

Report on an announced inspection of

# **HMP Hollesley Bay**

9 – 13 February 2009

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2009

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

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Fact page</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Healthy prison summary</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1 Arrival in custody</b>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	17
First days in custody	17
<b>2 Environment and relationships</b>	
Residential units	19
Staff-prisoner relationships	21
Personal officers	21
<b>3 Duty of care</b>	
Bullying and violence reduction	23
Self-harm and suicide	24
Diversity	26
Race equality	27
Foreign national prisoners	29
Applications and complaints	30
Legal rights	30
Substance use	31
<b>4 Health services</b>	
	33
<b>5 Activities</b>	
Learning and skills and work activities	41
Physical education and health promotion	43
Faith and religious activity	44
Time out of cell	45
<b>6 Good order</b>	
Security and rules	47
Discipline	48
Incentives and earned privileges	50

## **7 Services**

---

Catering	51
Prison shop	52

## **8 Resettlement**

---

Strategic management of resettlement	53
Offender management and planning	54
Resettlement pathways	56

## **9 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice**

---

65

## **Appendices**

---

I Inspection team	73
II Prison population profile	74
III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	76

# Introduction

Hollesley Bay is an open prison in Suffolk for adult men, including young offenders under 21. Like all open prisons, it has had to manage a more diverse population in recent years, including some prisoners with very little time left to serve who, as a result, may have little incentive to exercise the self-discipline required in low security conditions. Commendably, this full announced inspection found that the prison had risen to this and various other challenges, and was continuing to progress.

Hollesley Bay was a very safe prison. Early days were well managed and there was very little bullying or self-harm. Prisoners were largely well behaved and motivated. Drugs were not a major problem and there were few absconds. Security arrangements were generally proportionate, although movement around the grounds was too restricted. Transfers back to closed conditions were managed well to maintain control.

Staff-prisoner relations were positive, supported by a functioning personal officer scheme and efficient application and complaint procedures. The grounds and accommodation were generally good. Prisoners complained vociferously about the food and we found some meals were served cold. Religious needs were met, but development of chaplaincy services had been hampered by staff sickness. Diversity arrangements were underdeveloped and, despite a commendably strong lead from the governor, further work was required with staff to raise cultural awareness and with black and minority ethnic prisoners to satisfy them that they were treated equally. Health services were satisfactory.

Prisoners had plenty of time out of their rooms and there was sufficient activity to keep them all purposefully occupied. Education, work and training opportunities were all good. The most sought after placements were community projects and paid work, although the downturn in the economy was already beginning to limit opportunities. Library and physical education provision were both good.

Resettlement was well managed, although it was difficult to get probation officers in the community to visit prisoners for whom they were responsible in this distant rural prison. Sentence planning operated well for those on longer sentences, but there was no custody planning for those with short sentences for whom the prison was not well equipped. Work on most of the resettlement pathways was sound, but more help was needed for those with alcohol problems and to assist in the maintenance of family ties.

With the rising prison population, open establishments such as Hollesley Bay have had to deal with a more diverse population. Many prisoners are a long way from home and some have very little time left to serve, which means they can gain little from the regime and have little investment in it. Managers and staff are to be congratulated for rising to these challenges. The prison provided a very safe, well controlled and respectful environment. Prisoners were kept purposefully occupied and some good efforts were made to resettle those there long enough to receive appropriate support.

Anne Owers  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2009



# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

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

## Brief history

HMP/YOI Hollesley Bay was developed as a borstal in 1938 on the site of a former colonial college whose original buildings, dated 1887, now house much of the administration centre. It became a young offender institution in 1988. In April 2002, Hollesley Bay open prison for mainly adults was formally separated from the adjacent HMYOI Warren Hill, now a closed establishment holding a solely juvenile population.

## Area organisation

Eastern

## Number held

297 adults, 41 young offenders on 18 February 2009

## Certified normal accommodation

345

## Operational capacity

345

## Last inspection

Full unannounced: 8–12 December 2003

Short follow-up: 8–10 January 2007

## Description of residential units

Hoxon:	Mainly single rooms. Two of the four landings accommodate new arrivals on induction
Cosford, Stow, Wilford:	Mainly single rooms, with two or three double rooms each
Bosmere:	Part-enhanced unit. A pre-fabricated 'quick build' comprising two linked units accommodating 40 prisoners each





# 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:
- |                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Safety</b>              | prisoners, even the most vulnerable, are held safely  |
| <b>Respect</b>             | prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity  |
| <b>Purposeful activity</b> | prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them                          |
| <b>Resettlement</b>        | 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.
- ... performing well against this healthy prison test.**  
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- ... performing reasonably well 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.
- ... not performing sufficiently well 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.
- ... performing poorly 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 Few prisoners had very long journeys to the prison. New arrivals were well supported and received a good induction. The prison was safe and there were no significant issues of bullying or self-harm, with good support provided for those at risk. Disciplinary measures were generally fair and proportionate. Use of force was

extremely rare. The availability of drugs was not a major problem. The prison was performing well against this healthy prison test.

- HP4 Most prisoners arrived in cellular vehicles, which was not necessary for transfer to an open prison. Few had very long journeys. The reception building was unsuitable and, although some efforts had been made to improve the environment, it was not an appropriate introduction to the prison. Almost all said they felt safe on their first night, but young adults were not as positive as older men. Much of the induction programme was delivered by prisoner orderlies. It was comprehensive and allowed time for men to adjust to open conditions.
- HP5 Most men felt very safe. There was a clear message that bullying was not tolerated and the few identified persistent bullies were quickly returned to closed conditions. Well attended monthly anti-bullying meetings were held and included prisoner representatives. A wide range of appropriate issues was discussed. Potential bullying situations were well identified. Most were dealt with informally and only three men had been formally monitored in the previous year. The records of those few cases contained regular comments and management checks.
- HP6 Incidents of self-harm were very rare and only three men had been identified as at risk to date in 2009. In 2008, there had been 20. Men were not returned to closed prisons simply because they were regarded as at risk and the quality of assessments and daily monitoring for those who had caused some concerns was good, demonstrating care and that staff engaged directly with the prisoner. Case reviews were appropriately multidisciplinary.
- HP7 The level of security and application of rules were mostly suited to the prison's function, although some rules appeared a little too restrictive. Security information reports were well collated and evaluated. Prisoners understood what was expected of them, but some complained that rules were sometimes inconsistently applied. There were relatively few absconds and transfers back to closed conditions were effectively used to maintain control.
- HP8 Prisoners were largely well behaved and well motivated. There were not many adjudications and most minor breaches of rules were appropriately dealt with through informal warnings or the incentives and earned privileges scheme. Most adjudications were well conducted, but defences to late returns from release on temporary licence were not always fully considered. Only one man had been subject to use of force in the previous year. Some men were held in secure accommodation for transfer to closed conditions, but the length of time they spent locked in the cells was not recorded.
- HP9 The positive random mandatory drug test rate was around 9%. It did not appear that drugs were widely available in the prison, and in our survey significantly fewer than the comparator said it was easy to get them. Suspicion tests averaged a 35% positive rate. As there was no monitoring of how long it took to administer the test after the intelligence was received, it was not possible to judge whether the relatively low rate reflected poor intelligence or delays in testing. Prisoners who tested positive were referred to drug workers for support and it was helpful that they were not automatically returned to closed conditions. We welcomed the proposed introduction of drug maintenance programmes, but the dispensing arrangements were unsatisfactory.

## Respect

---

- HP10 Relationships between staff and prisoners were positive and personal officer work was reasonably good. The prison was clean and accommodation was of a decent standard, although some shower areas needed attention. Development of chaplaincy work had suffered because of staff absences, but an appropriate service had been maintained. Prisoners were dissatisfied with the standard of the food. There was no overarching diversity policy and little strategic direction as to how the needs of prisoners with disabilities would be met. Race structures were good, with a positive lead from senior management, but more active general promotion of race equality was needed to help build prisoners' confidence. Applications and complaints were well managed and much improved. Health services were satisfactory. The prison was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.
- HP11 Relationships between staff and prisoners were mostly very positive. In our survey, 87%, much higher than in comparator prisons, said most staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff who would help them if they had a problem. There was regular consultation with prisoners. Most prisoners knew their personal officers. Personal officer entries in history sheets were regular and respectful and showed some good interactions with prisoners, but few referred to resettlement objectives or family issues. There were good entries about families, including some identification of child protection matters, in observation books.
- HP12 The grounds were well maintained and accommodation was of a decent standard. Rooms and communal areas were clean and generally well decorated. Access to laundry and showering facilities was good, but some shower areas were in poor condition exacerbated by inadequate ventilation. There was no suitable accommodation for prisoners with mobility difficulties.
- HP13 Appropriate religious services were held and some good pastoral support was provided, but the absence of key staff through sickness had hindered the development of chaplaincy work. Relatively few men attended Christian services, but over 20 attended Muslim classes and prayers. Chaplains usually saw new arrivals within 24 hours.
- HP14 Prisoners had good access to the shop, including when they first arrived. A recent internal survey indicated broad satisfaction with the shop, although many prisoners said goods were expensive. Prisoners could order items from catalogues and some internet suppliers.
- HP15 Prisoners were dissatisfied with the quality of the food and only 27%, significantly fewer than the comparator of 52%, said it was good. Some of the food we sampled was cold. There were no opportunities for men to prepare their own meals.
- HP16 The application system was very effective, with a tracking system that wing managers actively used to chase up outstanding responses. Efforts were made to resolve complaints at the lowest possible level. Replies to formal complaints were timely and respectful. The deputy governor quality assured complaints and provided feedback. Monthly information about complaints was provided for the senior management team, but there was no trend analysis over longer periods.

- HP17 Just over 80% of prisoners were on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme. No one was on the basic level. The scheme was adequately monitored and reviews were well organised.
- HP18 There was no overarching diversity policy covering issues such as sexual orientation and age. Although the major religious festivals were celebrated, there was little wider promotion of diversity through cultural events. Prisoners were encouraged to disclose disabilities and evacuation plans were agreed for those with poor mobility. However, there was little strategic direction given to dealing with disabilities to ensure that individual needs were appropriately met. The large site made access to some areas difficult and would have precluded some prisoners with disabilities being allocated to Hollesley Bay.
- HP19 There was a clear commitment to race equality from the governor. Structures were good and ethnic monitoring was shared with prisoner representatives and did not indicate any major concerns. About a third of prisoners were black and minority ethnic and many came from London, while the staff group was almost wholly white and from a rural area. Black and minority ethnic prisoners believed they were generally treated fairly, but many were not confident that staff understood and accepted them. Significantly fewer in our survey than white prisoners said most staff treated them with respect or that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help. Twenty-one per cent of black and minority ethnic prisoners compared to 4% of white prisoners said they had felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff. Some said they were reluctant to raise issues about race because of potential repercussions. Racist incident reports were reasonably well investigated, but how findings were reached was not always clear.
- HP20 The foreign national strategy outlined the relevant issues for most foreign national prisoners, but very few of the foreign nationals at the prison needed much additional support as none were seeking repatriation or facing deportation. There had been little need for translation services. Good individual support was provided by the foreign national liaison officer who saw each foreign national prisoner every month and provided a report to the senior management team.
- HP21 Prisoners were mostly satisfied with healthcare services and the healthcare centre was well resourced and fully staffed. Despite sufficient space, most services were provided from one treatment area, which did not provide sufficient confidentiality. Prisoners had good access to GP services and a range of nurse-led clinics, but this was more difficult for those working out. Waiting lists for specialist clinics were generally short. Some medications were supplied to prisoners for just one day at a time, which was unnecessarily restrictive. There was a reasonable dental service. Mental health provision, including primary and secondary services, was good, except there was no counselling service.

## Purposeful activity

---

- HP22 There was little restriction on time out of room. There were sufficient activities for all men. Education provision was generally good, as was the quality of work and training and a number of jobs provided accredited qualifications. Some men had the opportunity to work outside the prison, but the skills they acquired were insufficiently recognised. A good library service was provided. Appropriate physical education

activities, including training opportunities, were run. The prison was performing well against this healthy prison test.

- HP23 Men had good time out of their room, but access to other units was too restricted. In the winter months, there was little time in the open.
- HP24 The quality of education and training was good. Management of learning and skills was well managed and there had been an expansion in the range of activities provided. Information, advice and guidance effectively linked to sentence planning. Standards of teaching were mainly good, although there was room for improvement in literacy and numeracy. Average classroom attendance was a little low at 77%, but prisoners were rarely late for classes. There was no pay disincentive for education. Only one prisoner was attending an education course at a local college. The number of formal education opportunities was limited, but this was compensated for by the wide range of activities available.
- HP25 There were sufficient activity places and all men were fully occupied. Some jobs led to accredited qualifications and vocational training was good, but in some areas of outside work there was insufficient recognition of the skills acquired. Fifteen men were in paid work in the community along with 10 drivers, and approximately 60 were in voluntary community placements. There was a good range of placements, but the downturn in the economy meant paid work was becoming difficult to find. Community placements were visited once a month for security checks, but not to check quality or progress.
- HP26 The library was well used and about half the population visited at least once a week. There was a range of fiction and non-fiction books and other materials, including legal reference books and Prison Service Orders. One of the two library orderlies was working towards a level three advice and guidance qualification. There was no internet access for prisoners to help them with research or job searches.
- HP27 Prisoners were positive about the gym and had opportunities to participate in recreational physical education in the evenings and at weekends. Remedial gym and accredited training were provided during the day. Facilities were reasonable, but some prisoners were turned away when the gym was full even though there was an adjacent separate staff facility that could have been used. An outdoor football field was well used and community links were fostered through the football team's participation in the local league.

## Resettlement

---

- HP28 An up-to-date reducing reoffending development plan was based on a recent needs analysis. Offender management and sentence planning operated satisfactorily, but there was no custody planning for shorter sentences. Reintegration services were stretched and too many men arrived with a very short time to serve. There was some help with maintaining family contact, but work in this area was underdeveloped. There was reasonable support for men with drug problems, but a lack of interventions to deal with alcohol issues. The prison was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.

- HP29 The resettlement strategy was outlined in an up-to-date reducing reoffending development plan based on a detailed local needs analysis. The plan set out the needs of prisoners linked to the resettlement pathways, but did not outline future strategic development including for particular groups of prisoners such as young offenders, lifers and short-term prisoners. There was no clear management of the individual resettlement pathways or a designated pathway lead for each. The resettlement needs analysis identified some key issues for development such as a need for more accessible resettlement services including housing and debt advice and improvements to visits. Monthly resettlement meetings were reasonably well attended, but the focus was mostly on current operational matters rather than an evaluation of whether provision met identified need, particularly for the increasing number of short-term prisoners or those arriving with very little time left to serve.
- HP30 Just two officer offender supervisors managed almost 270 men who were in scope for formal offender management arrangements. Some prisoners arrived from closed prisons without an up-to-date assessment or sentence plan, but a previous backlog had been dealt with and most eligible prisoners had up-to-date sentence plans. All young adults had a sentence plan irrespective of sentence length. The quality of case management was good, particularly for those in scope for offender management, but there was little personal contact with offender managers from the community. There were no custody plans for those serving short sentences, but most prisoners were seen by advice workers on induction and referred to appropriate services. Public protection arrangements were sound. Appropriate use was made of release on temporary licence. Home detention curfew was well used.
- HP31 There were 29 life-sentenced prisoners and one man serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection. Sentence planning for lifers was managed entirely separately. Most eligible lifers were taking part in community work. A large amount of the lifer staff time was spent completing risk assessments for release on temporary licence and there was scope to streamline the system.
- HP32 Accommodation needs were identified on arrival and a Nacro worker saw all urgent cases and those in the last three months of their sentence. Almost all prisoners went out to permanent accommodation, but as there were no checks on the addresses of the large numbers leaving on end of custody licence (ECL), it was not clear how stable that accommodation was. Nearly a quarter of the 345 prisoners released from the prison on ECL in the previous year had been at Hollesley Bay for less than seven days, which made it almost impossible to provide services. The Nacro housing worker was in high demand, but was at the prison only three days a week and relatively little use was made of peer advisers.
- HP33 Some advice on debt issues was provided by Citizens Advice, but just twice a month and a financial element of the resettlement course was available only to long-term prisoners. There were good arrangements for opening bank accounts and those with debts were prioritised for outside work. There was little to help prisoners find jobs. A single resettlement officer was responsible for managing community placements and an employment facilitator post was about to be lost due to a change in contract. In our survey, awareness of resettlement services was poorer than in other open prisons, but fewer prisoners said they would have a problem on release. Access to services was more difficult for those working out.
- HP34 A comfortable visitors' centre was provided and visitors were able to give feedback. The prison was very difficult to get to by public transport and no transport was

provided from the nearest station. Visits were run at weekends, but some were fully booked and men said they sometimes could not get visits because of this. Prisoners were required to wear prison clothing during visits, which was unnecessary. Two successful family days had been run during 2008. There was no family support worker and the children and families resettlement pathway needed further development. The prison's own survey had highlighted that over 40% of respondents had not had a visit in a three-month period, although release on temporary licence was well used to help men maintain family contact.

- HP35 Drug and alcohol policies were up to date and a recent needs analysis had been completed, but there was no overall action plan to take the drug strategy forward. Prisoners who had been involved in the short duration programme (SDP) were enthusiastic about the course and the support they received from their residential officers. Course facilitators had delivered SDP awareness training to many staff and this had helped referrals and officers' understanding of the therapeutic process. The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service had an active caseload of just over 100. Awareness groups on alcohol and cocaine were run as well as individual work. Some prisoners with alcohol problems were able to attend a local Alcohol Anonymous group, but otherwise there was little help for those with alcohol problems. Drug intervention programme workers from London, where many men came from, rarely visited prisoners at Hollesley Bay because of the distance, but CARAT workers kept in contact with them by telephone and email.

## Main recommendations

---

- HP36 Key departments in the prison should work together effectively to promote cultural and racial diversity and a better understanding among all staff of different backgrounds and the duty to promote race equality.
- HP37 A review of catering arrangements in consultation with prisoners should ensure that the meals meet their needs, are of reasonable quality and served at appropriate temperatures.
- HP38 A lead should be appointed for each resettlement pathway responsible for ensuring appropriate services designed to reduce reoffending.
- HP39 Offender managers in the community should keep in regular touch with prisoners they are responsible for in Hollesley Bay to ensure continuity of sentence management and that there are up-to-date appropriate sentence plan targets to help prepare prisoners for release.





# 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 prisoners' individual needs are recognised and given proper attention.

- 1.1 Arrangements for courts and escorts were generally satisfactory, but prisoners were transported to Hollesley Bay in cellular vehicles, which was inappropriate, and not all were given sufficient notice of their transfer.
- 1.2 Hollesley Bay received about 25 new prisoners a week on planned transfers. Staff reported good relations with GSL, the escort contractor. Most prisoners were transported in cellular vehicles, which was unnecessary for transfer to the open estate. Some prisoners from HMP Chelmsford said they had been told of their transfer only on the day of the move and had little time to prepare. Most journeys were between two and three hours. In our survey, 59% of prisoners said the vans were clean. The prison had its own cellular vehicle to return prisoners to closed conditions at short notice.

### Recommendations

---

- 1.3 Prisoners should be transported to Hollesley Bay in vehicles that are appropriate to their security category.
- 1.4 Prisoners should be given at least 24 hours notice of a transfer to an open prison.

## 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 Reception processes were efficient, but the reception building was unsuitable. Staff were welcoming and prisoners did not stay there long. Most prisoners felt safe on their first night. Much of the induction programme was led by prisoner orderlies and most prisoners said it had covered everything they needed to know.
- 1.6 Reception was located in the converted segregation unit and was unsuitable, despite efforts to improve it through the provision of easy chairs in two converted cells. The building was bright and clean, but facilities for healthcare staff were limited and one of their offices was also used to store cleaning equipment. Several converted cells were used to store property and the building was also used for mandatory drug testing. Two cells remained and were used for prisoners returning to closed conditions (see section on discipline).

