

Report on an announced inspection of

# **HMP Leyhill**

16–20 April 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

# Contents

	<b>Introduction</b>	5
	<b>Fact page</b>	7
	<b>Healthy prison summary</b>	9
<b>1</b>	<b>Safety</b>	19
<hr/>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Respect</b>	29
<hr/>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Purposeful activity</b>	43
<hr/>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Resettlement</b>	49
<hr/>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice</b>	61
<hr/>		
	<b>Appendices</b>	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	67
	II Prison population profile	68
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	71



# Introduction

HMP Leyhill in Gloucestershire was the first modern, open prison when it opened in 1946. It now holds about 500 men, many of whom are serving long sentences for serious offences. Central to the prison's role is the need to prepare most of these men for release back into the community while managing the risks they pose. This is no easy task, as other comparable prisons, and Leyhill itself, have found.

Leyhill was a safe prison. In our survey prisoners told us that they felt safe, and this was borne out by low levels of self-harm and violence that were sustained by embedded procedures. We observed a generally calm atmosphere. The primary mechanism for managing poor behaviour was a return to closed conditions. This was a severe sanction and there were different processes for prisoners serving determinate and indeterminate sentences; governance of the former was inadequate. Prisoners feared a return to closed conditions might be imposed arbitrarily and this caused a lack of confidence in processes such as complaints. Attitude to risk was generally proportionate and the number of absconds had fallen sharply since our last inspection. Some petty rules remained however – for instance, prisoners had to wear shirts with collars for visits. The positive mandatory drug testing rates were low but the prison was aware of the use of 'spice', a synthetic cannabinoid, in the prison and was addressing this.

The effective management of risk enabled an impressively large number of prisoners to participate in the 'Through the gate' programme and undertake paid or community work outside the prison. For men who had served long sentences this was important preparation for their eventual release back into the community, and helped equip them with the skills they would need to get and hold down a job. Many of these opportunities were made possible by the valuable support of a wide range of community organisations. Some prisoners complained that the process of granting release on temporary licence took too long and was too restrictive. In our view the process was appropriate but Leyhill, and the prisons that sent men to it, needed to manage prisoners' expectations better.

Time out of cell was very good and there were sufficient activity places for all the men held. Workshops in the prison provided a good range of work and vocational training opportunities, but they would have been improved if the skills that the men gained were recognised in qualifications that were valued by employers. Prisoners could supplement work in or outside the college with 'day release' in good quality education. However, literacy and numeracy support was not sufficiently embedded in the workshops.

There was evidence that opportunities to gain work experience while at the prison had a real impact on prisoners' ability to find employment after they were released. Despite the current economic climate, about a third of prisoners who had been discharged in the three months before the inspection had found permanent employment. Other practical help with resettlement needs, such as accommodation and money worries, was also good. Visit arrangements were satisfactory. Offender management and public protection arrangements were also generally satisfactory.

However, despite these positive elements, resettlement support was not managed strategically and did not ensure that the support and interventions that the men received were matched to their needs and risks. There was no whole prison approach to resettlement, so good specialist resettlement and offender management work was not sufficiently supported by day to day interactions between prisoners and staff in the prison.

Staff-prisoner relationships reflected this concern. They were generally respectful but officers were too passive. Most prisoners said there was someone they could talk to if they had a problem but there was too little proactive engagement. The external environment was very good and most accommodation was reasonable, but some new arrivals had to spend a short time in dormitories. Health care was generally good and an excellent new palliative care suite had recently been developed – unfortunately, at the time of the inspection the funds were not available to staff it. Some time before the suite had been developed, health care and residential staff had worked effectively together to provide dignified care for a terminally ill prisoner as his life ended. The palliative care suite met a clear need and should be sustained as an important regional prison resource.

