in the last week?**
- | Not been in a week | 0 | 1 to 2 | 3 to 4 | 5 or more |
|---------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| 5 (5%) | 48 (51%) | 40 (42%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (2%) |
- Q8.13 How are you and your family/ friends treated by visits staff?**
Not had any visits 19 (20%)
 Very well..... 11 (11%)
 Well 31 (32%)
 Neither 22 (23%)
 Badly 5 (5%)
 Very badly 3 (3%)
 Don't know..... 6 (6%)
- Q8.14 Have you been helped to maintain contact with your family/friends whilst in this prison?**
 Yes 34 (36%)
 No..... 61 (64%)
- Q8.15 Do you know who to contact to get help with the following within this prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|--|
| Don't know who to contact .. 43 (47%) | Help with your finances in preparation for release 9 (10%) |
| Maintaining good relationships 8 (9%) | Claiming benefits on release ... 18 (20%) |
| Avoiding bad relationships 7 (8%) | Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release 17 (19%) |
| Finding a job on release 30 (33%) | Continuity of health services on release 12 (13%) |

Finding accommodation on release..... 28 (31%) *Opening a bank account*..... 21 (23%)

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

<i>No problems</i>	39 (43%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i>	23 (26%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships</i>	10 (11%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release ...</i>	27 (30%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	12 (13%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i>	14 (16%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	40 (44%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i>	15 (17%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release</i>	27 (30%)	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	26 (29%)

Q8.17 Have you been provided with information on the following:

	Yes	No
ROTL (temporary release)	73 (77%)	22 (23%)
Facility licence (outside work, education)	49 (54%)	42 (46%)
Resettlement licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	44 (50%)	44 (50%)
Earned community visits (town visits)	64 (70%)	28 (30%)

Q8.18 Have you had access to the following:

	Yes	No
ROTL (temporary release)	67 (71%)	27 (29%)
Facility licence (outside work, education)	39 (48%)	42 (52%)
Resettlement licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	42 (51%)	41 (49%)
Earned community visits (town visits)	58 (67%)	28 (33%)

Q8.19 Please answer the following questions on resettlement:

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	15 (16%)	81 (84%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc)?	17 (18%)	76 (82%)
Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	66 (72%)	26 (28%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course?	38 (40%)	56 (60%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	38 (41%)	54 (59%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address?	44 (48%)	47 (52%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Hatfield (open) 2010