- 1.7 Two staff welcomed prisoners and managed the reception process efficiently. Prisoners waited in a holding room with an open door before having their photograph taken and property checked. They were offered a cold drink and access to the toilet. Healthcare staff usually conducted a private healthcare screening interview. All new arrivals were strip-searched and most said they had been searched in a respectful way, but fewer young adults than others believed this was the case.
- 1.8 Prisoners did not remain in reception more than two hours and magazines and information about the prison were provided.

### **First night and induction**

---

- 1.9 All new arrivals went to Hoxon House and were allocated to rooms on two specific spurs. Their location was included as part of the handover to night staff and recorded in the wing log. Staff on Hoxon House were aware of the needs of new arrivals and met them all individually for a private interview. In our survey, nearly all prisoners said they had felt safe on their first night, although young adults were less positive than others.
- 1.10 Two induction orderlies welcomed new arrivals, showed them the facilities on the induction unit, got them to sign required paperwork and gave them a tour of the prison. The orderlies had helped to develop the induction process and were well regarded by staff and prisoners. Both were due to progress in their sentence, but they had identified a potential successor and were working with him to ensure continuity. Three Listeners based on Hoxon House also met new arrivals.
- 1.11 Prisoners were given some initial information for their first 24 hours and a more detailed induction booklet was also provided. A comprehensive rolling induction process lasted a week, but included a lot of free time as most of the programme was delivered individually. There were plans to deliver more group-based work in a new induction room. Induction covered education, employment, release on temporary licence, the chaplaincy, Nacro crime reduction, the gym and the library. In our survey, 80% of prisoners said induction had covered everything they needed to know and this process appeared to allow them to make the transition to an open environment.
- 1.12 Induction documents went with new prisoners when they moved to other wings. These highlighted any outstanding issues such as property, prisoner monies or other problems. Employment was allocated the following week.

### **Recommendations**

---

- 1.13 A new reception building should be provided.
- 1.14 Strip searches on arrival should be conducted only where there is an identified security risk.
- 1.15 More staff support should be offered to young adults on their first night to help improve their perceptions of safety.

## 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 Accommodation was decent and facilities were good. Rooms and most communal areas were clean and well decorated, but there was no adapted accommodation for prisoners with mobility difficulties. Some shower areas were in poor condition and those on Bosmere were inadequate. Restrictions on wearing personal clothing were inconsistent with the low-risk environment of an open prison.

#### Accommodation and facilities

---

- 2.2 Prisoners were accommodated on five units (see fact page). Adults and young adults were accommodated on all units apart from Bosmere and there was no evidence that this led to any safety concerns for younger prisoners. Young adults were not allocated to double rooms. The accommodation on Bosmere was more difficult to supervise and therefore not used for mixing young adults with those over 21. There was a separate young adult forum and their needs were adequately considered. Thirty-one prisoners serving life sentences, including one young adult, were also integrated across all units. Prisoners were expected to stay in their rooms after 11pm.
- 2.3 Prisoners had privacy keys to their rooms. Rooms were adequately furnished and included in-cell television, lockable cabinets and curtains. Each room had a picture board and a published offensive displays policy was enforced. A wing painting programme had been introduced and most residential areas were reasonably well decorated. There was no obvious graffiti and virtually no vandalism. None of the rooms had been adapted for a prisoner with disabilities. A double room on Wilford unit was used when necessary, but had not been adapted to allow easy access by a wheelchair user and no lowered switches or call alarm had been installed. There was a height adjustable sink in the bathroom opposite, but the only showering facilities for wheelchair users were in the gym some way from the living accommodation.
- 2.4 Prisoners had good access to communal toilets, bathrooms and shower areas, but shower areas on Stow and Wilford units were poorly ventilated, resulting in condensation and peeling paint. Most shower cubicles had screens, but the showers on Bosmere were inadequate, with two shower heads in a single small area. Prisoners on Bosmere had agreed that only one prisoner should use each cubicle at a time to allow privacy, which meant 80 prisoners shared just four showers. All units apart from Bosmere contained baths.
- 2.5 All units apart from Bosmere had a servery and communal dining room. Prisoners on Bosmere ate in a large room adjacent to the unit that was also used for visits. Each unit also had a fridge, microwave and toaster, although the microwave and toaster on Bosmere 2 had been removed some years previously so 80 prisoners had to share the facilities on Bosmere 1. Although many prisoners were coming towards the end of long sentences, facilities to self-cater, practice or acquire cooking skills were inadequate.

- 2.6 Residential units were generally well equipped, with large communal areas and a range of facilities for association. Notice boards were well laid out with useful information. Each unit had a laundry area, interview rooms, a central storage area and boot room.
- 2.7 The grounds were clean and well maintained. Most prisoners could smoke in their rooms and in the grounds away from the entrances to buildings, but those on Bosmere could smoke only in outside areas due to the assessed risk of fire. Not all night staff knew the location of fire extinguishers or whether there was a fire hose.

### **Hygiene, clothing and possessions**

---

- 2.8 Supplies of personal toiletries, including plenty of sterilising tablets in communal washing areas, were provided. In our survey, 99% of prisoners said they could shower every day.
- 2.9 The standards of cleanliness on all units were generally high. Cleaning equipment was colour-coded and related rules were mostly followed. Cleaning equipment and materials for prisoners to use in their rooms were readily available and prisoners' rooms were inspected every weekend by the unit manager. Bedding, including mattresses and pillows, was clean and in good condition. Prisoners said there were no problems getting replacement mattresses. Bed sheets and pillow cases could be changed weekly. Many prisoners had their own duvets and covers and washed these in the unit laundries.
- 2.10 Prisoners working outside the prison could wear personal clothing, but others could do so only in the evenings and at weekends. All prisoners had to wear prison clothing during visits. Staff said the rules were a security measure to differentiate prisoners from non-uniform staff and members of the public using the public road that ran through the prison grounds. This was incongruous in an open prison where prisoners were allowed personal clothing in their possession and movement around the grounds was largely unrestricted. Prisoners were issued with a full prison kit within 24 hours of arrival. Most was in reasonable condition. Although required to wash prison kit through the prison laundry, most prisoners kept items in reasonable condition and washed them in unit laundries. Each unit had two domestic washing machines, two driers, irons and ironing boards.
- 2.11 A list of items allowed in possession was available on each unit. This was reviewed twice a year following suggestions from prisoner representatives. Volumetric control was applied when officers believed a prisoner may have exceeded allowances. Rules about property were applied reasonably.

### **Recommendations**

---

- 2.12 Suitable accommodation and provision should be made for prisoners with disabilities.
- 2.13 Shower areas on Stow and Wilford should be refurbished.
- 2.14 More showers with greater privacy should be provided on Bosmere unit.
- 2.15 Facilities for prisoners to cook for themselves should be provided.
- 2.16 All night staff should know the whereabouts of fire fighting equipment on the houses.
- 2.17 Prisoners should have the option of wearing their own clothing in the prison.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.18 The microwave and toaster on Bosmere 2 should be replaced.

## Staff-prisoner relationships

---

### Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by all 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.

- 2.19 Prisoners' relationships with staff and other prisoners were generally relaxed and respectful. There were opportunities for consultation, but prisoners were not given sufficient responsibility.

- 2.20 Relationships were mostly very positive and appeared mutually respectful. Most prisoners found staff helpful. In our survey, significantly more than the comparator said staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff who would help them if they had a problem, although perceptions of black and minority ethnic men were not as positive as those of white prisoners. A measuring the quality of prison life survey undertaken in May 2008 produced similar positive findings about relationships with staff.

- 2.21 Prisoners were well consulted and represented at a monthly prisoner forum chaired by a governor and attended by staff representatives from several departments. Most discussion related to domestic problems on residential units and minutes showed that most issues were resolved reasonably promptly. The meeting was also used to inform prisoners about expected standards of behaviour and explained the reasons why some prisoners were returned to closed prisons. A separate forum was held for young adults. There was particularly good peer support during induction (see section on first days in custody).

- 2.22 Despite the good consultation, prisoners were given relatively little responsibility compared to other open prisons. This was manifested in areas such as the rules about movements around the prison, restrictions on wearing personal clothing (see sections on security and rules and residential units) and use of prisoner orderlies.

- 2.23 There was often only one officer on each unit during most shifts and they were regularly confined to the office dealing with requests for information and applications. Interactions we observed were relaxed and respectful.

## Personal officers

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.24** Most prisoners knew their personal officer. Regular entries were made in history sheets, but there was not enough focus on each prisoner's personal circumstances and resettlement needs.
- 2.25** The head of residence reviewed the personal officer scheme annually and it had last been revised in January 2009. The scheme was underpinned by the Inspectorate's expectations. Prisoners were introduced to their personal officer shortly after induction and this was usually recorded in personal history sheets. Photographs of personal officers were displayed on the residential units. Most prisoners knew their personal officers, but fewer than the comparator said they found them helpful. The scheme was little help for those transferred with only a short time left to serve, but generally operated well.
- 2.26** Personal officers attended the reviews of prisoners who had completed a cognitive skills booster course and there were plans to extend this to the short duration drugs programme. They made at least two entries a month in prisoners' history sheets and considered incentives and earned privileges levels monthly. Entries were regular, respectful and indicated good interaction with prisoners. Staffing levels and shift patterns meant individual personal officers were not always available, but history sheets clearly showed that other officers had filled this role in their absence. Relatively few referred to resettlement objectives or family issues, although some good entries about families, including child protection matters, were written in observation books. Most entries related to behaviour on wings. These included 'red entries' where prisoners had been given a warning, most of which were reasonable. Prisoners with mobility difficulties or who would need help in an emergency were identified and had emergency evacuation plans.
- 2.27** Senior officers completed a fortnightly quality check of personal officer entries, but few commented on quality. Senior officer checks were monitored by principal officers and some poor personal officer entries were challenged.

## **Recommendation**

---

- 2.28** Senior officers should make a written comment about the quality of personal officer entries when completing management checks.

## 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 felt very safe. A violence reduction strategy included bullying and a separate anti-bullying strategy described specific procedures. A multidisciplinary anti-bullying and violence reduction committee met monthly and included prisoner representatives. Potential bullying situations were identified and investigated and the few men placed on anti-bullying measures were well monitored.
- 3.2 Prisoners were given information on anti-bullying and violence reduction at induction and notices were displayed throughout the prison. All the indicators suggested that most prisoners felt very safe. In a local reducing reoffending survey undertaken in 2008, 90% of prisoners said they were aware of the violence reduction policy and 94% felt safe. Our survey results were equally positive, with only 9% saying they felt unsafe. Prisoners who identified themselves as having a disability also reported feeling threatened or intimidated by other prisoners.
- 3.3 Anti-bullying was incorporated into a violence reduction strategy dated July 2008. This described a whole prison approach to reducing violence and included an action plan for 2008-09. It also included information about public protection, the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) strategy, cell-sharing risk assessments, the personal officer scheme, categorisation and allocation, investigation of racist incidents, use of secure accommodation and prisoner disciplinary procedures. A separate anti-bullying strategy dated February 2008 described the procedures for reporting, recording, investigating and monitoring bullying incidents. An anti-bullying survey was carried out annually, but the results of the last one in May 2008 had not been analysed and neither the anti-bullying nor the violence reduction strategy included prisoner feedback.
- 3.4 Each house had allocated anti-bullying liaison officers (ABLOs) and prisoner anti-bullying representatives (ABRs). Their photographs and names were displayed and staff and prisoners said the system worked well. ABRs said they were supported by staff and felt actively involved. ABLOs and ABRs attended the monthly anti-bullying and violence reduction committee. This was chaired by the head of residence and was well attended by a cross-section of staff.
- 3.5 Minutes showed that discussion included incidents indicative of bullying, covering anti-bullying reports, adjudications, assaults and unexplained injuries, self-harm, absconds, refusal to work and transfer to closed conditions. The names of alleged victims and perpetrators were removed from paperwork before discussion by the committee. Several attendees gave verbal reports about their specific areas, including ABLOs, ABRs, the race equality officer and representatives from healthcare, the gym and security. The committee monitored all incidents and took action as necessary. The high number of adjudications on one house had been investigated and an unexplained injury had been well followed up.

- 3.6 A principal officer had the role of anti-bullying coordinator as part of his wider duties. He received monthly written reports from each ABLO, staff in the gym, workshops and resettlement, met the ABRs every month and checked all staff observation books on the houses.
- 3.7 Any member of staff could complete a bullying incident form, copies of which went to the anti-bullying coordinator, house manager and security department. Each form was logged by the anti-bullying coordinator. Any information received from security information reports, observation books and any other source was also recorded.
- 3.8 Forty-two incidents had been logged and investigated in 2008. Some victims were reluctant to identify the perpetrator and support plans were therefore often general and focused mainly on observation and reassuring victims that they could speak to staff and ABRs if they had further concerns. Many issues were resolved by officers talking to the prisoners concerned and some prisoners were moved to a different house. If necessary, proven bullies were returned to closed conditions.
- 3.9 The anti-bullying coordinator's log recorded all anti-bullying incidents, the source of information, details of the investigation and investigator and outcomes for victims and perpetrators. The log was monitored by incident type, location and the ethnicity of victim and perpetrator. Monitoring by age was to be introduced. We cross-referenced a number of incidents of apparent bullying referred to in observation books on the houses and all had been referred for investigation.
- 3.10 No prisoners had been investigated on stage two of the bullying strategy in 2009 and only three had progressed to this in 2008. They had been monitored using a behavioural monitoring booklet. One of these prisoners had returned to closed conditions, although not as a result of bullying. The other two had completed a short period of monitoring and no further action had been taken. Both monitoring booklets contained regular daily comments showing that staff had actually spoken to prisoners and evidence of management checks.
- 3.11 Visitors could raise concerns about a prisoner by completing a slip and posting it in a locked box in the visitors' centre or by ringing a confidential telephone number. A message left by an inspector was responded to within 24 hours.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.12 The violence reduction and anti-bullying strategies should include analysis of prisoner responses to safety surveys and plans to address issues raised.

## 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.



- 3.13** Incidents of self-harm were rare and few prisoners were monitored on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) booklets. The suicide prevention committee met quarterly and was well attended. There was a published safer custody continuous improvement plan. ACCT documents were well completed, showing good engagement and support.
- 3.14** Incidents of self-harm were rare, with only two in 2008 and none to date in 2009. Both incidents in 2008 involved men waiting to return to closed conditions. Two Listeners based on Hoxon, the induction unit, gave a presentation at induction about their work and the support available.
- 3.15** The suicide prevention committee met quarterly, chaired by the head of residence. The meeting was well attended by a cross-section of staff from all disciplines, including the safer custody manager, and Listeners. Representatives from the Samaritans had not attended the previous three meetings due to staffing problems, but a senior officer maintained contact with a representative. A safer custody continuous improvement plan was published and updated after each committee meeting, with a copy attached to each set of minutes. An ACCT strategy published in March 2008 contained the terms of reference for the committee and clearly set out the procedures.
- 3.16** Only three ACCTs had been opened to date in 2009 and then only for a very short time. Twenty had been opened in 2008 and nine in 2007. None of the prisoners involved had been returned to closed conditions because they needed more intensive supervision. Assessments and care plans demonstrated a good level of care, and quality and procedures were checked by managers. Some ACCTs contained copies of letters sent to offender managers inviting them to reviews and keeping them updated. Home probation officers/offender managers were notified on a prisoner's release if the man had recently been subject to ACCT procedures. Notices were also sent to update the police national computer.
- 3.17** ACCT assessors included a cross-section of staff. Reviews also included a variety of staff, including officers and representatives from healthcare, the chaplaincy and probation. Eighty-nine per cent of staff had received ACCT foundation training and staff training was a standing agenda item at the quarterly meetings.
- 3.18** In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator said they had 'emotional well being/mental health issues'. Records showed that some men were supported by a mental health worker, but there were no opportunities for other counselling support. There were seven Listeners allocated to the houses and another two 'floating' Listeners. They met monthly with a Samaritan and a senior officer and said they were well supported. Their photographs and names were displayed on the houses, but they did not wear name badges or special T-shirts so were not easily identifiable. There were few formal requests to see a Listener and most support appeared to be given informally. In our survey, significantly fewer than the comparator said they had met a Listener within 24 hours of arrival or could see one at any time.
- 3.19** The Samaritans number was advertised on all houses, prisoners could also request to see a Samaritan and pre-paid envelopes addressed to the Samaritans were available. No one could remember when any of the direct dial portable telephones connected to the Samaritans had last been used and no records were kept.
- 3.20** Notices about the bullying and violence reduction strategies were displayed on notice boards, with information on violence reduction provided in eight languages. All night staff had received ACCT training and carried ligature knives. None had received first aid training.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.21 Prisoners should have access to appropriate counselling services if required.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.22 Listeners should wear badges or clothing to identify their roles.

## Diversity

---

### Expected outcomes:

**All prisoners should have equality of access to all prison facilities. All prisons should be aware of the specific needs of minority groups and implement distinct policies, which aim to represent their views, meet their needs and offer peer support.**

- 3.23 There was no policy encompassing the different strands of diversity. Some work was done to identify prisoners with disabilities, but there was no strategic overview.
- 3.24 There was no overarching diversity policy or a senior manager with responsibility for the specific needs of minority groups, including older prisoners, gay or bisexual prisoners and prisoners with disabilities. Eighty per cent of staff had received the Prison Service diversity awareness training package in the previous three years, but there was little promotion of the main strands of diversity.
- 3.25 Thirty prisoners were in their 50s and seven were over 60. Older prisoners had not been consulted about their needs. Other than weekly gym sessions for prisoners over 40 and those referred through healthcare, no specific consideration was given to older prisoners.
- 3.26 Some work was taking place to identify and support prisoners with disabilities, but there was no strategic overview. A disability policy revised in 2008 outlined the wider duties of the Prison Service under the Disability Discrimination Act (2005), but described little about how this would be applied at Hollesley Bay. The policy referred to a committee for prisoners with disabilities and visitors, but there was none. There was a risk that prisoners with disabilities who were suitable for open conditions could be denied the opportunity at Hollesley Bay because of lack of facilities. A physical education officer who acted as disability liaison officer (DLO) had not received specific training, but was familiar with the Disability Discrimination Act.
- 3.27 During induction, new prisoners were asked to complete a disability questionnaire. Verification was requested from healthcare when anyone indicated that he had a disability. The education provider also assessed new prisoners for learning difficulties. The DLO interviewed prisoners who disclosed a disability to establish what support or reasonable adjustments were needed and how these could be met. A monthly report on the needs of prisoners with a disability went to the senior management team.
- 3.28 A register of all prisoners identified as having a disability was kept and updated monthly. In January 2009, 29 prisoners had an identified disability, most associated with physical conditions. Seven of these had some difficulty accessing services or facilities, but all were in employment.

- 3.29 There was no evidence that prisoners' needs were not being met, but there was no adapted accommodation (see section on residential units) and no aids to help older and infirm prisoners. Most parts of the prison were accessible, but reaching some facilities involved a relatively long walk.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.30 A comprehensive diversity strategy should be developed and implemented.

## Race equality

---

### Expected outcomes:

All prisoners experience equality of opportunity in all aspects of prison life, are treated equally and are safe. Racial diversity is embraced, valued, promoted and respected.