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

		HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	HMP Moorland (Open) 2005
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent 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		101	1286	101	99
SECTION 1: General information					
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	6%	1%	6%	24%
3	Are you on recall?	2%	3%	2%	
4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%	12%	5%	21%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	47%	50%	47%	57%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	9%	11%	9%	14%
7	Are you a foreign national?	3%	6%	3%	8%
8	Is English your first language?	90%	93%	90%	96%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	24%	27%	24%	15%
10	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	1%	2%	1%	
11	Are you Muslim?	18%	12%	18%	
12	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	1%	0%	
13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	10%	13%	
14	Is this your first time in prison?	57%	51%	57%	54%
15	Have you been in more than five prisons this sentence/remand time?	8%	15%	8%	
16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	51%	55%	51%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
For the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons:					
1a	Was the cleanliness of the van good/very good?	49%	55%	49%	47%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	53%	62%	53%	60%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	13%	17%	13%	23%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	20%	34%	20%	37%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	6%	14%	6%	12%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	5%	9%	5%	4%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	71%	55%	77%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	84%	88%	84%	94%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	10%	24%	10%	22%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	99%	92%	99%	97%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	HMP Moorland (Open) 2005
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent 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	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:				
1b	Problems with loss of property?	9%	16%	9%	
1c	Housing problems?	9%	21%	9%	
1d	Problems contacting employers?	8%	12%	8%	
1e	Problems contacting family?	26%	51%	26%	
1f	Problems ensuring dependants were looked after?	9%	15%	9%	
1g	Money problems?	8%	17%	8%	
1h	Problems of feeling depressed/suicidal?	21%	39%	21%	
1i	Health problems?	34%	54%	34%	
1j	Problems in needing protection from other prisoners?	6%	16%	6%	
1k	Problems accessing phone numbers?	24%	38%	24%	
	When you first arrived:				
2a	Did you have any problems?	57%	45%	57%	44%
2b	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	11%	9%	11%	7%
2c	Did you have any housing problems?	20%	13%	20%	12%
2d	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	7%	5%	7%	3%
2e	Did you have any problems contacting family?	21%	15%	21%	9%
2f	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	5%	4%	5%	2%
2g	Did you have any money worries?	21%	16%	21%	13%
2h	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	12%	6%	12%	8%
2i	Did you have any health problems?	23%	10%	23%	8%
2j	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	1%	4%	2%
2k	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	21%	10%	21%	
3a	Were you seen by a member of health services in reception?	73%	83%	73%	89%
3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	71%	82%	71%	85%
4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	57%	80%	57%	80%
	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following information:				
5a	Information about what was going to happen to you?	34%	63%	34%	72%
5b	Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	28%	52%	28%	52%
5c	Information about how to make routine requests?	29%	53%	29%	48%
5d	Information about your entitlement to visits?	44%	61%	44%	62%
5e	Information about health services?	47%	67%	47%	
5f	Information about the chaplaincy?	36%	55%	36%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	HMP Moorland (Open) 2005
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent 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					
On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:					
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	94%	75%	94%	94%
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	47%	64%	47%	52%
6c	The opportunity to make a free telephone call?	16%	48%	16%	31%
6d	Something to eat?	59%	76%	59%	70%
Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:					
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	30%	45%	30%	53%
7b	Someone from health services?	72%	79%	72%	73%
7c	A Listener/Samaritans?	3%	35%	3%	29%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	5%	23%	5%	23%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	93%	91%	93%	94%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	96%	92%	97%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	47%	74%	47%	83%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	48%	61%	48%	
1b	Attend legal visits?	35%	56%	35%	
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	43%	26%	43%	29%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
3a	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	98%	99%	100%
3b	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	84%	80%	84%	76%
3c	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76%	70%	76%	87%
3d	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	68%	79%	68%	74%
3e	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	35%	51%	35%	50%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25%	42%	25%	50%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	34%	52%	34%	52%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	79%	86%	79%	80%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	91%	91%	91%	92%
7	Have you made an application?	93%	84%	93%	74%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	HMP Moorland (Open) 2005
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody continued					
For those who have made an application:					
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	49%	76%	49%	66%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	48%	71%	48%	62%
9	Have you made a complaint?	39%	33%	39%	54%
For those who have made a complaint:					
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	18%	44%	18%	55%
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	22%	51%	22%	53%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	39%	21%	39%	11%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	10%	25%	10%	36%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	23%	45%	23%	49%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	58%	44%	50%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	40%	64%	40%	57%
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	13%	66%	13%	56%
15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	64%	76%	64%	74%
15b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	54%	76%	54%	67%
SECTION 5: Safety					
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	12%	16%	12%	12%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	6%	4%	6%	
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	8%	8%	8%	9%
Since you have been here, has another prisoner:					
5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	4%	4%	4%	7%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	1%	3%	4%
5c	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%	1%	1%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%	0%	2%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%	0%	1%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	1%	1%	1%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	2%	2%	3%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	0%	0%	0%	0%
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	1%	1%	
5k	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	0%	1%	
5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	1%	3%	4%
5m	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	1%	1%	
5n	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland (Open)	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open)	HMP Moorland (Open)
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Safety continued					