- 3.31 Black and minority ethnic prisoners, many of whom were from London, believed many staff had little cultural awareness, but considered that they were generally treated fairly. The governor provided a strong lead on race equality, with good structures to support this, but there was relatively little active promotion of cultural diversity.
- 3.32 Thirty-five per cent of prisoners were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and many came from the London area. By contrast, almost all staff were white and from a rural area. There were only three black and minority ethnic members of staff. The governor provided a good lead through the race equality action team (REAT) and occasional meetings open to all black and minority ethnic prisoners. There was a clear commitment to race equality and structures were in place to support this. Photographs of the REAT members were displayed.
- 3.33 The race equality officer (REO) was a principal officer who worked 20 hours a week. The deputy REO was a senior officer who was also a wing manager and the foreign nationals liaison officer. He had not received training for his role as deputy REO. There was also a part-time administrative assistant. Each unit had a race equality link officer who produced a monthly written report for the REAT.
- 3.34 The race equality scheme (September 2008) and information packs were given to new arrivals and explained by race equality prisoner representatives at induction. The pack, which had last been reviewed in December 2008, clearly outlined how to report a racist incident and the support available. A similar pack was given to new staff. A race equality policy statement was prominently displayed around the prison and regular notices were issued to staff reinforcing their responsibilities in promoting race equality.
- 3.35 The REAT met monthly. Membership included representatives from all main departments and areas, but lack of funding meant it was difficult to attract consistent support from agencies such as the Ipswich and Suffolk Council for Race Equality to help oversee the development of policy. A representative from the Suffolk Racial Harassment initiative (Suffolk County Council) had attended the REAT for a short period in 2008. Contact had been re-established in January 2009 when the organisation had provided some external scrutiny of investigations. Attendance at the REAT was reasonable, but the chaplaincy and the education provider, two departments key to promoting race and diversity, had not attended meetings regularly between September and December 2008. None of the managers who attended the REAT were from black and

minority ethnic backgrounds. Most REAT members, including prisoner representatives, had completed training in managing and promoting race equality.

- 3.36 Ethnic monitoring returns were examined routinely by the REAT. Monitoring data were shared with prisoner representatives and did not identify any particular concerns. Statistics outside the expected range were analysed and action was taken if necessary. The REAT considered a range of reports and the race equality action plan and actions required were reviewed at each meeting. Progress and outcomes were also incorporated from completed race equality impact assessments. The minutes indicated wide ranging discussion of race equality.
- 3.37 Black and minority ethnic prisoners believed they were generally treated fairly, but many were not confident that staff understood and accepted them. In our survey, only 74% of black and minority ethnic prisoners compared to 92% of white prisoners said they had a member of staff they could turn to if they had problem, fewer black and minority ethnic prisoners than white prisoners said most staff treated them with respect and 21% compared to just 4% of white prisoners said they had felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff. Some said they were reluctant to raise issues about race because of potential repercussions. This sense of alienation was compounded for those who believed the '30 mile rule' for outworking (see section on resettlement pathways) disadvantaged black prisoners seeking work in a largely white rural area of the country.

### **Managing racist incidents**

---

- 3.38 Locked boxes for submitting racist incident report forms (RIRFs) were easily accessible and well stocked with blank forms and envelopes. An RIRF was opened on any formal complaint with a racist element. All RIRFs were logged and most were responded to within three days. A summary of the incident and investigation was included and signed by the governor and area manager.
- 3.39 Thirty-two investigations had been completed to date in 2009 by the REO or his deputy, although only the REO had received relevant training. Investigations were reasonably thorough, but findings and conclusions were not always sufficiently well explained. Recent external scrutiny had identified a number of improvements needed in the procedures, but the reviewer concluded that incidents were taken seriously and that staff tried to respond fairly and urgently to complaints. Prisoners completed feedback on their experience of the investigation at its conclusion, but this was not analysed.

### **Race equality duty**

---

- 3.40 Eighty per cent of staff had been trained in race and diversity awareness. The major religious festivals were celebrated, but there was little wider promotion of diversity through cultural events and this had largely been limited to an annual diversity day. There was little evidence of joint working between the chaplaincy, education and catering and others to develop this area. Several recent REAT meetings had described difficulties sourcing posters that promoted diversity.
- 3.41 Prisoners with racially aggravated crimes were identified by security and this information was available to all staff. Prisoners who were considered to have displayed racist behaviour following an investigation normally received a verbal warning. One member of staff had recently been required to complete further diversity training following an investigation.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.42 Renewed efforts should be made to find a representative from an external organisation promoting race equality to be co-opted onto the race equality action team, attend regularly, contribute to the development of local policy and scrutinise investigations of racist complaints.
- 3.43 Representatives from the chaplaincy and education should attend the race equality action team regularly.
- 3.44 Racist incident investigations should record more fully how findings and conclusions are reached.
- 3.45 Feedback forms from racist incident complainants should be analysed and any concerns followed up.

## Foreign national prisoners

---

### Expected outcomes:

Foreign national prisoners should have the same access to all prison facilities as other prisoners. All prisons are aware of the specific needs that foreign national prisoners have and implement a distinct strategy, which aims to represent their views and offer peer support.

- 3.46 There were few foreign national prisoners and little need for much additional support. The foreign national liaison officer met each foreign national prisoner each month and provided individual support as necessary.
- 3.47 The foreign national strategy outlined relevant issues and support for foreign national prisoners and had last been reviewed in February 2009. The policy required the foreign nationals management committee to meet quarterly and support groups to be introduced when more than 10 foreign national prisoners were held. The last meeting of the foreign nationals management committee, and the first such meeting in 18 months, had been in September 2008. This had included management, the foreign nationals liaison officer (FNLO), the Independent Monitoring Board and seven prisoners. The help and services available were discussed and prisoners had been able to raise any concerns.
- 3.48 There were 10 prisoners identified as foreign nationals, none of whom were seeking repatriation or facing deportation. Most had visits and around half had received release on temporary licence. The group we met knew the FNLO, were aware of the provision for foreign national telephone calls and were confident they could get help if required. The needs of foreign national prisoners were a standing agenda item at the monthly race equality action team meeting. A list of prisoners able to speak different languages was kept updated and accessible on the intranet and professional translators had been used once to translate documents. The prisoner information booklet was available in nearly 30 languages.
- 3.49 The FNLO met all foreign national prisoners monthly and provided individual support. He recorded all contact in prisoners' history sheets and in a monthly report for the senior management team that also recorded each prisoner's current circumstances. This was available to all staff on the intranet. The FNLO had a range of information leaflets covering topics such as repatriation and the facilitated return scheme. An administrative assistant

provided a link with the UK Border Agency when required, but there were few immigration issues.

## 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.

**3.50** Processes for managing applications were good and most were dealt with efficiently. Few formal complaints were made and responses were polite, timely and dealt with the issue raised. Complaints were checked for quality, but trends were not analysed.

**3.51** Application forms were available on all units and a duplicate system was used. All were logged and the process was well managed, with unit managers following up all outstanding applications to ensure that a response was received. In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator said applications were dealt with fairly and promptly. Applications to see a governor were also dealt with properly and tracked through a log system. Governors checked logs regularly to ensure that there were no delays.

**3.52** A total of 288 complaints had been submitted between January and December 2008. Replies were timely, respectful and mostly addressed the issues raised without passing the complaint to other departments. Apologies were made when necessary. The deputy governor reviewed all complaints monthly and kept a basic quality assurance log of responses. The senior management team was given monthly information on complaints received, but no analysis took place over longer periods to examine whether there was trends that needed to be addressed. The prison aimed for complaints to be dealt with at the lowest possible level and encouraged prisoners to raise issues initially with unit staff.

### Recommendation

---

**3.53** Periodic trend analysis of complaints received should be undertaken.

## Legal rights

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.54** There was no designated legal services officer and apparently little demand for services. There was an arrangement with a local legal practice by which prisoners could get advice in person. The library stocked up-to-date legal books.

**3.55** There was no designated legal services officer or arrangements to assess prisoners' legal issues and, other than in the library, very little information was provided. Information about access to legal services was not included in induction. Some prisoners had been recalled on

licence, but had already spent time in closed conditions and were not identified as having any particular needs.

- 3.56 In our survey, significantly fewer than the comparator said it was easy to attend legal visits. However, there were similarly poor responses to questions about domestic visits, suggesting that the location of the prison was a factor. Legal visits took place during the week when there were no domestic visits.
- 3.57 Subject to risk assessment, prisoners without a legal representative were allowed to visit a local law practice, but there was no record of how many prisoners did so.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.58 The annual resettlement survey should include a question as to whether there are unmet needs for legal services.

## 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.

- 3.59 Plans to launch the integrated drug treatment system were well under way, but the design of the methadone administration facility was inappropriate. Drugs were not widely available, but the mandatory drug testing positive rate had recently been distorted by high levels of diluted samples. Drug-related intelligence was generally good, but the positive rate for target (suspicion) testing was relatively low and the time it took to take tests was not monitored.

## Clinical management

---

- 3.60 The prison was due to implement the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) in April 2009 starting with 15 to 20 prisoners receiving methadone treatment. The necessary clinical staff were already in post. In addition, 40 staff had been trained to the standard of the Royal College of General Practitioners (RCGP) Level 1 in drugs awareness so there was a good level of understanding of what to expect when the new treatment system started.
- 3.61 The methadone administration room and the nurses' room were separated by a double thickness of toughened glass. Once IDTS was under way, the prisoner would be locked in the administration room using an electronic device in the nurses' room. Communication between the prisoner and the nurses was through an intercom, with medication passed through a steel one-way shutter. This design was unsafe, demeaning and inappropriately secure and would make it difficult for nurses properly to assess patients' health and general demeanour before or after the administration of methadone.
- 3.62 Weekly smoking cessation clinics were held. Two nurses were trained to run the clinic and there were eight prisoners on the programme with 16 on a waiting list. Nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) was available, as was zyban, the anxiety reducing drug. Blood-borne virus clinics were held weekly.

## **Drug testing**

---

- 3.63 In our survey, 24%, significantly fewer than the comparator, said it was easy to get drugs in the prison. The mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate for the last six months of 2008 was 9.3%. A number of diluted samples had been returned in November and December 2008 but prisoners had been warned that diluting samples would result in a 56-day loss of release on temporary licence, with the result that the MDT positive rate for January 2009 had been 0% with no diluted samples.
- 3.64 Risk tests were carried out on prisoners assessed as presenting specific risks in key work areas or because of previous drug use history. Thirty-three risk tests had been carried out between July and December 2008 with a 0% positive rate.
- 3.65 There had been 217 drug-related security information reports in the last six months of 2008, but these had resulted in suspicion tests that averaged only a 35% positive rate. There was no monitoring of the time lapse between the issue of a test request and the actual test and delays could have contributed to the relatively low rate. Prisoners who tested positive were referred to drug workers and were not automatically returned to closed conditions.
- 3.66 The MDT suite was in the reception area. The testing room was clean and tidy with appropriate facilities. The two holding rooms were light and airy, with comfortable seating and plenty of information leaflets, posters and notices about drugs, information on blood-borne viruses and healthy living and details of all drug services and programmes available in the prison.
- 3.67 Daily alcohol breath tests were carried out on all prisoners who drove others to work in the local community. One passive drug dog and one active/passive dog that was also trained to detect mobile telephones were kept permanently on site.

## **Recommendations**

---

- 3.68 The methadone administration facility should be modified to ensure safe and respectful treatment.
- 3.69 Target (suspicion) testing should be managed effectively to ensure tests are undertaken within the required timeframe.



## Section 4: 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.

- 4.1 Prisoners had generally good access to health services. The resources and space available were good, but not used to their full potential and most services were provided from the main treatment room. The department was fully staffed and all staff were enthusiastic and professional, but did not get enough clinical supervision or specialist training. Pharmacy resources were adequate, but a number of policies and procedures were out of date. Mental health services were good except there were no counselling services.

### General

---

- 4.2 Health services were commissioned by Suffolk Primary Care Trust (PCT). A comprehensive health needs analysis had been completed in August 2008. The prison had established good working relationships through the prison health partnership board chaired by the PCT.
- 4.3 Prisoners were generally positive about access to and the quality of healthcare. The healthcare centre had a number of rooms, although most activity centred on one treatment room, which was inappropriate and did not provide sufficient privacy for patients. Many of the rooms were cluttered with equipment. There were insufficient computers in some rooms where care was delivered, including those used for consultation in reception. SystemOne was used for the management of electronic patient records in addition to paper records.
- 4.4 The ground floor of the healthcare centre contained the main treatment area, offices, a dental suite, a storeroom and the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) suite. A central waiting area provided sufficient space for patients. Clinical records were stored in filing cabinets in the main treatment room. Medicines were kept in locked metal cupboards in the same room, although one was not secured to the wall or floor. Keys to the cabinets were kept in a key safe to which all healthcare staff, including healthcare officers and secretaries, had access. This room was also equipped for clinical consultations, with an examination couch and desk. It was cluttered and cramped and unsuitable for consulting with or treating patients. The upper floor included two further multipurpose rooms used for training, clinics and office space. The building was clean with sufficient facilities for infection control. A prisoner cleaner was supervised by healthcare staff. Interaction we observed between healthcare staff and prisoners was generally appropriate and professional.
- 4.5 A member of the nursing team had been identified as the lead nurse for older prisoners. She had undertaken some shadowing work experience, but had yet to receive formal training.
- 4.6 Health promotion literature and service information were available only in English. A multilingual file in the treatment room contained useful healthcare phrases translated into a wide range of languages.
- 4.7 There was little use of care plans, but where used, the patients were involved. Treatments were not impeded by security procedures.

## Clinical governance

---

- 4.8 Clinical governance arrangements were well integrated, with good communication between PCT and prison staff. The healthcare centre was well resourced and fully staffed, including a part-time administrator and additional nurses recruited in preparation for the implementation of the IDTS programme. The healthcare manager was a registered nurse supported by a registered nurse team leader and five further registered nurses. There was also one registered mental health nurse and two healthcare officers. There were enough nursing staff to provide a daily service and cover at the weekends and there were training plans to develop staff skills.
- 4.9 Three GPs from a local practice were contracted to provide daily clinics. Emergency cover was provided by a neighbouring prison, but there was no provision for simple analgesia out of hours. The dental service commissioned by Suffolk PCT was provided by a private contract. The dentist had been in post for two years and was assisted by a registered dental nurse.
- 4.10 PCT human resources staff maintained records of professional registration. Clinical supervision was offered, but take up was poor. Staff were involved in a range of training courses suited to their roles, but these tended to be short familiarisation courses rather than nationally recognised programmes. No staff had attended courses specific to the mental health needs of older prisoners or courses showing how to identify social care needs.
- 4.11 Emergency equipment was available in the healthcare centre and on each wing. Staff were trained to use the equipment and up-to-date training records were maintained. The equipment on the wings was in date and checked monthly, but some packs contained old record books. A central record of monthly checks was kept in the healthcare centre. The defibrillator, which was kept in the healthcare centre, was checked monthly rather than daily.
- 4.12 There were arrangements for the loan of occupational therapy equipment from the PCT when required. Labour boards carried out in the prison sought the advice of healthcare staff in assessing the suitability of prisoners for work.
- 4.13 Clinical records were safely stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act and Caldicott principles, but access was hampered by the fact that files were kept in the treatment room, which was often being used for clinics when they were required. Patient records were created and updated using SystemOne with varying levels of contribution ranging from 'generally unwell' to much more detailed assessment. Archived records were stored in a separate building accessible only to healthcare staff.
- 4.14 Prisoners benefited from the adherence to treatment plans that reflected national service frameworks and NICE guidelines. These were available with policy documentation and were also used as reference material on the wings.
- 4.15 There was no separate health forum for prisoners and healthcare staff very rarely attended the prisoners' general forum. Prisoners' views about healthcare were not sought at that forum and healthcare was not a standard agenda item. We were told that complaints about healthcare were addressed by the PCT complaints system administered by the patient advice and liaison service (PALS). PALS leaflets were given to prisoners at induction, but none we spoke to understood this process and all said complaints about healthcare were made using the standard prison complaint form. Only 10 complaints about healthcare had been received in the previous six months.

- 4.16 Policies and protocols for managing communicable diseases were linked to the local NHS services with advice from the health protection agency. Protocols also ensured that confidentiality was maintained in relation to public protection and information about patients was shared as required with the appropriate agencies. The system for maintaining hard copies of policies and protocols was disorganised and there was no index to help staff locate documents.

### **Primary care**

---

- 4.17 There was a daily GP clinic on weekdays and patients were seen within 24 hours if necessary. New cases reporting sick were seen by nursing staff at 7am to fit in with the daily work routine and there was a robust attitude to attending work. Clinics were mostly run during the working day and were less accessible. A range of specialist clinics including asthma, diabetes, coronary heart disease, sexual health and smoking cessation was offered by healthcare staff. Visiting specialists also attended the prison. Waiting lists were generally short.
- 4.18 The rooms used by healthcare in reception were stark and unwelcoming. One was used to store cleaning equipment, which was inappropriate. The reception transfer screen was thorough, but staff could not access SystmOne in reception and therefore had to transfer manual notes to the computer after the consultation. Secondary screening was offered and appointments were available at weekends. The healthcare information leaflet given to new arrivals was out of date. If known, prisoners' home GPs were contacted and any relevant previous records requested.
- 4.19 Health promotion and information was available in the healthcare centre and on the wings. Condoms and dental dams were freely available at the entrance to the healthcare centre.
- 4.20 Prisoners could attend a triage clinic run by one of the registered nurses each morning. Triage algorithms were not used and there were no nurse practitioners or nurse prescribers.
- 4.21 Healthcare appointments were requested through the general application system. These were forwarded to healthcare staff by officers when they emptied the boxes, but this did not allow full clinical confidentiality. Prisoners were given appointments to attend clinics, but many arrived at the beginning of a session rather than their allocated appointment time and therefore had to wait.
- 4.22 Most care was provided from the healthcare centre, apart from occasional visits by nurses to patients sick in cell and the weekly visits to the units by the mental health nurse. On the very few occasions that prisoners were transferred, the process did not interfere with those with long-term stable conditions. Manual registers of patients with long-term conditions were maintained as read codes had only recently been introduced. Resources were readily available for continence support where required and one nurse had been trained as the continence adviser. Prisoners' clinical records were usually completed electronically at the time of appointment.
- 4.23 There was no facility for in-patients.

### **Pharmacy**

---

- 4.24 Pharmacy services were provided by a local supplier who visited the prison once a month. Prescription items were supplied within a reasonable timeframe, but there were no pharmacist-led clinics. No medicines reviews were undertaken by pharmacy staff. A pharmacy technician

visited weekly to support nursing staff. There was no audit of stock supplied to patients or agreed stock lists. Only the current temperature of the refrigerator was recorded and staff were unaware that they should reset the maximum and minimum temperatures after recording daily.

- 4.25 Prescriptions were kept in the treatment room, which was accessible to all the healthcare team. Patients' identities when collecting medication were not checked thoroughly enough. Patients could get medication out of hours on the authority of the local out-of-hours doctors' service and the medication was provided from the stock items. When Hollesley Bay staff were not on duty, healthcare staff from the neighbouring prison attended.
- 4.26 Most medication was supplied as monthly in possession, although there was quite a high level of weekly in possession medication supplied and patients assessed as in need of 'see to take medication' were given it daily, secondarily dispensed from monthly packs. It was reported that the pharmacy supplier refused to supply daily in possession packs for patients. Patient information leaflets were supplied with each month's medication, but patients had no direct pharmacist contact for advice.
- 4.27 Risk assessments were not adequately filled in by nursing staff and sometimes comprised simply a tick in the seven-day box with no reasoning. Risk assessments were not attached to the prescription and administration chart, so finding them could be difficult.
- 4.28 There was a very limited list of medication to supply on special sick. There were no patient group directions (PGDs) so only medication that could be bought in general stores could be supplied without prescription.
- 4.29 The medicines and therapeutics committee met quarterly and reviewed pharmacy data and prescribing. There was a large file of policies, but we could not find written policies for in possession medication, special sick or out of hours provisions. Nursing staff were unaware of any written policies.
- 4.30 Controlled drugs were kept in a sub-compartment of one of the cabinets, which did not appear to comply with the controlled drugs (safe custody) regulations. The key to this compartment was kept on top of the cabinet. Records for controlled drug stock were not kept separately from named patient item records.
- 4.31 An IDTS suite had been prepared. The cabinet intended for methadone storage was not compliant with the safe custody regulations and would require a certificate of exemption from the local police force if it was to be used for controlled drugs.
- 4.32 Prescriptions were hand written on standard prescription and administration charts, some of which had no date and were therefore not legal and some had no diagnoses. Special sick records were kept on SystmOne and in a separate book rather than on the prescription charts, so the pharmacy received no information about special sick medication. Unused medication, including controlled drugs, was returned to the supplying pharmacy, which was inappropriate.

## **Dentistry**

---

- 4.33 The dental surgery was appropriately decorated, maintained and equipped, but the dental unit, although in working order, was coming to the end of its useful life and clinical time had been lost through breakdowns. A bid for a new unit had been submitted.
- 4.34 The administration of the dental service was efficiently carried out by an experienced member of the healthcare staff who was also the radiological protection supervisor. The dentist

attended three sessions a week. The throughput of patients was satisfactory, with a commendably low rate of failure to attend. About 100 patients were under treatment, with 50 on the waiting list. Routine appointments were available within five weeks. Emergency patients were seen at the next available session. In the interim, triage was undertaken by healthcare staff and appropriate medication provided. Although the service was not provided under NHS contract, the range of treatments on offer was appropriate.

- 4.35 The materials, disposables and equipment necessary to ensure satisfactory cross-infection controls were in place. Waste disposal was satisfactory. Radiological protection protocols were adhered to.
- 4.36 Dental records were maintained manually and were generally satisfactory and securely held. In addition to the manual record, SystmOne was appropriately annotated after each visit.

### **Secondary care**

---

- 4.37 Prisoners could attend healthcare appointments in the community by release on temporary licence. This arrangement appeared to work well.

### **Mental health**

---

- 4.38 Prisoners with mental health problems were cared for by one full-time registered nurse (mental health) who had a caseload of about 18 patients and a capacity for up to 35. Secondary care in reach cover was provided one day a week by an additional mental health nurse whose caseload was often minimal (two patients at the time of our visit). Mental health services were under review with a view to redesigning them.
- 4.39 Mental health care was available on weekdays from 9am to 5pm. Referrals were made by anyone, including prisoners and their families. Most problems related to anxiety and depression and there were about three or four referrals a week. Reception screening included questions on mental health and the mental health nurse visited all units weekly. A clinical psychiatrist was available, but rarely used. Most cases were seen individually at the healthcare centre. There was no counsellor or access to cognitive behavioural therapy. Mental health awareness training had recently begun. A target of 11 prison staff for training in the current year was too low.

### **Recommendations**

---

- 4.40 Only one patient should be seen at a time in the treatment room and only healthcare staff involved in that consultation should be present.
- 4.41 Nurses responsible for the management of patients with life-long conditions and older prisoners should receive appropriate training.
- 4.42 Triage algorithms should be developed to ensure consistency of advice and treatment to all prisoners.
- 4.43 Healthcare should be regularly represented at the prisoners' forum and consideration given to the creation of a separate prisoners' health forum.

- 4.44 Mental health awareness training should be delivered to a greater number of prison staff.
- 4.45 The suitability of the cupboards used to store controlled drugs should be reviewed and appropriate certificates obtained from the local police.
- 4.46 The in possession risk assessments of each drug and patient should be documented and the reasons for the determination recorded.
- 4.47 Prisoners should have appropriate access to simple analgesia.
- 4.48 All prescriptions should be legally written and include the quantity prescribed and date prescribed and should be signed by the prescriber.
- 4.49 Secondary dispensing should stop.
- 4.50 The use of general stock should be audited so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions issued.
- 4.51 The responsible pharmacist should have professional control of the stock supplied.
- 4.52 Patient group directions should be introduced to enable supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor.
- 4.53 Pharmacy staff should put in place procedures to monitor the use of special sick medication.
- 4.54 Prisoners should have access to a pharmacist.
- 4.55 All pharmacy procedures and policies should be formally reviewed and adopted through the medicines and therapeutics committee. All staff should read and sign the agreed procedures.
- 4.56 The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock used only if unavoidable.
- 4.57 A new dental unit should be installed.

### Housekeeping points

---

- 4.58 The healthcare information leaflet given to new arrivals should be updated.
- 4.59 The application process for healthcare appointments should be separate from general applications ensuring confidentiality for prisoners.
- 4.60 Clinical supervision should be promoted.
- 4.61 Clinical records should be moved to a room that would avoid the interruption of clinical activities.

- 4.62 The files containing policies and protocols should be reorganised with indices to facilitate easier location.
- 4.63 The defibrillator in the healthcare centre should be checked daily and records of this maintained.
- 4.64 Cleaning equipment should be removed from the reception room allocated for healthcare staff.
- 4.65 The medicines cabinets should be securely attached to the floor or walls in the pharmacy and kept locked when not in use.
- 4.66 Access to medications stored in the healthcare centre should be restricted to appropriate staff.
- 4.67 The use of out-of-hours medicines taken from the pharmacy under the emergency procedure should be audited and all checks recorded.
- 4.68 Pharmaceutical waste disposal should be reviewed to comply with the waste regulations that came into force in July 2005.
- 4.69 All medicine refrigerators should be kept between 2 and 8 Celsius and the minimum and maximum refrigerator temperatures should be monitored and recorded daily and adjusted when necessary.





# Section 5: 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.

- 5.1 The learning and skills provision was good. The prison offered a decent range of qualifications and generally satisfactory teaching and learning. Formal education classes were limited in range, but all prisoners were in work or training. Prisoners had the opportunity to work in the community, but the skills acquired were insufficiently recognised. The range of work opportunities was sufficient to meet prisoners' needs. There were decent library facilities, which were reasonably well used.
- 5.2 The head of reducing reoffending was responsible for education, training and resettlement. Education was provided in five subjects, including literacy, numeracy and information technology. Vocational training was available in catering, brick work, plastering, painting and decorating, fork lift truck driving, horticulture and physical education. There was no evening or weekend provision. Fifty-four prisoners participated in education, 12 of whom were full time. Thirty-one prisoners participated in vocational training full time. All prisoners were engaged full time in a range of appropriate activities in education, training or work. Eighty-one worked outside the prison with local businesses or charitable organisations and 15 of these prisoners were in paid employment.
- 5.3 Leadership and management of learning and skills were good. There were regular meetings with the key partners. Education and training were provided by A4e and were well delivered. Suitable vocational opportunities, particularly in workshops, had improved. The prison had steadily introduced additional learning and training places to cater for the wide range of prisoners' needs. Systems and procedures to ensure the quality of the learning and skills in the OLASS provision were good, although not sufficiently thorough in all other areas.
- 5.4 A development plan to improve education and training was designed to take account of prisoners' needs, but the plan did not contain many detailed targets. The data collected by the prison about individual prisoners were not used sufficiently well to identify trends in the overall performance of the prison as a whole.
- 5.5 The prison was part of the East of England 'test bed' for reducing reoffending through learning and skills and had introduced an employability compact, which meant that courses provided should meet the needs of outside industry. However, although work was well under way in this area, such as in changes to physical education courses offered, not all work skills developed in the prison were recognised.
- 5.6 Although community placements were visited once a month for security checks, progress made at work was not formally recognised or recorded and no targets were set for learners in relation to their placements.

- 5.7 The quality of vocational training was good. Teaching and learning was well evidenced and lessons were well planned and actively developed skills. Training sessions had clearly stated objectives and learning. The standard of learners' work was good and they took pride in their work and achievements, enjoying vocational programmes and working hard to improve their skills levels. Progress in vocational training workshops was well monitored. Resources were well managed throughout the prison, with classroom facilities available in the workshop areas. Teachers from the education department visited the vocational workshops to provide literacy and numeracy support for those who required it. This support was, wherever possible, made relevant to the vocational area.
- 5.8 The vocational programmes provided prisoners with good skills and knowledge that helped to improve their future job prospects. Men enjoyed their courses and valued the opportunity to gain important work skills and knowledge. However opportunities to accredit some work areas already operating in the prison were missed. These areas included motor vehicle repair and maintenance, plumbing, industrial cleaning and waste management. Progression opportunities were limited in bricks and plastering as only a level one qualification could be gained. Not all relevant areas offered the right qualifications. For example, it was not possible for prisoners working in the kitchen to get the industry relevant food hygiene qualification.
- 5.9 Some prisoners had their own vehicles to travel to and from work. Prison-owned mini buses staffed by paid prisoner drivers took and picked up other prisoners from their work placements. This provided those participating with the important discipline of regular attendance, good time-keeping and physical work for sustained periods that they may not have experienced for a long time. Although prison staff often found the work experience placements, prisoners had to find the paid work themselves, helping to develop their job search skills. This was sometimes difficult due to the lack of a job club and internet access. Some prisoners did not have suitable work clothing such as waterproofs and warm work clothes for external work.
- 5.10 Staff had developed a strategy for integrating key skills into vocational training programmes. Prisoners benefited from support in workshops to help them achieve qualifications in computing, team work and organising their own work in their vocational area. Some had one-to-one coaching and support to meet individual needs and achieve their literacy and numeracy qualifications. Men appreciated this support. Some men were able to progress to key skills at level three. Prison staff observed lessons, but this was not formalised in learning plans.
- 5.11 Staff effectively referred prisoners to other partners such as Learndirect to receive literacy and numeracy support where this suited the needs of individual men to achieve national qualifications.
- 5.12 Information, advice and guidance was satisfactory. An external partner provided appropriate advice and guidance at the start of training programmes. Staff were able to support prisoners to find work and give advice and guidance on applying for benefits.
- 5.13 Staff had developed a skills for life strategy, but this had yet to impact on planning for improvement, particularly to integrate literacy and numeracy into vocational learning such as cooking and health and nutrition as a useful and more interesting context to develop skills.
- 5.14 Individual learning plans were insufficiently detailed and contained broad targets that were not specific, with few long-term goals negotiated with individual learners. They did not contain small measurable targets that were frequently reviewed and updated to monitor learners' progress. Few plans contained personal and social targets to monitor progress and record improvement over a period of time.

## Library

---

- 5.15 A well-managed library was in a separate building and accessible to those with disabilities. Suffolk County Library provided the service. Staff were adequately qualified and included a full-time library manager and two prisoner orderlies, one of whom was working towards a level three advice and guidance qualification. Prisoners could visit the library at least once a week for 75 minutes. It was open on weekday afternoons, five evenings and weekend mornings. Prisoners could also visit the library at any time throughout the day.
- 5.16 A recent library users' survey had found that 49% of prisoners visited the library once a week and 29% more than once a week, which was similar to our own survey. Prisoners could get to the library easily during the core day when they were in education and vocational workshops. Use of the library was effectively promoted in education, including weekly reading hours, cultural diversity days and visits by authors.
- 5.17 The library had adequate stock that included books, magazines, CDs, DVDs, audio books and tapes and books and newspapers in a range of languages and for emergent readers. Legal materials were available. Open University students used the library for research when they needed. Prisoners could search for their own books and place orders for new books as required. There was no internet access to enable prisoners to carry out job searches (see section on resettlement pathways) or conduct other research.

## Recommendations

---

- 5.18 Prisoners should be provided with suitable work clothing when working in wet, cold or dirty conditions, including in external placements.
- 5.19 Progression opportunities up to level two should be provided for bricks and plastering courses.
- 5.20 Those involved in serving food and those wanting to work in the catering industry should be given the opportunity to get an intermediate food hygiene certificate.
- 5.21 Lesson observations for courses delivered by prison staff to assess and improve the quality of courses should be formalised.
- 5.22 The range of vocational courses should include motor vehicle repair, plumbing, waste management and industrial cleaning.

## 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.

- 5.23 Recreational physical education (PE) was available to all prisoners in the evenings and at weekends. Appropriate remedial gym and satisfactory accredited training took place during the day. PE facilities were satisfactory, but some prisoners were turned away when an adjacent separate staff facility could have been used.
- 5.24 Accredited vocational courses in PE included the community sports leader award, football coaching and national vocational qualifications in sport and leisure. Before using the facilities, all prisoners were required to complete a questionnaire about their health and fitness. Any identified issues were referred to healthcare for advice. A PE senior officer and three gym instructors staffed the PE department. Three gym orderlies also worked full time.
- 5.25 All young adults and prisoners over 40 years old could use the PE facilities on at least three weekdays a week, although they could also attend in the evenings and at weekends. Other prisoners could use the facilities at least two evenings a week or at weekends. Facilities included a large sports hall used for badminton, soft tennis, basketball and circuit training. Another large room with cardiovascular and weight training equipment could take up to 30 prisoners. There was a separate staff facility with cardiovascular equipment, but prisoners were sometimes turned away from the main gym even when this was empty and could have been used. There was also an outside full-size football pitch and the prison's football team competed in the local league. A classroom with an electronic whiteboard was used for theory work. Recreational exercise was encouraged by staff and posters around the prison advertised the range of activities.
- 5.26 Prisoners were issued with two towels a week to cover general personal use and PE. There were six showers in the PE department, two of which were suitable for wheelchair users. When the gym was fully used, prisoners had to shower in shifts or they could shower on their residential unit.
- 5.27 Records of accidents, injuries and assaults were regularly recorded and any necessary follow-up procedures were appropriately addressed.

## Recommendation

---

- 5.28 Prisoners should be able to use the separate staff fitness facilities during busy periods in the gym.

## 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.

- 5.29 New arrivals were seen by a chaplain usually within 24 hours and the team met the needs of all faith groups. The Sycamore Tree restorative justice programme was heavily subscribed. Long-term illness had affected the further development of chaplaincy work.

- 5.30 In our survey, nearly two-thirds of prisoners, significantly more than the comparator, said their religious beliefs were respected. Chaplaincy services were provided by HMP Warren Hill, but

the two full-time chaplains had been on long-term sick leave and their work had been covered temporarily by the area chaplaincy team. This had hindered the further development of chaplaincy services. A range of sessional chaplains supporting different faiths also attended regularly. Chaplains met most new arrivals individually within 24 hours.

- 5.31 Prisoners were largely encouraged to have their spiritual needs met on site, although one Sikh prisoner attended services in the community. Prisoners and staff were positive about the support offered to men with domestic issues and bereavements. The chapel was large and bright. Attendance at Christian services was quite low. There was a smaller multi-faith room, but no washing facilities. A Muslim chaplain came to the prison twice a week and led prayers and a teaching session attended by over 20 Muslim prisoners.
- 5.32 The chaplaincy team led the delivery of the Sycamore Tree restorative justice programme and there was a high demand for the next three scheduled courses.

## Recommendation

---

- 5.33 Washing facilities should be provided for prisoners before Friday prayers.

## 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.

- 5.34 Doors to rooms were never locked and only the external doors were locked at night. A range of activities was available during the week, but this was limited in the evenings. Prisoners could associate on the sports field in the summer, but had no free access or sufficient time in the fresh air at other times. They could not visit friends on other houses.
- 5.35 Doors to prisoner rooms on houses were never locked and only the external doors were locked at night. The core day was displayed on each house, with houses unlocked from 7am until 8pm. Prisoners attending the gym or library had to return to their houses by 8.15pm. Six roll checks took place during the day. A range of activities was available during the working week, but there were few evening activities apart from some religious events run by the chaplaincy. Each house had appropriate association areas and leisure equipment.
- 5.36 Prisoners could associate on the sports field in summer months, but not at other times. Each house had its own open air patio area with shrubs, plants and seating. Staff said these could be used by prisoners, but we only saw prisoners from Hoxon using their outside area. On one house, the doors to the patio were locked and concealed behind a large display board. Staff said the doors could be unlocked on request, but none of the prisoners we spoke to were aware of this. On another house, the doors to the patio were unlocked and ajar and staff said prisoners could go outside, but not 'after dark'. We did not see any prisoners using it during the day.
- 5.37 Prisoners were not allowed to visit other houses at any time of the year. They did not have free movement around the grounds and had only limited opportunity to associate in the fresh air with others on their house (see section on security and rules). In our survey, significantly fewer prisoners than the comparator said they had exercise three or more times a week.

## Recommendation

---

- 5.38 All prisoners should have the opportunity for at least one hour of exercise in the open air every day.

# Section 6: 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. Categorisation and allocation procedures are based on an assessment of a prisoner's risks and needs; and are clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed.

- 6.1 Security issues were well managed. Security was mostly proportionate to the prison, although some rules and procedures, particularly about clothes and movements, appeared too restrictive. Dynamic security was well developed. Prisoners were appropriately moved back to closed conditions if they presented a control risk. Absconds were rare.
- 6.2 The level of security was appropriate to the open nature of the prison. Security was managed by a dedicated staff group consisting of a full-time senior officer, an intelligence officer and administrative staff. The number of security information reports (SIRs) had increased from an average of 100 a month in 2007 to 150 a month in 2008 (a total of 1861). SIRs were mostly related to drugs, mobile telephones and alcohol, but there was no significant problem with widespread substance misuse and the associated security problems sometimes associated with open prisons. Sixty-eight mobile telephones had been recovered in 2008. Although not high compared to other prisons, the prison said this was increasing.
- 6.3 Dynamic security was largely good. Staff were often working in singleton posts on the units and consequently got to know prisoners well in order to manage the units. Security staff reported few problems with gang-related behaviour and very little violence and spent most of their time evaluating intelligence and dealing with public protection issues and the large number of release on temporary licences issued daily. Risk assessments relating to life-sentenced prisoners also took up some time. A recent security audit had shown a marked improvement in procedures. Apart from reception and some room searches, there was little use of strip searching, which was almost all intelligence-led in the case of searching returning outworkers.
- 6.4 SIRs were dealt with promptly. During the weekend periods when no security staff were on duty, immediate actions were dealt with by the duty governor. A police intelligence officer also worked at the prison, although he had other responsibilities elsewhere. He did not always attend security meetings, but the prison reported a cooperative and productive relationship and had held a number of joint operations with Suffolk constabulary. It was not always clear that actions arising from SIRs were dealt with. For example, there was no tracking system for recording the outcome of target-led searching and there were similar concerns about suspicion drug tests (see section on substance misuse).
- 6.5 Prisoners did not have free access to the prison grounds and there were restrictions on wearing personal clothing (see section on hygiene, clothing and possessions). A public road ran through the prison and there were several public footpaths. The prison was sensitive to local opinion and was not willing to extend the range of movement prisoners could have within the prison grounds. Managers also believed that the clear separation between living units

reduced the opportunity for bullying and for prisoners to retrieve illicit items from the grounds. Prisoners were not allowed to associate on units other than their own. There were also restrictions on outside exercise (see section on time out of cell). These rules appeared very restrictive for prisoners assessed as suitable for open conditions.

- 6.6 All prisoners had signed a number of compacts and understood what was expected of them, although some prisoners said they were applied inconsistently by different staff.
- 6.7 There had been 134 returns to closed conditions in 2007-08 and 118 to date in 2008-09. The reasons behind these varied, but were mostly linked to drugs, alcohol or further criminal charges that changed the risk assessment of the prisoner. Absconds were rare.
- 6.8 The security department was also responsible for completing checks of community and work placements, which took place at least every 28 days. Community placements were aware that they could contact the prison and a confidential hotline had been established for prisoners and visitors to telephone with any concerns.
- 6.9 The prison had access to a search dog team, including one trained to detect mobile telephones. There were no banned visitors.

## Recommendations

---

- 6.10 A tracking system should be introduced to ensure that the outcomes from security information reports are completed.
- 6.11 The rules restricting prisoners' movements in the grounds during daylight hours should be relaxed.

## 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.

- 6.12 There were relatively few formal adjudications. Records showed that most were well conducted, but defences to charges of late return from release on temporary licence were not always fully explored. There had been only one use of force in the previous year. There was no special accommodation or segregation unit. Cells in the reception area were used to hold men transferring to closed conditions, but the length of time they spent there was not recorded.
- 6.13 Most of the men at Hollesley Bay were well motivated and conformed to the prison rules. There were relatively few adjudications, with a total of 270 in 2008, averaging around five a week. Appropriately, most minor breaches of rules were dealt with through informal warnings or the incentives and earned privileges scheme. Disciplinary charges generally related to more serious offences such as men testing positive on mandatory drug tests or failure to comply with conditions of temporary release such as by returning late.
- 6.14 Quarterly adjudications committee meetings were chaired by the governor and involved governor adjudicators and other relevant staff from a range of departments, although the February and May 2008 meetings had more apologies for absence than attendees. The



meetings examined trends of reports, appeals, consistency of punishments, tariff guidance and other relevant matters relating to adjudications. All adjudication records were checked for compliance by the deputy governor. There had been no referrals to an independent adjudicator.