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	20%	16%	20%	9%
	Since you have been here has a member of staff:				
7a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	8%	10%	5%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	2%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	4%	7%	3%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	0%	0%	0%	
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	0%	1%	
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	
7j	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	
7k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%	3%	1%
7l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	2%	1%	
7m	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:					
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	36%	26%	36%	14%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	8%	9%	8%	12%
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	22%	14%	22%	10%
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	37%	36%	37%	35%
SECTION 6: Health care					
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	52%	62%	52%	
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	74%	79%	74%	
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	8%	31%	8%	
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	11%	26%	11%	
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	33%	52%	33%	
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:					
3a	The doctor?	66%	72%	66%	64%
3b	The nurse?	49%	80%	49%	78%
3c	The dentist?	36%	61%	36%	26%
3d	The optician?	46%	59%	46%	73%
4	The overall quality of health services?	40%	69%	40%	61%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	HMP Moorland (Open) 2005
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
health care continued					
5	Are you currently taking medication?	55%	36%	55%	
For those currently taking medication:					
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	91%	95%	91%	
7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	20%	12%	20%	
For those with emotional well-being/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:					
8a	Not receiving any help?	31%	31%	31%	
8b	A doctor?	53%	36%	53%	
8c	A nurse?	20%	31%	20%	
8d	A psychiatrist?	4%	9%	4%	
8e	The mental health in-reach team?	27%	26%	27%	
8f	A counsellor?	0%	10%	0%	
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	8%	7%	8%	5%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	10%	5%	10%	5%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	3%	3%	3%	
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	93%	92%	93%	
12	Have you received any help or intervention while in this prison?	61%	87%	61%	
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:					
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	50%	81%	50%	
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	11%	9%	11%	7%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	12%	8%	12%	7%
For those who may have a drug or alcohol problem on release, do you know who in this prison:					
15	Can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?	68%	73%	68%	89%
SECTION 7: Purposeful activity					
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
1a	A prison job?	61%	74%	61%	
1b	Vocational or skills training?	11%	24%	11%	
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	23%	30%	23%	
1d	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	4%	12%	4%	
2ai	Have you had a job while in this prison?	86%	91%	86%	
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	46%	48%	46%	
2bi	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	76%	80%	76%	
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:					
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	61%	75%	61%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland (Open)	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open)	HMP Moorland (Open)
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Purposeful activity continued					
2ci	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	87%	82%	87%	
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	59%	74%	59%	
2di	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	72%	71%	72%	
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	43%	58%	43%	
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	40%	60%	40%	48%
4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	67%	61%	67%	67%
5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	67%	70%	67%	23%
6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	46%	52%	46%	52%
7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	76%	84%	83%
8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	12%	21%	12%	22%
SECTION 8: Resettlement					
1	Do you have a personal officer?	39%	66%	39%	57%
For those with a personal officer:					
2	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	63%	77%	63%	75%
For those who are sentenced:					
3	Do you have a sentence plan?	68%	69%	68%	82%
For those with a sentence plan?					
4	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	60%	75%	60%	72%
5	Can you achieve some/all of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	72%	85%	72%	
6	Are there plans for you to achieve some/all your targets in another prison?	13%	30%	13%	
7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you address your offending behaviour while in this prison?	18%	39%	18%	
8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	11%	36%	11%	
9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	33%	21%	33%	33%
10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	10%	17%	33%
11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	56%	50%	56%	48%
12	Did you receive one or more visits in the last week?	44%	48%	44%	
For those who have had visits:					
13	How are you and your family/ friends usually treated by visits staff? (Very well/well)	54%	73%	54%	
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	36%	55%	36%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	Open prisons comparator	HMP Moorland (Open) 2010	HMP Moorland (Open) 2005
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Resettlement continued					
15	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with the following:				
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	9%	22%	9%	
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	8%	17%	8%	
15d	Finding a job on release?	33%	60%	33%	87%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	31%	54%	31%	85%
15f	With money/finances on release?	10%	41%	10%	60%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	20%	50%	20%	68%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	19%	46%	19%	72%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	13%	42%	13%	67%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	23%	42%	23%	
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison?				
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	11%	4%	11%	
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	13%	4%	13%	
16d	Finding a job?	44%	30%	44%	
16e	Finding accommodation?	30%	22%	30%	
16f	Money/finances?	26%	22%	26%	
16g	Claiming benefits?	30%	17%	30%	
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	16%	11%	16%	
16i	Accessing health services?	17%	9%	17%	
16j	Opening a bank account?	29%	18%	29%	
17	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
17a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	77%	76%	77%	
17b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	54%	60%	54%	
17c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	50%	61%	50%	
17d	Earned community visits (town visits)	70%	76%	70%	
18	Have you had access to the following:				
18a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	71%	61%	71%	
18b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	48%	43%	48%	
18c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	51%	43%	51%	
18d	Earned community visits (town visits)	68%	60%	68%	
19	Please answer the following about resettlement:				
19a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	16%	28%	16%	
19b	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility)?	18%	30%	18%	
19c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	72%	84%	72%	
19d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	40%	20%	40%	
19e	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	41%	69%	41%	
19f	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	48%	46%	48%	