- 6.15 Adjudications were carried out in an office in one of the residential units in a relaxed environment. Paper and a pen were provided. The records of the adjudications we examined indicated that appropriate consideration was given to the individual circumstances of the prisoner. Cases were usually thoroughly investigated and there were a number where adjudicating governors had rightly dismissed charges. In a small number of cases, there had been insufficient investigation before reaching a guilty verdict. Although there is always a possible defence to charges under Prison Rule, in some cases involving late return from release on temporary licence (ROTL) a strict liability approach appeared to have been taken rather than accepting reasonable reasons for delay as appropriate defences. In such cases, defences were treated as mitigation and prisoners received just a caution, but it meant they had a guilty verdict against them on the record and possible further penalties. However, most hearings were fair and punishments were reasonable and appropriate.
- 6.16 Following a guilty verdict at adjudication related to ROTL or positive mandatory drug test, prisoners were liable to have their ROTL suspended. The memoranda from the security manager giving notification of the outcome of adjudications suggested that suspension of ROTL was part of the adjudication punishment rather than a separate administrative action afterwards. Notice to staff 50/2005 referred to a risk assessment board taking such decisions, but in practice the decisions appeared to be made by the adjudicator immediately after the adjudication.

### **Use of force**

---

- 6.17 Force had been used on only one prisoner in the previous year. Despite this, 98% of uniformed staff had received the required control and restraint refresher training.

### **Segregation**

---

- 6.18 There was no designated segregation unit or special accommodation. Some cells in the reception area were used to hold men waiting for transfer back to closed conditions. We were assured that no one had been held in one of these cells overnight in recent times. A record kept of all prisoners held in these cells did not include how long they spent in them so it was not possible to confirm this.

### **Recommendations**

---

- 6.19 Explanations for arriving late back from release on temporary licence should be investigated as possible defences rather than mitigation irrespective of the prisoner's plea.
- 6.20 Decisions to suspend release on temporary licence following a proven adjudication should be clearly separate from the adjudication process and based on an individual assessment of risk in each case.
- 6.21 Records of the use of cells in the reception area for men returning to closed conditions should include the length of time they spend in the cell.

# Incentives and earned privileges

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

6.22 Prisoners' behaviour was motivated more by keeping their place at Hollesley Bay than through the incentives and earned privileges scheme. The scheme operated fairly and was overseen by managers.

6.23 Prisoners valued their place at Hollesley Bay and were a largely well behaved group. This was reflected through the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, where over 80% of prisoners were on the enhanced level. Only two prisoners had been placed on the basic level in the previous four months. Prisoners were motivated more by their desire to keep their place at Hollesley Bay than the few significant privileges available on the enhanced level, although some were keen to achieve the highest level. Incentives included extended hours when on release on temporary licence, access to additional private cash and an additional property allowance.

6.24 There was a comprehensive policy that was reviewed annually. Personal officers were required to review prisoners' incentive levels monthly and consider whether behaviour justified a referral to an IEP board for promotion or demotion. History sheets were stamped to confirm this check. Boards took place when required and were chaired by a senior officer. The scheme was overseen by principal officers through regular management checks and monitored through the race equality action team. In a recent five-month period, 74 prisoners had been considered by IEP boards. Of these, 61% had resulted in promotion, 29% in demotion and 10% had remained on the same level.

# Section 7: 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.

- 7.1 Few prisoners were positive about the quality of food. The kitchen was clean and food was appropriately stored, but prisoners working there could not obtain qualifications. Meals were served at serveries on the units and some of the food was cold. Prisoners ate together in dining rooms. There were no opportunities for prisoners to self-cater.
- 7.2 The kitchen provided meals for men in Hollesley Bay and HMP Warren Hill. Meals were delivered in containers to the prisons by van. The kitchen was clean and food was appropriately stored. The kitchen was staffed by a catering manager, six civilian chefs and 10 to 12 prisoners from Hollesley Bay.
- 7.3 Meals were served on each house, supervised by officers. Serveries were clean and well maintained. Catering staff attended on a rota to check that food was served correctly, temperatures were checked, prisoners were appropriately dressed and the area and equipment were clean. These checks were recorded. All prisoners working in the kitchen and serveries, and supervising staff, had received some food hygiene training. Prisoners could not obtain any qualifications while working in the kitchen.
- 7.4 A pre-select menu ran on a four-week cycle offering four lunch and five evening meal choices on weekdays and four of both at weekends. A range of diets was catered for and the menu highlighted meals for vegetarians, halal and low-fat options. Lunchtime meals were usually cold choices during the week, although soup was always available alongside a choice of salad. Fresh fruit was available every evening. Breakfast was served on the morning it was eaten. Portion control was good and prisoners helped themselves to soup and salad at lunchtime and vegetables in the evening. Bread was also freely available.
- 7.5 In our survey, only 27% of prisoners, significantly fewer than the comparator, said the food was good or very good and 45% said it was bad or very bad. Many complained about the menu choice, quality of food and temperature. Some of the food we sampled was cold. Twenty-three per cent of prisoners had responded to the last food survey in November 2008. This had resulted in some changes to the menu, including that more hot choices were going to be provided for lunch. Prisoner representatives attended monthly catering meetings with the catering manager and staff and these were minuted. Food comment books were available on the serveries, but not all prisoners knew this. Books were not openly displayed and pens were not provided. Comments were read and signed by catering staff, but they did not always address the specific complaint. Comments were not discussed at the catering meetings and many prisoners complained that 'nothing changed'.
- 7.6 Prisoners ate together in dining rooms on the houses. Outworkers were given a packed lunch and £4.25 for an evening meal if necessary.

# 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.

- 7.7 New arrivals were usually able to obtain goods from the shop within 24 hours. The product range was satisfactory and prisoners were regularly consulted about the introduction of new items. There were arrangements to source some goods not available through catalogues.
- 7.8 Shop products were ordered from a wholesale provider and stored and bagged in a storeroom at Hollesley Bay. New arrangements were due to start in May 2009 when a national delivery contract came into force, but the same model would be retained.
- 7.9 New arrivals were often able to have an emergency shop order within 24 hours. They could also have an advance of up to £10 to buy essential items while their money was transferred from the sending prison. The advance was repaid weekly.
- 7.10 Each house unit had a designated delivery day for shop orders and prisoners pre-ordered goods from a canteen list. The list contained 280 items and included halal and vegan products and fresh fruit and salad items. There were some skin and hair care products for black and minority ethnic prisoners, but in our survey significantly fewer than white prisoners considered the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. Prices were comparable to the high street, but prisoners said some items were expensive. Catalogue items could be ordered from a small range of providers. Staff were also prepared to source some goods such as CDs from internet suppliers.
- 7.11 Most respondents to a canteen survey undertaken in November 2008 expressed broad satisfaction with the provision and suggested additional food and toiletry items, some of which had been introduced on a trial basis.

# Section 8: 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.

- 8.1 The resettlement strategy was up to date and based on an in-depth needs analysis, but meetings were not sufficiently strategic and did not take account of the changing nature of the population.
- 8.2 The resettlement strategy, known as the 'reducing reoffending development plan (2008-09)', had been updated in December 2008. It was based on an in-depth needs analysis carried out several months earlier through a detailed survey that had generated 155 responses. A number of development points had been identified, such as access to visits, housing, access to resettlement provision and a need for debt advice. The plan identified prisoners' needs and specified how these linked with the resettlement pathways. It also set out how existing provision would meet the needs. However, other than the senior manager who also had responsibility for learning and skills, there were no designated managers responsible for the strategic management of each pathway.
- 8.3 Monthly meetings were well attended by most of the service providers in the prison and key resettlement staff, but the focus was mostly on practical and operational matters rather than any strategic evaluation of the provision and whether it met need, particularly of the increasing number of short-term prisoners, life-sentenced prisoners and those arriving with little time left to serve. The head of offender management rarely attended and the senior psychologist responsible for lifers was not part of the meeting.
- 8.4 There were some links with the local voluntary sector, particularly through the resettlement officer responsible for community placements, but there had been no meeting in 2008. A group called Business in the Community had been set up and had held a meeting in the prison and the prison was working with the local ROMS (regional offender management service) office to pilot a multi-agency skills and education programme. This was largely focused on ensuring that the provision of learning and skills was more focused on the job market (see section on activities).
- 8.5 Although most prisoners were serving sentences of more than 12 months, many were transferred to Hollesley Bay right at the end of their sentence and so did not stay long. The impact of an increasing short-term population had been recognised, but was not yet sufficiently strategically managed. Since the introduction of automatic release on end of custody licence (ECL) in mid-2007, the population had become much more transient. In 2007, 129 prisoners were released early, the vast majority of whom spent several weeks in the prison. By 2008, this figure had risen to 395, with a quarter of those spending less than a week at Hollesley Bay. Prisoners were sometimes sent from local prisons at Norwich and Chelmsford with just days left to serve. They then had to return to their home area, which was often near their local prison. This was a poor use of resources and unnecessarily disruptive to prisoners and their families.

- 8.6 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was well used. In the previous six months, 2,505 prisoners had applied for ROTL and the vast majority had been successful. These included prisoners going out on town visits and home leave as well as to work and community placements.

## Recommendations

---

- 8.7 The regular resettlement meetings should involve all key staff and include a strategic element that reviews the resettlement needs of the population and ensures that the prison is meeting the development points identified in the reducing reoffending action plan.
- 8.8 The reducing reoffending action plan should include an assessment of the needs of very short-term prisoners and how they will be met.
- 8.9 Prisoners should not be transferred from local prisons to Hollesley Bay with just days left to serve.

## 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.

- 8.10 Offender management was a busy department, with only two offender supervisors. Forty-eight prisoners were in scope for formal offender management, but the department also managed all sentence plans and young offenders. Contact between prisoners and offender managers in the community was limited and mostly by telephone. Although the quality of work was good, there was insufficient multidisciplinary involvement with sentence planning and contact with offender supervisors was limited.

### Sentence planning and offender management

---

- 8.11 Offender management was a small and busy department, with just two offender supervisors managing almost 300 cases, of which 48 were in scope for formal offender management. The remainder were eligible for sentence planning and 30 of these prisoners were identified as high or very high risk of harm due to their original offence or level of supervision required on release. Some prisoners arrived from closed prisons without an up-to-date sentence plan or offender assessment system (OASys) document. The backlog was being dealt efficiently and only a few assessments were outstanding. New receptions in scope were identified the day after arrival. Forty-nine prisoners had arrived in 2008 without an initial assessment and there were 37 reviews not complete from other establishments.
- 8.12 Offender management was not the responsibility of the head of reducing reoffending but the head of operations, which meant it was not an integral part of the resettlement strategy. The two offender supervisors were supported by a full-time case manager. They were described as full time, but in common with other specialist staff were required to cover meal breaks on the unit and other operational tasks. This meant they often lost two hours out of an already

stretched working day. Cover arrangements for annual leave and sickness were ad hoc, with staff who were not trained detailed to work in the department, although the prison had recently trained some additional staff.

- 8.13 Despite the pressures, the quality of case management was good with regular meetings with those who came under offender supervision, albeit limited to once every two months in most cases. All young offenders had a sentence plan irrespective of sentence length. Few offender managers from the community attended the prison to engage personally with prisoners and two prisoners in scope did not have a designated offender manager. Prolific and priority offenders were seen monthly and the prison reported much better communication with the crime reduction teams responsible for managing prolific offenders in the community. The location of the prison and restrictions on probation budgets were given as the reasons why so few offender managers came to the prison. Some use was made of telephone conferencing for sentence planning boards.
- 8.14 Prisoners eligible for sentence planning were normally seen within three months of arrival if they stayed at the prison long enough. Sentence planning boards normally involved the offender supervisor and the prisoner. There was no multidisciplinary forum that took into account reintegration pathways such as work placements or community employment. Staff had access to information about education and skills, but were not normally asked for any input about community/work placements and sentence planning targets were usually linked to what was available in the prison (such as victim awareness or education) rather than specifically to resettlement objectives related to skills or employment. Personal officers sent written contributions, but rarely attended sentence planning boards due to the low staffing levels of the prison.
- 8.15 There were no custody plans for those serving short sentences, but all prisoners were seen by advice workers on induction and referred to partner agencies dealing with areas such as housing advice. The impact of end of custody licence meant there was a significant population churn (see section on resettlement pathways).
- 8.16 Public protection arrangements were sound and all prisoners were assessed through a panel soon after arrival. Thirty prisoners were assessed as high or very high risk of harm and most of these were not assessed as suitable to work out in the community, although many were eligible for town visits. There was no blanket ban on community work, but the prison was sensitive to potential risk to the public and local public relations. Regular risk management meetings were well attended.
- 8.17 Parole processes for determinate-sentenced prisoners were normally completed on time. In 2008, 556 prisoners had been eligible for home detention curfew and 292 of these had been released. There were sometimes delays in receiving external reports, which delayed prisoners being released on their eligible date.

### **Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners**

---

- 8.18 There were 30 life-sentenced prisoners and one with an indeterminate sentence for public protection who were managed by a senior psychologist, a seconded probation officer and lifer case officers. Unlike in many prisons now, the lifer processes were still entirely separate from the offender management unit and there was some scope to streamline the procedures. Twenty-three of the 31 prisoners were post tariff.
- 8.19 There had been some delays in lifer hearings, but a new system had been established to manage these. Of the 30 lifers, 11 were working out in the community and the remainder were

going through the risk assessment process, although most were taking part in town visits. The lifer officers spent considerable amounts of time completing risk assessments. Life-sentenced prisoners we spoke to said the prison was preparing them for release, but that contact with external probation officers was mostly limited to telephone conversations. Some lifers said they found this difficult in establishing a relationship with the person who would be supervising them after release. The decreasing number of paid work opportunities was a concern as many life-sentenced prisoners were anxious to build up some financial independence before release.

- 8.20 There were no specific days for life-sentenced prisoners, although many had been involved in an open family day held in the summer of 2008. The senior psychologist responsible for life-sentenced prisoners maintained contact with external probation officers and families and some families had attended sentence planning boards.
- 8.21 The lifer team was accessible during the day as part of a drop in surgery. The lifer manager also held regular evening meetings to see those working out during the day.

## Recommendations

---

- 8.22 Offender supervisors should not be diverted to other tasks to the detriment of their core work.
- 8.23 Sentence planning boards should include representatives from other disciplines such as learning and skills to ensure that other reintegration needs such as work and community placements are taken into account.
- 8.24 Release on temporary licence should be used in appropriate cases to allow life-sentenced prisoners to meet their probation officer when they are unable to visit the prison.

## 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.

- 8.25 There were some good resettlement opportunities, but reintegration services were stretched. Awareness of services was poor, but few prisoners thought they would have problems on release. Most prisoners were released to secure housing and many prisoners had training or employment arranged. Daily healthcare discharge clinics were held, but few prisoners attended. Finance and debt advice did not meet prisoners' needs. A short duration programme was helpful for those with drug problems and drugs workers provided a range of one-to-one and group interventions. Links with drug intervention programme workers in London were complicated by the remoteness of the prison.



## Reintegration planning

---

### Accommodation

---

- 8.26 In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said they knew who to see about getting help with preparation for release in terms of accommodation, finance, benefits and work and training. However, fewer than in other open prisons thought they would have problems on release. The number of prisoners discharged from the prison had increased from 682 in 2007 to 860 in 2008, attributed largely to the increase in end of custody licence (ECL), which gave automatic early release to prisoners with an address.
- 8.27 Most prisoners were released with secure housing and very few were released without accommodation. A Nacro worker was based at the prison for three days a week and had a high caseload of between 60 and 70, although not all needs were acute. Information, advice and guidance workers (Tribal) also saw all new receptions to screen for immediate problems. Some prisoners were subsequently referred to Nacro for urgent issues.
- 8.28 A housing worker from the St Giles Trust, based in London, came to the prison twice a month to meet prisoners under the 'Through the Gate' initiative, which aimed to help meet the acute housing needs of men discharged to the main inner London boroughs. The initiative provided an on release meet and greet and helped secure housing in difficult areas. The prison had also had some success with the ClearSprings project, which provided housing for those on home detention curfew in Norwich, Luton and Northampton, although often this could not be confirmed until a late stage.
- 8.29 Access to housing advice was restricted to the three months before release due to the demands placed on the single housing adviser. Some prisoners we spoke to felt this was too late. There were no systems to help those who wanted to arrange private rented accommodation on release. Providing meaningful services for the large number of prisoners who spent less than seven days at the prison was almost impossible.
- 8.30 The high numbers of prisoners released on ECL meant it was hard to determine the substantive housing needs of the population. Some prisoners seeing the Nacro adviser discontinued the contact in favour of short-term accommodation in order to get early release.
- 8.31 Relatively little use was made of prisoners as peer advisers. Two prisoner employees in the resettlement office collected initial information from prisoners and carried out some administrative tasks, but could not make telephone calls or provide any form of housing surgery on the units. The lack of a drop-in advice centre on the residential units may have contributed to the lack of awareness of resettlement services.
- 8.32 High numbers of prisoners were released on temporary licence to community placements, paid employment and to maintain family ties. Around 25,000 licences (ROTLs) had been issued in 2008 and 67% of men in our survey, against a comparator of 55%, said they had had access to ROTL. There were very few ROTL failures. The administration of the ROTL scheme was cumbersome, with a number of staff involved in issuing and processing paperwork.

## **Education, training and employment**

---

*For further details, see Learning and skills and work activities in Section 5*

- 8.33 The prison provided good education, training and work opportunities. Education programmes were based on the needs of individual prisoners to improve their literacy and numeracy skills and their personal and social development. Vocational programmes were based on their need to improve work skills and provide them with work experience. Information, advice and guidance were provided to raise awareness of skills shortages and job vacancies. JobCentre Plus visited the prison to provide up-to-date information about local job opportunities and jobs in other regions.
- 8.34 A resettlement officer worked full time providing the main contact point between the prison and community placements. This was a busy post as the number of prisoners working out had increased from 28 to 83 in two years. There was no regular cover for leave and the resettlement officer was regularly required to cover lunch and tea times in the prison, which could take up to two hours of a scheduled shift. The post holder also worked shifts that meant he was not available to answer queries during Monday to Friday when most placements were out working. Prisoners wanting to work out were seen by a prisoner orderly who completed an assessment of skills. Attempts were made to match the skills and wishes of the prisoner with an appropriate placement, but this was not always possible. Some employers also came into the prison to interview prisoners. There was some administrative support to carry out police checks, complete ROTL paperwork and complete vehicle checks. The resettlement unit was very busy, with 146 appointments in January 2009.
- 8.35 Specialist services, such as Next Step, JobCentre Plus, probation and the Foundation Training Company (FTC), were used to help prisoners gain employment on release. There were links with local employers and charities to identify ROTL and employment opportunities, but there was a restriction that work and community placements had to be within a 30-mile radius of the prison, which was less effective for prisoners who came from farther away. The many prisoners from London felt disadvantaged. The criteria were interpreted flexibly and there was scope for prisoners to get a job further afield at the end of their sentence, but few were aware of this and it was not widely advertised. Eighty-one prisoners were working in the community and 15 of these were in paid work. The outside work was well overseen by resettlement staff.
- 8.36 The FTC provided employment advice and an adviser liaised between prisoners and employers or training provision in the community. This work was valued by prisoners and other resettlement staff, who believed that the role was integral to building prisoners' self-esteem and confidence in looking for working and to identifying the special needs of employers. The post was due to finish in March 2009 and there were no firm plans to replace the service.
- 8.37 Five-week job preparation courses were run, but were not roll on, roll off courses and did not allow prisoners to start after the first week.
- 8.38 Relatively high numbers of prisoners were released with employment or training arranged. In the previous six months, just over 70% of prisoners had been released to education, training or a confirmed job, but the economic climate was making this more difficult.
- 8.39 Resettlement services were not easily accessible to those out at work. There was no job club and prisoners did not have the facilities, such as internet access, to look for work. A job point terminal in the induction unit had been out of use for some time and anyway would not have been accessible to prisoners in other units.