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Hatfield (open) 2010

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

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent 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		24	77	18	83
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	9%	1%	12%	1%
1.8	Is English your first language?	63%	99%	56%	98%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			84%	11%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	1%	0%	1%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	63%	4%		
1.13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	14%	5%	14%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	67%	53%	67%	54%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	22%	20%	23%	20%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	58%	55%	44%	58%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	88%	83%	84%	84%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	39%	22%	30%	26%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	22%	21%	23%	21%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	26%	36%	30%	35%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	69%	54%	85%	52%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	75%	72%	84%	70%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	54%	77%	50%	76%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	57%	53%	58%

Key to tables

Diversity Analysis

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	75%	72%	79%	71%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	97%	72%	97%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	92%	88%	93%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	67%	42%	72%	43%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%	100%	99%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	26%	24%	16%	27%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	30%	36%	21%	37%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	75%	80%	79%	80%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	83%	93%	83%	93%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	33%	41%	44%	38%
4.13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	39%	72%	38%
4.13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	40%	40%	55%	37%
4.14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	4%	16%	16%	13%
4.15a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	70%	61%	61%	64%
4.15b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	66%	50%	59%	52%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	9%	13%	12%	12%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	9%	5%	12%	5%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	4%	10%	5%	9%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	5%	0%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	21%	20%	21%	20%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	12%	0%	16%	0%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	1%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	12%	0%	16%	0%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	0%	11%	0%	10%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	26%	21%	23%	22%

Key to tables

Diversity Analysis

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	23%	41%	23%	40%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%	59%	50%	53%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	54%	80%	67%	76%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	23%	37%	23%	36%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	54%	55%	59%	54%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	4%	25%	5%	23%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	48%	66%	48%	64%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	4%	12%	5%	11%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	31%	21%	42%	19%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	9%	3%	5%	4%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39%	41%	45%	40%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	88%	60%	88%	62%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	69%	66%	67%	67%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	37%	48%	33%	48%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	86%	78%	86%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	9%	14%	12%	13%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	42%	38%	35%	40%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	28%	35%	14%	37%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	14%	19%	13%	19%
8.18	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
8.18a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	77%	77%	63%	80%
8.18b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	53%	54%	42%	56%
8.18c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	47%	51%	45%	51%
8.18d	Earned community visits (town visits)	72%	69%	53%	73%
8.19	Have you had access to the following:				
8.19a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	83%	68%	68%	72%
8.19b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	56%	46%	39%	50%
8.19c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	59%	48%	45%	51%
8.19d	Earned community visits (town visits)	83%	64%	65%	68%
8.20	Please answer the following about resettlement:				
8.20a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	17%	15%	23%	14%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.20b	were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility)?	35%	14%	26%	17%
8.20c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	60%	75%	53%	75%
8.20d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	28%	44%	24%	44%
8.20e	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	47%	49%	47%	49%



Diversity Analysis - Disability

Key questions (disability analysis) HMP Hatfield (open) 2010

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 percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent 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		13	88
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	0%	3%
1.8	Is English your first language?	93%	90%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	16%	25%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	1%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	7%	19%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	61%	56%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	39%	18%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	56%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	77%	85%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	27%	26%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	19%	22%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	35%	33%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	55%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	59%	75%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	70%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	57%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	75%	72%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	100%	92%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	92%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	55%	47%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	100%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	39%	23%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39%	34%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	70%	81%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	84%	92%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	30%	40%
4.13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	54%	43%
4.13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	37%
4.14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	7%	14%
4.15a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	61%	64%
4.15b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	68%	52%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	16%	12%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	7%	6%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	0%	9%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	23%	19%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	0%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	3%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	0%	10%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	23%	22%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	32%	38%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	61%	51%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	61%	76%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	19%	35%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	75%	53%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well-being/mental health issues?	55%	15%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	46%	64%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	12%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	35%	21%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	5%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	30%	42%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	41%	71%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	65%	68%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	30%	48%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	86%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	16%	12%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	39%	39%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	32%	33%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	16%	18%
8.18	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
8.18a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	55%	80%
8.18b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	39%	56%
8.18c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	41%	51%
8.18d	Earned community visits (town visits)	45%	73%
8.19	Have you had access to the following:		
8.19a	ROTL (release on temporary licence)	70%	71%
8.19b	Facility licence (outside work, education)	65%	46%
8.19c	Resettlement licence (other outside activities e.g. work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	65%	49%
8.19d	Earned community visits (town visits)	59%	69%
8.20	Please answer the following about resettlement:		
8.20a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	17%	16%
8.20b	were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility)?	17%	19%
8.20c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	93%	69%
8.20d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	41%	40%
8.20e	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	32%	51%