## **Mental and physical health**

---

- 8.40 Prisoners were expected to attend a daily discharge clinic on the day before their release, but few did so, often turning up instead in healthcare on the day of their release to receive their discharge letter and medication. The healthcare centre usually received information about releases some days in advance and staff could therefore scrutinise and prepare records in advance. Any medications a prisoner needed to take away were noted and supplied and information given to the prisoner. Prisoners who were not registered with a GP were given details of GPs in their area and the contact details of NHS Direct. Letters to GPs included the prison letterhead, which would have been better removed. The care programme approach was used appropriately for those with severe and enduring mental health problems. There was a policy outlining how to access services for the terminally ill.

## **Finance, benefit and debt**

---

- 8.41 Financial advice was available through the Citizens Advice Bureau, who visited the prison for 1.5 hours every fortnight and took surgeries on the wing. The prison's needs analysis found that 45% of those surveyed had significant debt in the community and 44% of those said they would like support and advice. The prison was hoping to expand this service, but it was currently inadequate to meet the needs of the short-term and transitory population. The employment adviser helped with looking for business start-up funds or grants through the Prince's Trust. The FTC also provided a minor financial component to the five-week pre-release course, but many short-term prisoners were not at the prison long enough to participate in it. There were no specific courses on debt or money management.
- 8.42 Most prisoners were required to complete a period of unpaid community work in the first instance, but those with proven debts were allowed to go straight into paid work where available. Those with skills in demand were identified on arrival and could be fast-tracked to the scheme.
- 8.43 There were sound arrangements for prisoners to open bank accounts while in custody and significantly fewer prisoners in our survey than the comparator had experienced problems in doing so.

## **Recommendations**

---

- 8.44 Prisoner peer advisers should be trained to provide housing guidance.
- 8.45 The services provided by the Foundation Training Company resettlement worker should be effectively replaced.
- 8.46 A flexible roll on, roll off intake should be integrated into the work preparation course to allow more short-term prisoners to take part.
- 8.47 A job club should be established that provides prisoners looking for work with the tools and equipment, such as internet access, to look for work before release. This should be available at convenient hours for those taking part in outside activities.
- 8.48 Subject to a suitable risk assessment and suitable travel arrangements, prisoners should be allowed to work in their home areas at the end of their sentences before release if they are able to find suitable employment.

- 8.49 The resettlement officer should not be taken away from core resettlement duties to cover tasks elsewhere in the prison and should be available on Monday to Friday.
- 8.50 Prisoners should be informed that they need to be seen by healthcare staff at least 24 hours before their release.
- 8.51 Finance and debt advice should be structured and expanded to meet the needs of the short-term population, including modular budgeting and money management courses.

## Drugs and alcohol

---

- 8.52 There were up-to-date and separate drug and alcohol policies, but they had not been informed by the drug and alcohol needs analysis completed in October 2008 and there was no overall action plan taking the drug strategy forward. The drug strategy team met monthly with attendance from all relevant sections of the prison.
- 8.53 The accredited short duration programme (SDP) was run. Assessments were carried out by the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service workers. Seventy-three prisoners had completed the SDP to date in 2009. The target for the year to April 2009 was 78. In addition to running the course, the SDP facilitators delivered programme-awareness training to a quarter of prison staff each year. This appeared to have had positive outcomes reflected in the number of prisoners coming forward for the programme and in understanding of the aims of the course. Prisoners who had completed the course reported excellent levels of support from programme facilitators and house officers and high levels of satisfaction with the SDP.
- 8.54 The CARAT service had case files on 237 prisoners, of which 109 were active. CARAT staff worked with prisoners both individually and in group sessions addressing alcohol awareness, cocaine awareness, harm minimisation and healthy living. In-cell packs on cocaine/crack, harm minimisation, heroin and 'stop supplying' were also provided for prisoners to work through on their own. The CARAT team was not funded to work with prisoners whose only substance of abuse was alcohol, but such prisoners could attend local community Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings on the recommendation of CARAT staff. Several prisoners expressed concern at the lack of alcohol interventions, particularly one-to-one counselling.
- 8.55 There were 102 voluntary drug testing (VDT) compacts, with approximately 100 prisoners on the VDT waiting list. Staff appropriately prioritised prisoners with previous drug problems as many others on the waiting list were non-users wanting to prove their continued abstinence. The VDT positive test rate for the previous six months was 3%. The VDT testing suite was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. Prisoners waited for tests in a light and airy room. Large notice boards displayed information about drugs, blood-borne viruses, healthy living and details of all the drug services and programmes on offer at the prison.
- 8.56 Links with drug intervention programmes (DIP) in East Anglia were good, but many prisoners were from London and links with those DIPs were complicated by distance and the remoteness of the prison. As a result, London-based DIP workers rarely visited prisoners at Hollesley Bay. Some prisoners said this was a cause for concern, although there was regular email and telephone contact between CARAT staff and all DIP teams.

## Recommendations

---

- 8.57 The separate drug and alcohol strategy documents should be updated to reflect the findings of the annual needs analysis and should contain detailed action plans and performance measures.
- 8.58 Appropriate services and interventions should be provided to meet the needs of prisoners with alcohol problems.

## Children and families of offenders

---

- 8.59 Telephones were available all day and prisoners had reasonable access. Many telephones had ineffective hoods and were in busy areas so could not be used in private. The two telephones on Hoxon were side by side. Most units had only two telephones for around 65 prisoners, although Bosmere had better provision. There were no incoming telephone calls and no provision for prisoners to receive calls from children or to deal with arrangements for them.
- 8.60 Visits were run at weekends. The information given to prisoners said these ran from 1.45pm to 3.45pm while the visiting order said 2pm to 3.45pm. Records showed that visits generally started at 1.45pm. Visits could be booked by prisoners in advance and by visitors while they were at the prison. The prison was difficult to get to by public transport and no transport was provided from the nearest station. It was poorly signposted. Many prisoners said the distance and cost of travelling prevented family and friends from visiting. Some also said they had been unable to book a visit because the visits session was full. Records showed that visits were fully booked 25% of the time, but it was not possible to determine how many visits requests had been denied as a result.
- 8.61 All visitors checked in at the visitors' centre, which contained a range of information on resettlement support and local and national support and information groups. Visitors were able to provide feedback about their experience and could communicate any concerns about a prisoner (see section on bullying and violence reduction). The visitors' centre had comfortable chairs and a television. The room was staffed by an operational support grade officer and free refreshments were provided.
- 8.62 The visits room, which was also used as a dining room for prisoners on Bosmere, could seat 28 prisoners and their visitors. It was clean, although not particularly attractive and some prisoners complained that it was often cold. A small room contained a limited selection of toys and children's books, but some items were a choking hazard to young children in an unsupervised area. Prisoners could not go with their child to help them choose a toy or book. Prisoners had to wear prison-issue clothing during visits even though all visitors had to wear a wrist band. We were unable to observe visits during the inspection, but prisoners said the atmosphere was relaxed and a selection of refreshments was available.
- 8.63 In our survey, 45% of prisoners said they had children under the age of 18. The reducing reoffending development plan 2008-09 included the children and families pathway, but was underdeveloped. Apart from the provision of home leave and town visits, the pathway focused only on what was provided in the prison excluding any links in the community. The plan did not identify any other roles of prisoners, such as husbands, partners, sons or fathers, or indicate how these would be developed and supported. A local reducing reoffending survey undertaken in 2008 identified the number of prisoners who had visits (59%), who had children (62%), if

they visited (38%) and how often. The survey did not ask the children's ages or care arrangements. Forty-one per cent of prisoners said they had not been visited in a three-month period, but the survey did not ask why. The action plan recommended that the prison look into the possibility of providing visitor transport to and from the prison and explore why some prisoners did not get visits. We were told that a visitor survey was undertaken annually, but this was not alluded to in the development plan and the visits survey given to us was dated 2006.

- 8.64 Prisoners could invite a family member or friend to attend their review on completion of the short duration drug course, but relatives and friends were not usually involved in any sentence planning meetings.
- 8.65 Comments in observation books on the houses clearly showed that many prisoners were helped to maintain contact, including through extra telephone calls and credit. They also showed that staff were aware of the domestic situation of many prisoners and offered support and help at times of bereavement, illness or other cases. There were examples of officers supporting prisoners who had concerns about their children by, for example, helping them contact social services.
- 8.66 There were no opportunities for prisoners with identified need to attend accredited programmes aimed at improving parenting skills and relationships. The library ran a big book share scheme that allowed prisoners to record a story to be sent to their child with the book and a card made by the prisoner.
- 8.67 Two family days had been run in 2008 and were planned to run again in 2009. These were open to all prisoners and provided a range of activities, including football, story telling and craft activities. Lunch was provided and photographs were taken free of charge.
- 8.68 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was very well used to allow many prisoners to enjoy home and town visits with their family and friends.
- 8.69 There was no family support worker to help prisoners maintain or rebuild relationships and contact with their families or friends, to support those undergoing separation and advise on child protection issues.

## Recommendations

---

- 8.70 Prisoners should be able to use telephones in private.
- 8.71 There should be provision for prisoners to get incoming calls from children.
- 8.72 Transport should be provided from the local railway station for visitors to get to and from the prison.
- 8.73 Prisoners should be able to accompany their child to the play area in the visits room.
- 8.74 Prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes during a visit.
- 8.75 The children and families pathway should be further developed to identify accurately and support the needs of prisoners and involve families in key aspects of the prisoners' sentence.

- 8.76 There should be a qualified family support worker to help prisoners maintain or rebuild relationships with their families or friends.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 8.77 The prison should be better signposted.
- 8.78 The prison should monitor the number of requests for visits that cannot be facilitated and take action to address this.
- 8.79 An assessment should be made to ensure that toys in the unsupervised play area are safe and suitable.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 8.80 Interventions were limited to victim awareness and the short duration drug programme. Cognitive skills booster courses were also provided three times a year by external psychology staff, but this involved a very small number of prisoners with a target of 12 a year. The prison had exceeded this target with 16 completions and had received external recognition for this.
- 8.81 There was some scope for prisoners to be released on licence to take part in courses, but this did not often happen even though courses were frequently set as licence conditions. Offender management staff had identified a need for relationship courses and cited domestic violence as an issue for some prisoners, but this had not been highlighted as part of the needs analysis. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said that they had done something that would make them less likely to offend in future.
- 8.82 The chaplaincy also ran the Sycamore Tree victim awareness course, a six-session group based on Christian values and on restorative justice principles. Some additional interventions were available to young adults through advice and guidance courses provided by the St Giles Trust and a visiting theatre group based in Ipswich.

## Recommendations

---

- 8.83 A regular needs analysis should be conducted to determine whether the right interventions are available.
- 8.84 The scope for completing interventions on licence in the community before release should be expanded through the offender management function.





## Section 9: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

---

Main recommendation	to NOMS
---------------------	---------

---

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 9.1 | Offender managers in the community should keep in regular touch with prisoners they are responsible for in Hollesley Bay to ensure continuity of sentence management and that there are up-to-date appropriate sentence plan targets to help prepare prisoners for release. (HP39) |
|-----|--|

---

Main recommendations	to the governor
----------------------	-----------------

---

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 9.2 | Key departments in the prison should work together effectively to promote cultural and racial diversity and a better understanding among all staff of different backgrounds and the duty to promote race equality. (HP36) |
| 9.3 | A review of catering arrangements in consultation with prisoners should ensure that the meals meet their needs, are of reasonable quality and served at appropriate temperatures. (HP37)                                  |
| 9.4 | A lead should be appointed for each resettlement pathway responsible for ensuring appropriate services designed to reduce reoffending. (HP38)   |

---

Recommendations	to NOMS
-----------------	---------

---

---

Courts, escorts and transfers
-------------------------------

---

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 9.5 | Prisoners should be given at least 24 hours notice of a transfer to an open prison. (1.4) |
|-----|---|

---

Strategic management of resettlement
--------------------------------------

---

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 9.6 | Prisoners should not be transferred from local prisons to Hollesley Bay with just days left to serve. (8.9) |
|-----|---|

---

Recommendation	to the escort contractor
----------------	--------------------------

---

---

Courts, escorts and transfers
-------------------------------

---

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 9.7 | Prisoners should be transported to Hollesley Bay in vehicles that are appropriate to their security category. (1.3) |
|-----|---|

## Recommendations

to the governor

---

### First days in custody

---

- 9.8 A new reception building should be provided. (1.13)
- 9.9 Strip searches on arrival should be conducted only where there is an identified security risk. (1.14)
- 9.10 More staff support should be offered to young adults on their first night to help improve their perceptions of safety. (1.15)

---

### Residential units

---

- 9.11 Suitable accommodation and provision should be made for prisoners with disabilities. (2.12)
- 9.12 Shower areas on Stow and Wilford should be refurbished. (2.13)
- 9.13 More showers with greater privacy should be provided on Bosmere unit. (2.14)
- 9.14 Facilities for prisoners to cook for themselves should be provided. (2.15)
- 9.15 All night staff should know the whereabouts of fire fighting equipment on the houses. (2.16)
- 9.16 Prisoners should have the option of wearing their own clothing in the prison. (2.17)

---

### Personal officers

---

- 9.17 Senior officers should make a written comment about the quality of personal officer entries when completing management checks. (2.28)

---

### Bullying and violence reduction

---

- 9.18 The violence reduction and anti-bullying strategies should include analysis of prisoner responses to safety surveys and plans to address issues raised. (3.12)

---

### Self-harm and suicide

---

- 9.19 Prisoners should have access to appropriate counselling services if required. (3.21)

---

### Diversity

---

- 9.20 A comprehensive diversity strategy should be developed and implemented. (3.30)

---

### Race equality

---

- 9.21 Renewed efforts should be made to find a representative from an external organisation promoting race equality to be co-opted onto the race equality action team, attend regularly,

contribute to the development of local policy and scrutinise investigations of racist complaints. (3.42)

9.22 Representatives from the chaplaincy and education should attend the race equality action team regularly. (3.43)

9.23 Racist incident investigations should record more fully how findings and conclusions are reached. (3.44)

9.24 Feedback forms from racist incident complainants should be analysed and any concerns followed up. (3.45)

---

### **Applications and complaints**

---

9.25 Periodic trend analysis of complaints received should be undertaken. (3.53)

---

### **Legal rights**

---

9.26 The annual resettlement survey should include a question as to whether there are unmet needs for legal services. (3.58)

---

### **Substance use**

---

9.27 The methadone administration facility should be modified to ensure safe and respectful treatment. (3.68)

9.28 Target (suspicion) testing should be managed effectively to ensure tests are undertaken within the required timeframe. (3.69)

---

### **Health services**

---

9.29 Only one patient should be seen at a time in the treatment room and only healthcare staff involved in that consultation should be present. (4.40)

9.30 Nurses responsible for the management of patients with life-long conditions and older prisoners should receive appropriate training. (4.41)

9.31 Triage algorithms should be developed to ensure consistency of advice and treatment to all prisoners. (4.42)

9.32 Healthcare should be regularly represented at the prisoners' forum and consideration given to the creation of a separate prisoners' health forum. (4.43)

9.33 Mental health awareness training should be delivered to a greater number of prison staff. (4.44)

9.34 The suitability of the cupboards used to store controlled drugs should be reviewed and appropriate certificates obtained from the local police. (4.45)

9.35 The in possession risk assessments of each drug and patient should be documented and the reasons for the determination recorded. (4.46)

- 9.36 Prisoners should have appropriate access to simple analgesia. (4.47)
- 9.37 All prescriptions should be legally written and include the quantity prescribed and date prescribed and should be signed by the prescriber. (4.48)
- 9.38 Secondary dispensing should stop. (4.49)
- 9.39 The use of general stock should be audited so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions issued. (4.50)
- 9.40 The responsible pharmacist should have professional control of the stock supplied. (4.51)
- 9.41 Patient group directions should be introduced to enable supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (4.52)
- 9.42 Pharmacy staff should put in place procedures to monitor the use of special sick medication. (4.53)
- 9.43 Prisoners should have access to a pharmacist. (4.54)
- 9.44 All pharmacy procedures and policies should be formally reviewed and adopted through the medicines and therapeutics committee. All staff should read and sign the agreed procedures. (4.55)
- 9.45 The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock used only if unavoidable. (4.56)
- 9.46 A new dental unit should be installed. (4.57)

### **Learning and skills and work activities**

---

- 9.47 Prisoners should be provided with suitable work clothing when working in wet, cold or dirty conditions, including in external placements. (5.18)
- 9.48 Progression opportunities up to level two should be provided for bricks and plastering courses. (5.19)
- 9.49 Those involved in serving food and those wanting to work in the catering industry should be given the opportunity to get an intermediate food hygiene certificate. (5.20)
- 9.50 Lesson observations for courses delivered by prison staff to assess and improve the quality of courses should be formalised. (5.21)
- 9.51 The range of vocational courses should include motor vehicle repair, plumbing, waste management and industrial cleaning. (5.22)

### **Physical education and health promotion**

---

- 9.52 Prisoners should be able to use the separate staff fitness facilities during busy periods in the gym. (5.28)

### **Faith and religious activity**

---

- 9.53 Washing facilities should be provided for prisoners before Friday prayers. (5.33)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 9.54 All prisoners should have the opportunity for at least one hour of exercise in the open air every day. (5.38)

### **Security and rules**

---

- 9.55 A tracking system should be introduced to ensure that the outcomes from security information reports are completed. (6.10)
- 9.56 The rules restricting prisoners' movements in the grounds during daylight hours should be relaxed. (6.11)

### **Discipline**

---

- 9.57 Explanations for arriving late back from release on temporary licence should be investigated as possible defences rather than mitigation irrespective of the prisoner's plea. (6.19)
- 9.58 Decisions to suspend release on temporary licence following a proven adjudication should be clearly separate from the adjudication process and based on an individual assessment of risk in each case. (6.20)
- 9.59 Records of the use of cells in the reception area for men returning to closed conditions should include the length of time they spend in the cell. (6.21)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 9.60 The regular resettlement meetings should involve all key staff and include a strategic element that reviews the resettlement needs of the population and ensures that the prison is meeting the development points identified in the reducing reoffending action plan. (8.7)
- 9.61 The reducing reoffending action plan should include an assessment of the needs of very short-term prisoners and how they will be met. (8.8)

### **Offender management and planning**

---

- 9.62 Offender supervisors should not be diverted to other tasks to the detriment of their core work. (8.22)
- 9.63 Sentence planning boards should include representatives from other disciplines such as learning and skills to ensure that other reintegration needs such as work and community placements are taken into account. (8.23)
- 9.64 Release on temporary licence should be used in appropriate cases to allow life-sentenced prisoners to meet their probation officer when they are unable to visit the prison. (8.24)

## **Resettlement pathways**

---

- 9.65 Prisoner peer advisers should be trained to provide housing guidance. (8.44)
- 9.66 The services provided by the Foundation Training Company resettlement worker should be effectively replaced. (8.45)
- 9.67 A flexible roll on, roll off intake should be integrated into the work preparation course to allow more short-term prisoners to take part. (8.46)
- 9.68 A job club should be established that provides prisoners looking for work with the tools and equipment, such as internet access, to look for work before release. This should be available at convenient hours for those taking part in outside activities. (8.47)
- 9.69 Subject to a suitable risk assessment and suitable travel arrangements, prisoners should be allowed to work in their home areas at the end of their sentences before release if they are able to find suitable employment. (8.48)
- 9.70 The resettlement officer should not be taken away from core resettlement duties to cover tasks elsewhere in the prison and should be available on Monday to Friday. (8.49)
- 9.71 Prisoners should be informed that they need to be seen by healthcare staff at least 24 hours before their release. (8.50)
- 9.72 Finance and debt advice should be structured and expanded to meet the needs of the short-term population, including modular budgeting and money management courses. (8.51)
- 9.73 The separate drug and alcohol strategy documents should be updated to reflect the findings of the annual needs analysis and should contain detailed action plans and performance measures. (8.57)
- 9.74 Appropriate services and interventions should be provided to meet the needs of prisoners with alcohol problems. (8.58)
- 9.75 Prisoners should be able to use telephones in private. (8.70)
- 9.76 There should be provision for prisoners to get incoming calls from children. (8.71)
- 9.77 Transport should be provided from the local railway station for visitors to get to and from the prison. (8.72)
- 9.78 Prisoners should be able to accompany their child to the play area in the visits room. (8.73)
- 9.79 Prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes during a visit. (8.74)
- 9.80 The children and families pathway should be further developed to identify accurately and support the needs of prisoners and involve families in key aspects of the prisoners' sentence. (8.75)
- 9.81 There should be a qualified family support worker to help prisoners maintain or rebuild relationships with their families or friends. (8.76)

- 9.82 A regular needs analysis should be conducted to determine whether the right interventions are available. (8.83)
- 9.83 The scope for completing interventions on licence in the community before release should be expanded through the offender management function. (8.84)

## Housekeeping points

---

### Residential units

---

- 9.84 The microwave and toaster on Bosmere 2 should be replaced. (2.18)

### Self-harm and suicide

---

- 9.85 Listeners should wear badges or clothing to identify their roles. (3.22)

### Health services

---

- 9.86 The healthcare information leaflet given to new arrivals should be updated. (4.58)
- 9.87 The application process for healthcare appointments should be separate from general applications ensuring confidentiality for prisoners. (4.59)
- 9.88 Clinical supervision should be promoted. (4.60)
- 9.89 Clinical records should be moved to a room that would avoid the interruption of clinical activities. (4.61)
- 9.90 The files containing policies and protocols should be reorganised with indices to facilitate easier location. (4.62)
- 9.91 The defibrillator in the healthcare centre should be checked daily and records of this maintained. (4.63)
- 9.92 Cleaning equipment should be removed from the reception room allocated for healthcare staff. (4.64)
- 9.93 The medicines cabinets should be securely attached to the floor or walls in the pharmacy and kept locked when not in use. (4.65)
- 9.94 Access to medications stored in the healthcare centre should be restricted to appropriate staff. (4.66)
- 9.95 The use of out-of-hours medicines taken from the pharmacy under the emergency procedure should be audited and all checks recorded. (4.67)
- 9.96 Pharmaceutical waste disposal should be reviewed to comply with the waste regulations that came into force in July 2005. (4.68)

- 9.97 All medicine refrigerators should be kept between 2 and 8 Celsius and the minimum and maximum refrigerator temperatures should be monitored and recorded daily and adjusted when necessary. (4.69)

### **Resettlement pathways**

---

- 9.98 The prison should be better signposted. (8.77)
- 9.99 The prison should monitor the number of requests for visits that cannot be facilitated and take action to address this. (8.78)
- 9.100 An assessment should be made to ensure that toys in the unsupervised play area are safe and suitable. (8.79)



## Appendix 1 : Inspection team

---

Nigel Newcomen	Deputy Chief Inspector of Prisons
Michael Loughlin	Team Leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Hayley Folland	Inspector
Marie Orrell	Inspector
Mick Bowen	Healthcare Inspector
Mandy Whittingham	Healthcare Inspector
Paul Roberts	Substance Misuse Inspector
Michael Skidmore	Researcher
Lucy Trussler	Researcher
Jane Robinson	Ofsted team leader
John Grimmer	Ofsted inspector
Iris Evan	Ofsted inspector

## Appendix 2: Prison population profile

### Population breakdown by:

(i) No. of sentenced prisoners	No. of adult men	%
	297	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>

(ii) Sentence	No. of adult men	%
Less than 6 months	24	8.1
6 months to less than 12 months	17	5.7
12 months to less than 2 years	21	7.1
2 years to less than 4 years	95	32.0
4 years to less than 10 years	103	34.7
10 years and over (less than life)	7	2.4
Life	30	10.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>

(iii) Length of stay	No. of adult men	%
0 to 4 months	37	12.5
4 months to 8 months	46	15.5
8 month to one year	53	17.8
12 to 18 months	33	11.1
18 to 24 months	27	9.1
over 24 months	35	11.8
unknown	66	22.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>

(iv) Main offence	No. of adult men	%
Violence against the person	85	28.6
Sexual offences	0	0
Burglary	28	9.4
Robbery	31	10.4
Theft and handling	20	6.7
Fraud/forgery	17	5.7
Drugs offences	83	27.9
Driving	17	5.7
Other Offences	2	0.7
Civil offences		0
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	14	4.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>

(v) Age	No. of adult men	%
21 years to 29 years	102	34.3
30 years to 39 years	84	28.3
40 years to 49 years	73	24.6
50 years to 59 years	30	10.1
60 years to 64 years	6	2.0
65+	1	0.3
unknown	1	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>(vi) Home area</b>	<b>No. of adult men</b>	<b>%</b>
Within 50 miles of the prison	73	24.6
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	97	32.7
Over 100 miles from the prison	50	16.8
Overseas	2	0.7
NFA	1	0.3
No record	74	24.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>(vii) Nationality</b>	<b>No. of adult men</b>	<b>%</b>
British	287	96.6
Foreign nationals	10	3.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>(viii) Ethnic group</b>	<b>No. of adult men</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>White</i>		
British	197	66.3
Irish	4	1.3
Other	15	5.1
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and Black Caribbean	3	1.0
White and Black African	1	0.3
White and Asian	0	0
Other mixed	2	0.7
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	7	2.4
Pakistani	5	1.7
Bangladeshi	1	0.3
Other Asian	4	1.3
<i>Black or Black British</i>		
African	10	3.4
Caribbean	38	12.8
Other Black	8	2.7
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese	0	0
Other ethnic group	1	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>(vii) Religion</b>	<b>No. of adult men</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	97	32.7
Roman Catholic	53	17.8
Other Christian denominations	16	5.4
Muslim	28	9.4
Sikh	1	0.3
Hindu	3	1.0
Buddhist	9	3.0
Jewish	1	0.3
Other	4	1.3
No religion	84	28.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>100</b>

## Appendix 3: 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 5 January 2009, the prisoner population at HMP Hollesley Bay was 329. The sample size was 109. Overall, this represented 33% of the prisoner population.

### **Selecting the sample**

---

Respondents were randomly selected from a LIDS prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a LIDS 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. No respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties and two respondents were interviewed.

### **Methodology**

---

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

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

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable
- 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, 99 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 30% of the prison population. The response rate was 91%. Nine questionnaires were not returned and one was returned blank.

Three of the five surveys were returned from the CSC, with two prisoners refusing to complete the survey.

## Comparisons

---

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2008 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 April 2003.
- A comparison within the 2009 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2009 survey between those who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not.
- A comparison within the 2009 survey between those who were under 21 and those who were 21 or over.

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

## Summary

---

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question as well as examples of comments made by prisoners. 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 that shown in the comparison data as the comparator data have been weighted for comparison purposes.

## Section 1: About You

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

**Q1.1 What wing or houseblock are you currently living on?**

See front cover

**Q1.2 How old are you?**

<i>Under 21</i> .....	11%
<i>21 - 29</i> .....	34%
<i>30 - 39</i> .....	18%
<i>40 - 49</i> .....	21%
<i>50 - 59</i> .....	10%
<i>60 - 69</i> .....	5%
<i>70 and over</i> .....	0%

**Q1.3 Are you on recall?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	6%
<i>No</i> .....	94%

**Q1.4 How long is your sentence?**

<i>Less than 6 months</i> .....	5%
<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i> .....	9%
<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i> .....	11%
<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i> .....	27%
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i> .....	33%
<i>10 years or more</i> .....	5%
<i>IPP (Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection)</i> .....	0%
<i>Life</i> .....	9%

**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> .....	70%
<i>More than 6 months</i> .....	30%

**Q1.6 How long have you been in this prison?**

<i>Less than 1 month</i> .....	14%
<i>1 to less than 3 months</i> .....	26%
<i>3 to less than 6 months</i> .....	13%
<i>6 to less than 12 months</i> .....	14%
<i>12 months to less than 2 years</i> .....	26%
<i>2 to less than 4 years</i> .....	3%
<i>4 years or more</i> .....	3%

**Q1.7 Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not hold UK citizenship)**

<i>Yes</i> .....	5%
<i>No</i> .....	95%

Q1.8	Is English your first language?				
	Yes.....		96%		
	No .....		4%		
Q1.9	What is your ethnic origin?				
	White - British.....		65%	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi ...	1%
	White - Irish .....		4%	Asian or Asian British - Other .....	0%
	White - Other.....		6%	Mixed Race - White and Black Caribbean .....	2%
	Black or Black British - Caribbean .....		10%	Mixed Race - White and Black African .....	1%
	Black or Black British - African .....		3%	Mixed Race - White and Asian .....	0%
	Black or Black British - Other.....		0%	Mixed Race - Other .....	4%
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....		0%	Chinese.....	0%
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....		3%	Other ethnic group.....	1%
	Q1.10	What is your religion?			
None .....		31%	Hindu .....	0%	
Church of England.....		34%	Jewish .....	0%	
Catholic .....		19%	Muslim.....	8%	
Protestant .....		0%	Sikh.....	0%	
Other Christian denomination.....		3%	Other.....	3%	
Buddhist.....		2%			
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?				
	Heterosexual/ Straight.....		98%		
	Homosexual/Gay .....		1%		
	Bisexual.....		1%		
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?				
	Yes.....		10%		
	No .....		90%		
	Q1.13	How many times have you been in prison before?			
0		1	2 to 5	More than 5	
48%		17%	26%	9%	
Q1.14	Including this prison, how many prisons have you been in during this sentence/remand time?				
	1	2 to 5	More than 5		
	4%	82%	13%		
Q1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?				
	Yes.....		45%		
	No .....		55%		



## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons? How was ...</b>	<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	10%	49%	19%	16%	2%	2%	2%
	Your personal safety during the journey	9%	57%	15%	10%	6%	1%	1%
	The comfort of the van	3%	14%	20%	31%	32%	0%	0%
	The attention paid to your health needs	1%	30%	29%	18%	13%	1%	7%
	The frequency of toilet breaks	1%	12%	17%	25%	31%	2%	13%
<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>How long did you spend in the van?</b>	<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>		
		3%	51%	36%	9%	1%		
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>How did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?</b>	<i>Very well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Badly</i>	<i>Very badly</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>	
		16%	52%	22%	7%	1%	2%	
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about when you first arrived here:</b>				<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?				90%	9%	1%	
	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?				26%	71%	3%	
	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?				92%	7%	1%	

## Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>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)</b>		
	<i>Didn't ask about any of these</i> .....	11%	<i>Money worries</i> ..... 19%
	<i>Loss of property</i> .....	20%	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> ..... 36%
	<i>Housing problems</i> .....	18%	<i>Health problems</i> ..... 60%
	<i>Contacting employers</i> .....	13%	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> .....
	<i>Contacting family</i> .....	48%	<i>Accessing phone numbers</i> ..... 46%
	<i>Ensuring dependants were being looked after</i> .....	14%	<i>Other</i> ..... 8%
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	<i>Didn't have any problems</i> .....	60%	<i>Money worries</i> ..... 10%
	<i>Loss of property</i> .....	12%	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> ..... 6%

<i>Housing problems .....</i>	14%	<i>Health problems.....</i>	17%
<i>Contacting employers.....</i>	1%	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners .....</i>	4%
<i>Contacting family.....</i>	13%	<i>Accessing phone numbers.....</i>	5%
<i>Ensuring dependants were looked after.....</i>	3%	<i>Other.....</i>	1%

**Q3.3 Please answer the following questions about reception:**

	Yes	No	Don't remember
Were you seen by a member of health services?	92%	6%	2%
When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	7%	7%

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

Very well	Well	Neither	Badly	Very badly	Don't remember
29%	52%	15%	1%	3%	0%

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

<i>Information about what was going to happen to you .....</i>	71%
<i>Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal .....</i>	62%
<i>Information about how to make routine requests .....</i>	81%
<i>Information about your entitlement to visits.....</i>	79%
<i>Information about health services .....</i>	86%
<i>Information about the chaplaincy.....</i>	79%
<b><i>Not offered anything.....</i></b>	7%

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

<i>A smokers/non-smokers pack.....</i>	33%
<i>The opportunity to have a shower .....</i>	78%
<i>The opportunity to make a free telephone call.....</i>	52%
<i>Something to eat .....</i>	82%
<b><i>Did not receive anything .....</i></b>	10%

**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)**

<i>Chaplain or religious leader.....</i>	47%
<i>Someone from health services.....</i>	86%
<i>A listener/Samaritans.....</i>	20%
<b><i>Did not meet any of these people .....</i></b>	12%

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

Yes.....	54%
No .....	46%

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

Yes.....	97%
No .....	1%
Don't remember .....	2%

<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after your arrival did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	3%
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	94%
	<i>More than a week after my arrival</i> .....	1%
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	2%
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	3%
	<i>Yes</i> .....	77%
	<i>No</i> .....	17%
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3%

## Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is to:</b>						
		<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?	32%	37%	8%	6%	3%	13%
	Attend legal visits?	18%	31%	9%	1%	4%	38%
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters</i> .....						34%
	<i>Yes</i> .....						20%
	<i>No</i> .....						46%
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>						
					<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?				99%	1%	0%
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?				70%	9%	6%
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?				86%	10%	3%
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?				77%	21%	2%
	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?				48%	15%	30%
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>						
		<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>	
		4%	23%	27%	26%	19%	
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet</i> .....						0%
	<i>Yes</i> .....						58%
	<i>No</i> .....						42%
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get either</b>						
		<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	44%	39%	5%	0%	1%	11%
	An application form	47%	45%	2%	4%	0%	1%

Q4.7	Have you made an application?					
	Yes.....			84%		
	No .....			16%		
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 applications are dealt with fairly?	17%	73%	10%		
	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly? (within seven days)	17%	69%	14%		
Q4.9	Have you made a complaint?					
	Yes.....			22%		
	No .....			78%		
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 complaints are dealt with fairly?	79%	11%	9%		
	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly? (within seven days)	79%	16%	5%		
	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	78%	10%	11%		
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.....			78%		
	Yes.....			9%		
	No .....			13%		
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
	28%	16%	31%	20%	3%	1%
Q4.13	Please answer the following questions about your religious beliefs?					
		Yes	No	Don't know/ N/A		
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	7%	28%		
	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	6%	29%		
Q4.14	Can you speak to a listener at any time, if you want to?					
	Yes	No	Don't know			
	57%	1%	42%			
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?	87%	13%			
	Do most staff treat you with respect?	87%	13%			

## Section 5: Safety

- Q5.1 Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?**  
 Yes..... 9%  
 No ..... 91%
- Q5.2 Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?**  
 Yes..... 4%  
 No ..... 96%
- Q5.3 In which areas of this prison do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply)**
- |                                  |     |                                      |    |
|----------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Never felt unsafe</b> .....   | 94% | <i>At meal times</i> .....           | 0% |
| <i>Everywhere</i> .....          | 1%  | <i>At health services</i> .....      | 1% |
| <i>Segregation unit</i> .....    | 0%  | <i>Visit's area</i> .....            | 1% |
| <i>Association areas</i> .....   | 3%  | <i>In wing showers</i> .....         | 1% |
| <i>Reception area</i> .....      | 0%  | <i>In gym showers</i> .....          | 0% |
| <i>At the gym</i> .....          | 1%  | <i>In corridors/stairwells</i> ..... | 1% |
| <i>In an exercise yard</i> ..... | 1%  | <i>On your landing/wing</i> .....    | 2% |
| <i>At work</i> .....             | 1%  | <i>In your cell</i> .....            | 2% |
| <i>During Movement</i> .....     | 3%  | <i>At religious services</i> .....   | 0% |
| <i>At education</i> .....        | 2%  |                                      |    |
- Q5.4 Have you been victimised by another prisoner or group of prisoners here?**  
 Yes..... 4%  
 No ..... 96%      **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)**
- |  |    |   |    |
|--|----|---|----|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> ..... | 2% | <i>Because you were new here</i> .....                              | 0% |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....         | 1% | <i>Because of your sexuality</i> .....                              | 0% |
| <i>Sexual abuse</i> .....  | 0% | <i>Because you have a disability</i> .....                          | 0% |
| <i>Because of your race or ethnic origin..</i> .....                 | 0% | <i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....             | 0% |
| <i>Because of drugs</i> .....  | 0% | <i>Being from a different part of the country than others</i> ..... | 0% |
| <i>Having your canteen/property taken ...</i> .....                  | 0% | <i>Because of your offence/ crime</i> .....                         | 2% |
- Q5.6 Have you been victimised by a member of staff or group of staff here?**  
 Yes..... 17%  
 No ..... 83%      **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)**
- |  |    |   |    |
|--|----|---|----|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> ..... | 5% | <i>Because of your sexuality</i> .....                              | 0% |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....         | 0% | <i>Because you have a disability</i> .....                          | 0% |
| <i>Sexual abuse</i> .....  | 0% | <i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....             | 4% |
| <i>Because of your race or ethnic origin..</i> .....                 | 4% | <i>Being from a different part of the country than others</i> ..... | 1% |
| <i>Because of drugs</i> .....  | 0% | <i>Because of your offence/ crime</i> .....                         | 2% |
| <i>Because you were new here</i> .....                               | 7% |   |    |

<b>Q5.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>					
	<i>Not been victimised</i> .....	81%				
	Yes.....	5%				
	No .....	13%				
<b>Q5.9</b>	<b>Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?</b>					
	Yes.....	4%				
	No .....	96%				
<b>Q5.10</b>	<b>Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff/group of staff in here?</b>					
	Yes.....	8%				
	No .....	92%				
<b>Q5.11</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>					
	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	15%	8%	4%	2%	2%	68%

## Section 6: Health services

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to see the following people:</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	18%	25%	44%	7%	5%	1%
	The nurse	16%	36%	48%	0%	0%	0%
	The dentist	30%	13%	21%	11%	13%	13%
	The optician	47%	12%	16%	11%	10%	3%
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Are you able to see a pharmacist?</b>						
	Yes.....						45%
	No .....						55%
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people:</b>						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	27%	17%	34%	8%	13%	1%
	The nurse	18%	32%	40%	4%	4%	2%
	The dentist	51%	11%	19%	6%	9%	4%
	The optician	58%	13%	15%	7%	8%	0%
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
		15%	17%	44%	15%	7%	2%
<b>Q6.5</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>						
	Yes.....						30%
	No .....						70%
<b>Q6.6</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?</b>						
	<i>Not taking medication</i> .....						70%
	Yes.....						30%
	No .....						0%

Q6.7	<b>Do you feel you have any emotional well being/ mental health issues?</b>		
	Yes.....		16%
	No .....		84%
Q6.8	<b>Are your emotional well-being/ mental health issues being addressed by any of the following? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	<i>Do not have any issues / Not receiving any help .....</i>		91%
	<i>Doctor.....</i>		4%
	<i>Nurse.....</i>		5%
	<i>Psychiatrist.....</i>		2%
	<i>Mental Health In Reach team.....</i>		3%
	<i>Counsellor.....</i>		0%
	<i>Other.....</i>		0%
Q6.9	<b>Did you have a problem with either of the following when you came into this prison?</b>		
		Yes	No
	Drugs	7%	93%
	Alcohol	8%	92%
Q6.10	<b>Have you developed a problem with either of the following since you have been in this prison?</b>		
		Yes	No
	Drugs	1%	99%
	Alcohol	0%	100%
Q6.11	<b>Do you know who to contact in this prison to get help with your drug or alcohol problem?</b>		
	Yes.....		11%
	No .....		2%
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug or alcohol problem.....</i>		87%
Q6.12	<b>Have you received any intervention or help (including, CARATs, Health Services etc.) for your drug/alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>		
	Yes.....		11%
	No.....		1%
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug or alcohol problem.....</i>		88%
Q6.13	<b>Was the intervention or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>		
	Yes .....		9%
	No.....		3%
	<i>Did not have a problem/Have not received help.....</i>		88%
Q6.14	<b>Do you think you will have a problem with either of the following when you leave this prison?</b>		
		Yes	No Don't know
	Drugs	0%	93% 7%
	Alcohol	1%	89% 10%
Q6.15	<b>Do you know who in this prison can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?</b>		
	Yes.....		5%
	No .....		2%
	N/A.....		93%

## Section 7: Purposeful Activity

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply)</b>	
	Prison job .....	72%
	Vocational or skills training .....	13%
	Education (including basic skills) .....	21%
	Offending behaviour programmes .....	3%
	<b>Not involved in any of these</b> .....	14%

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

	<b>Not been involved</b>	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	19%	39%	36%	6%
Vocational or skills training	33%	48%	15%	5%
Education (including basic skills)	27%	50%	18%	5%
Offending behaviour programmes	38%	25%	25%	13%

<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>How often do you go to the library?</b>	
	<b>Don't want to go</b> .....	11%
	Never .....	17%
	Less than once a week .....	22%
	About once a week .....	25%
	More than once a week .....	19%
	Don't know .....	6%

<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>On average how many times do you go to the gym each week?</b>						
	<b>Don't want to go</b>	0	1	2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
	16%	18%	3%	5%	41%	14%	4%

<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>On average how many times do you go outside for exercise each week?</b>					
	<b>Don't want to go</b>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
	8%	36%	14%	21%	13%	8%

<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>On average how many hours do you spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	3%
	2 to less than 4 hours .....	4%
	4 to less than 6 hours .....	11%
	6 to less than 8 hours .....	16%
	8 to less than 10 hours .....	15%
	10 hours or more .....	39%
	Don't know .....	12%

<b>Q7.7</b>	<b>On average, how many times do you have association each week?</b>					
	<b>Don't want to go</b>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
	4%	3%	2%	4%	75%	11%

<b>Q7.8</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association time?</b>	
	<b>Do not go on association</b> .....	12%
	Never .....	12%



Rarely.....	25%
Some of the time .....	33%
Most of the time .....	12%
All of the time .....	6%

## Section 8: Resettlement

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal officer?</b>					
	<i>Still have not met him/her</i> .....	17%				
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	45%				
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	22%				
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	16%				
<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>How helpful do you think your personal officer is?</b>					
	<i>Do not have a personal officer</i>	<i>Very helpful</i>	<i>Helpful</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Not very helpful</i>	<i>Not at all helpful</i>
	17%	33%	26%	13%	5%	6%
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan/OASys?</b>					
	<i>Yes</i> .....	77%				
	<i>No</i> .....	23%				
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>					
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i> .....	24%				
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	24%				
	<i>Involved</i> .....	29%				
	<i>Neither</i> .....	8%				
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	12%				
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	2%				
<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>Can you achieve all or some of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>					
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i> .....	25%				
	<i>Yes</i> .....	63%				
	<i>No</i> .....	13%				
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve all/some of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>					
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i> .....	24%				
	<i>Yes</i> .....	20%				
	<i>No</i> .....	56%				
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to address your offending behaviour whilst at this prison?</b>					
	<i>Yes</i> .....	42%				
	<i>No</i> .....	58%				
<b>Q8.8</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>					
	<i>Yes</i> .....	38%				
	<i>No</i> .....	62%				
<b>Q8.9</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?</b>					
	<i>Yes</i> .....	23%				

	No .....	71%
	Don't know .....	6%
<b>Q8.10</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes.....	7%
	No .....	91%
	Don't know .....	1%
<b>Q8.11</b>	<b>Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?</b>	
	<i>Not been here a week yet</i> .....	3%
	Yes.....	30%
	No .....	65%
	Don't remember .....	2%
<b>Q8.12</b>	<b>Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what my entitlement is</i> .....	16%
	Yes.....	79%
	No .....	5%
<b>Q8.13</b>	<b>How many visits did you receive in the last week?</b>	
	<i>Not been in a week</i> 0                      1 to 2                      3 to 4                      5 or more	
	3%                      71%                      25%                      1%                      0%	
<b>Q8.14</b>	<b>Have you been helped to maintain contact with your family/friends whilst in this prison?</b>	
	Yes.....	61%
	No .....	39%
<b>Q8.15</b>	<b>Do you know who to contact to get help with the following within this prison: (please tick all that apply)</b>	
	<i>Don't know who to contact</i> ..... 24%	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i> ..... 38%
	<i>Maintaining good relationships</i> ..... 25%	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i> ..... 51%
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> ..... 23%	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i> ..... 35%
	<i>Finding a job on release</i> ..... 65%	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i> ..... 30%
	<i>Finding accommodation on release</i> ..... 50%	<i>Opening a bank account</i> ..... 58%
<b>Q8.16</b>	<b>Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison? (please tick all that apply)</b>	
	<i>No problems</i> ..... 57%	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i> ..... 17%
	<i>Maintaining good relationships</i> ..... 7%	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i> ..... 14%
	<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i> ..... 3%	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i> ..... 5%
	<i>Finding a job on release</i> ..... 26%	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i> ..... 8%
	<i>Finding accommodation on release</i> ..... 16%	<i>Opening a bank account</i> ..... 9%

<b>Q8.17</b>	<b>Have you been provided with information on the following:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	ROTL (temporary release)	87%	13%
	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	70%	30%
	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	67%	33%
	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	86%	14%
<b>Q8.18</b>	<b>Have you had access to the following:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	ROTL (temporary release)	67%	33%
	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	42%	58%
	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	41%	59%
	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	52%	48%
<b>Q8.19</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions on resettlement:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	20%	80%
	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (increased responsibility, freedom etc)	26%	74%
	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	75%	25%
	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	16%	84%
	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	62%	38%
	Is this prison near your home area or intended release address?	22%	78%

**Thank you for completing this survey**



## Prisoner Survey Responses HMP Hollesley Bay 2009

**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	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>99</b>	<b>1087</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General Information</b>			
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	11%	0%
3	Are you on recall?	6%	3%
4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	14%	13%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	70%	47%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	14%	13%
7	Are you a foreign national?	5%	7%
8	Is English your first language?	96%	93%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	25%	26%
10	Are you Muslim?	8%	15%
11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	1%
12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	9%
13	Is this your first time in prison?	48%	51%
14	Have you been in more than 5 prisons this sentence/remand time?	13%	9%
15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	45%	57%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts</b>			
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?	59%	53%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	67%	61%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	17%	20%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	32%	34%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	13%	14%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	9%	8%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	74%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	90%	98%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	26%	24%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	94%

# Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
<b>3</b>	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:		
<b>1b</b>	Problems with loss of property?	20%	19%
<b>1c</b>	Housing problems?	18%	24%
<b>1d</b>	Problems contacting employers?	13%	16%
<b>1e</b>	Problems contacting family?	48%	63%
<b>1f</b>	Problems ensuring dependants were looked after?	14%	20%
<b>1g</b>	Money problems?	19%	20%
<b>1h</b>	Problems of feeling depressed/suicidal?	36%	37%
<b>1i</b>	Health problems?	60%	51%
<b>1j</b>	Problems in needing protection from other prisoners?	13%	21%
<b>1k</b>	Problems accessing phone numbers?	46%	35%
	When you first arrived:		
<b>2a</b>	Did you have any problems?	40%	41%
<b>2b</b>	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	7%
<b>2c</b>	Did you have any housing problems?	15%	10%
<b>2d</b>	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	4%
<b>2e</b>	Did you have any problems contacting family?	13%	14%
<b>2f</b>	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	5%
<b>2g</b>	Did you have any money worries?	11%	16%
<b>2h</b>	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	7%	6%
<b>2i</b>	Did you have any health problems?	17%	8%
<b>2j</b>	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	0%
<b>2k</b>	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	5%	5%
<b>3a</b>	Were you seen by a member of health services in reception?	92%	82%
<b>3b</b>	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	79%
<b>4</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	81%	81%
	On your day of arrival, were offered any of the following information:		
<b>5a</b>	Information about what was going to happen to you?	72%	63%
<b>5b</b>	Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	62%	52%
<b>5c</b>	Information about how to make routine requests?	82%	49%
<b>5d</b>	Information about your entitlement to visits?	79%	61%
<b>5e</b>	Information about health services?	86%	77%
<b>5f</b>	Information about the chaplaincy?	79%	57%

**Key to tables**

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:		
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	33%	77%
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	79%	66%
6c	The opportunity to make a free telephone call?	52%	47%
6d	Something to eat?	82%	75%
	Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:		
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	47%	55%
7b	Someone from health services?	86%	79%
7c	A listener/Samaritans?	20%	45%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	54%	26%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	97%	91%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	94%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	80%	73%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	69%	65%
1b	Attend legal visits?	48%	67%
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	20%	27%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
3a	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	99%
3b	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	70%	87%
3c	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	86%	72%
3d	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	77%	79%
3e	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	48%	48%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	27%	52%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	58%	52%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	83%	85%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	93%	91%
7	Have you made an application?	84%	81%

# Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody continued</b>			
For those who have made an application:			
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	88%	73%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly? (within 7 days)	83%	69%
9	Have you made a complaint?	23%	42%
For those who have made a complaint:			
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	55%	50%
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly? (within 7 days)	75%	55%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	41%	17%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	10%	36%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	47%	51%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	56%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	62%
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	57%	75%
15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	87%	74%
15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	87%	76%
<b>SECTION 5: Safety</b>			
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	9%	15%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	4%	4%
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	4%	9%
Since you have been here, has another prisoner:			
5a	Made insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	2%	5%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	2%
5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	1%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	2%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	0%	1%
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
5k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%
5l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%

# Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>SECTION 5: Safety continued</b>			
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	17%	15%
	Since you have been here, has a member of staff:		
7a	Made insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	5%	9%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%
7c	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	3%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	0%	0%
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%
7j	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	3%
7k	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	2%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	28%	21%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	4%	9%
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	8%	13%
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	24%	42%
<b>SECTION 6: Healthcare</b>			
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	69%	64%
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	84%	85%
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	34%	14%
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	29%	20%
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	45%	53%
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?	69%	73%
3b	The nurse?	87%	79%
3c	The dentist?	61%	53%
3d	The optician?	67%	61%
4	The overall quality of health services?	72%	67%



# Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>Healthcare continued</b>			
5	Are you currently taking medication?	30%	34%
For those currently taking medication:			
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	100%	97%
7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	16%	9%
For those with emotional well being/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:			
8a	Not receiving any help?	40%	0%
8b	A doctor?	26%	44%
8c	A nurse?	34%	44%
8d	A psychiatrist?	14%	14%
8e	The Mental Health In-Reach Team?	20%	27%
8f	A counsellor?	0%	44%
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	7%	4%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	9%	3%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	1%	1%
10b	Have you developed an alcohol problem since you have been in this prison?	0%	1%
For those with drug or alcohol problems:			
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	84%	94%
12	Have you received any help or intervention whilst in this prison?	93%	94%
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:			
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	75%	87%
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	7%	9%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	11%	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?	71%	59%
<b>SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity</b>			
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
1a	A prison job?	72%	72%
1b	Vocational or skills training?	13%	25%
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	21%	38%
1d	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	3%	15%
2ai	Have you had a job whilst in prison?	81%	92%
For those who have had a prison job whilst in prison:			
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	48%	44%
2bi	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training whilst in prison?	67%	79%
For those who have had vocational or skills training whilst in prison:			
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	71%	66%

# Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>Purposeful Activity continued</b>			
2ci	Have you been involved in education whilst in prison?	73%	85%
For those who have been involved in education whilst in prison:			
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	69%	72%
2di	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes whilst in prison?	63%	74%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes whilst in prison:			
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	39%	62%
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	44%	56%
4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	59%	57%
5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	34%	70%
6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	39%	53%
7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	78%
8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	18%	22%
<b>SECTION 8: Resettlement</b>			
1	Do you have a personal officer?	83%	66%
For those with a personal officer:			
2	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	71%	77%
For those who are sentenced:			
3	Do you have a sentence plan?	77%	67%
For those with a sentence plan?			
4	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	71%	78%
5	Can you achieve some/all of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	83%	85%
6	Are there plans for you to achieve some/all your targets in another prison?	27%	32%
7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you address your offending behaviour whilst at this prison?	42%	53%
8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	38%	51%
9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	23%	21%
10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	7%	12%
11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	30%	51%
12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	79%	87%
13	Did you receive one or more visits in the last week?	26%	57%
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends whilst in this prison?	61%	71%

# Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Hollesley Bay 2009	Open prisons comparator
	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		
<b>Resettlement continued</b>			
15	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with the following:		
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	25%	26%
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	23%	24%
15d	Finding a job on release?	66%	72%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	50%	66%
15f	With money/finances on release?	38%	51%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	51%	60%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	34%	59%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	30%	56%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	58%	51%
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison?		
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	7%	1%
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	4%	4%
16d	Finding a job?	26%	29%
16e	Finding accommodation?	16%	26%
16f	Money/finances?	18%	30%
16g	Claiming benefits?	14%	19%
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	5%	16%
16i	Accessing health services?	8%	9%
16j	Opening a bank account?	9%	22%
17	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
17a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	87%	69%
17b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	70%	57%
17c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	67%	58%
17d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	86%	72%
18	Have you had access to the following:		
18a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	67%	55%
18b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	42%	43%
18c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	41%	41%
18d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	52%	57%
19	Please answer the following about resettlement:		
19a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	20%	27%
19b	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (increased responsibility)	26%	30%
19c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	75%	82%
19d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	16%	19%
19e	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	62%	70%
19f	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	22%	51%



## Key Question Responses (Age- Under 21) HMP Hollesley Bay 2009

Diversity Analysis

**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	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		11	88
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	9%	5%
1.8	Is English your first language?	100%	95%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? Including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories.	46%	23%
1.10	Are you Muslim?	8%	8%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	73%	45%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	46%	71%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	92%	90%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	57%	38%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff in reception?	100%	91%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	61%	88%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79%	81%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	99%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	98%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	30%	74%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91%	100%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	27%

## Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	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		
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	70%	57%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	73%	84%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	79%	94%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	9%	24%
4.13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	66%
4.13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	61%	65%
4.15a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	79%	88%
4.15b	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	100%	86%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	0%	10%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	0%	5%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	0%	5%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.5i	Have you been victimised because of your disability? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	9%	18%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	5%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	3%
5.7h	Have you been victimised because of your disability? (By staff)	0%	0%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	0%	5%

## Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	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		
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	0%	9%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	9%	25%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	67%	69%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	77%	85%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	10%	16%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	74%	72%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	12%	13%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	12%	22%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an Offending Behaviour Programme?	0%	4%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	43%	44%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	43%	61%
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%	40%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	57%	77%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	10%	19%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	67%	85%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	23%	23%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	10%	7%
8.12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	43%	82%
8.18	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
8.18a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	90%	87%

## Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	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		
8.18b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	77%	69%
8.18c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	81%	66%
8.18d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	85%	87%
8.19	Have you had access to the following:		
8.19a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	77%	66%
8.19b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	57%	41%
8.19c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	71%	38%
8.19d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	50%	52%
8.20	Please answer the following about resettlement:		
8.20a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	10%	20%
8.20b	were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (increased responsibility)	10%	27%
8.20c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	100%	72%
8.20d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	33%	15%
8.20e	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	23%	23%



# Key Question Responses for Ethnicity Analysis HMP Hollesley Bay 2009

**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	BME prisoners	White prisoners
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>74</b>
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	4%	5%
1.8	Is English your first language?	96%	96%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? Including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories.		
1.10	Are you Muslim?	24%	3%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	60%	44%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	67%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	91%	89%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	30%	43%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff in reception?	92%	92%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	89%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	82%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	91%	99%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	96%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	68%	70%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	35%	25%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	63%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	76%	85%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	96%	92%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	36%	18%



## Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	BME prisoners	White prisoners
	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		
4.13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	40%	72%
4.13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	58%	67%
4.15a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	74%	92%
4.15b	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	90%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	4%	11%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	4%	4%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	0%	5%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	33%	12%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	16%	0%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	16%	0%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	0%	5%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	21%	4%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	28%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	63%	71%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	82%	85%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	13%	17%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	61%	76%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	17%	11%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	22%	21%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an Offending Behaviour Programme?	0%	4%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48%	43%

## Key to tables

	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>BME prisoners</b>	<b>White prisoners</b>
	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		
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	64%	58%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	30%	42%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	73%	76%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	17%	19%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	84%	83%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	40%	16%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	8%	7%
8.12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	68%	83%
8.18	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
8.18a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	88%	87%
8.18b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	52%	77%
8.18c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	60%	69%
8.18d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	86%	87%
8.19	Have you had access to the following:		
8.19a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	65%	67%
8.19b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	37%	44%
8.19c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	39%	42%
8.19d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	43%	56%
8.20	Please answer the following about resettlement:		
8.20a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	22%	19%
8.20b	were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (increased responsibility)	34%	23%
8.20c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	75%	75%
8.20d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	30%	12%
8.20e	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	13%	26%





## Key questions Disability Analysis HMP Hollesley Bay 2009

**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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>1.9</b>	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	<b>9%</b>	<b>27%</b>
<b>2.1d</b>	On the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons, how was the attention paid to your health needs? (good/very good)	<b>33%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>2.3</b>	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	<b>91%</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>2.4a</b>	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	<b>79%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>3.1d</b>	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	<b>61%</b>	<b>46%</b>
<b>3.1g</b>	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	<b>61%</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>3.1h</b>	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	<b>79%</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>3.2a</b>	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>33%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>3.3a</b>	Were you seen by a member of healthcare staff in reception?	<b>100%</b>	<b>91%</b>
<b>3.4</b>	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>91%</b>	<b>80%</b>
<b>3.7b</b>	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	<b>100%</b>	<b>85%</b>
<b>3.9</b>	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>91%</b>	<b>98%</b>
<b>3.10</b>	Have you been on an induction course?	<b>100%</b>	<b>97%</b>
<b>4.3b</b>	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	<b>100%</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>3.6a</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	<b>100%</b>	<b>81%</b>
<b>3.6b</b>	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	<b>100%</b>	<b>92%</b>

## 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		
3.9	Have you made a complaint?	0%	25%
3.14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	91%	53%
3.15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	100%	86%
3.15b	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	100%	86%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	21%	8%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	10%	3%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	9%	3%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	0%	19%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/ group of prisoners in here?	21%	2%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	0%	9%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	91%	66%
6.1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	100%	82%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	50%	45%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	61%	26%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health problems?	33%	14%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	79%	71%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	14%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	22%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an Offending Behaviour Programme?	9%	3%

## 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		
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	44%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	9%	65%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50%	32%
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)	39%	39%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	70%	76%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association time?	39%	16%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	91%	82%
8.9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	9%	24%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	8%
8.12	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	91%	77%
8.18	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
8.18a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	100%	86%
8.18b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	74%	70%
8.18c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	87%	65%
8.18d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	90%	86%
8.19	Have you had access to the following:		
8.19a	ROTL (release on temporary license)	90%	64%
8.19b	Facility Licence (outside work, education)	44%	42%
8.19c	Resettlement Licence (other outside activities e.g.. Work, arranging accommodation, family visits)	50%	40%
8.19d	Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	67%	50%
8.20	Please answer the following about resettlement:		
8.20a	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	9%	21%
8.20b	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here? (increased responsibility)	9%	28%
8.20c	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	91%	73%
8.20d	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	0%	18%
8.20e	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	21%	23%