Support for the 29% of prisoners over the age of 50 was generally good. A day care centre known, because of its appearance, as ‘The Lobster Pot’, provided activities for older prisoners, reduced isolation and encouraged healthy living. However, in other respects, work on equality and diversity issues was less good. In some areas the perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners were significantly worse than those of the population as a whole. The prison’s own monitoring data revealed some unequal outcomes that were a real cause for concern, but little had been done to address them. The investigation of diversity incidents was poor. There was no monitoring of other diversity strands. The prison needed to take immediate steps to improve the leadership and external quality assurance of its work on equality and diversity issues.

Leyhill provided a safe, decent environment in which to prepare the men it held for release back into the community and carefully managed the risks involved in doing so. However, in a generally positive picture there was scope to improve its approach in some important areas – and weaknesses in diversity work were a serious shortcoming that needed to be quickly addressed.

**Nick Hardwick**  
**HM Chief Inspector of Prisons**

**July 2012**

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

HMP Leyhill accommodates sentenced Category D male prisoners over the age of 25. There are no restrictions on the type of offence or nationality held. Its specialist function is to assess and prepare life-sentenced prisoners for release.

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

Public

## Region/Department

South-west

## Number held

503 (on 13 April 2012)

## Certified normal accommodation

527

## Operational capacity

527

## Date of last full inspection

March 2007

## Brief history

Leyhill originally opened with huttled accommodation in 1946 (it was formerly a United States Army Air Forces wartime hospital). It was the first independent, minimum security prison in England and Wales and has no perimeter security fence. From the outset, it was established to adopt an experimental approach to the rehabilitation of selected long-term prisoners. In 1986, prisoners were re-housed from the original huttled accommodation into two new large units, providing single room accommodation. The redevelopment programme provided a new central kitchen, dining room and staff club. During 1990, a new visits complex, reception, chapel, hospital and facilities for the farms and gardens, works department, physical education and education departments were completed. In 2002, new accommodation units were added. In 2010, the Lobster Pot, a day care centre for prisoners over the age of 50 was set up. At the time of the inspection, a palliative care unit was under development.

## Short description of residential units

Three units – A, B and C – each on two floors.

## Name of governor/director

Mick Bell

## Escort contractor

GeoAmey

## Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: South Gloucestershire PCT

Providers: Bristol Community Health  
Hanham Health  
Avon and Wiltshire Partnership

**Learning and skills providers**

Strode College and A4E. This is due to change to Weston College later in the year.

**IMB chair**

Stephanie Fairhead



# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

HP1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

HP3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The criteria are:

**Safety** prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

**Respect** prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

**Purposeful activity** prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them

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

HP4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

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

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

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

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

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

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many

areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

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

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

## Safety

---

HP5 Reception and first night arrangements were good. The induction programme was comprehensive. Most prisoners reported feeling safe and there were adequate systems in place to manage bullying. The few assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents opened were well managed. A safeguarding policy had been developed but was not yet embedded. Security was mainly proportionate, and strip-searching arrangements were appropriate. There were some unnecessary restrictions. The transfer process back to closed conditions needed greater governance. The positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was low. Most prisoners were on the enhanced incentive and earned privileges (IEP) level. Adjudications were adequately managed and use of force was rare. Support for prisoners with substance misuse issues was good. On the basis of this full inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

HP6 Some prisoners arrived with too little time left to serve to take advantage of the provision. Some prisoners did not receive sufficient notice of their transfer, or sufficient information about what to expect at Leyhill.

HP7 Prisoners waited in vans unnecessarily if they arrived around lunchtime. Reception was relaxed and prisoners moved through efficiently with good support from orderlies. Most prisoners felt safe on their first night, although in our survey those with a disability were slightly less likely to report this. Staff did not routinely interview new prisoners on their first night, although prisoner advice workers provided good support. Induction was comprehensive. Some prisoners complained about it being too long but this period gave them time to adjust to the prison and its regime.

HP8 Most bullying and violent incidents were associated with prisoners' offences and involved rumour and subtle methods to intimidate sex offenders – but there were very few reported fights or assaults. Incidents were investigated well and suspected perpetrators were monitored and victims supported. A small number of bullies had been transferred out of the prison; however, they had been dealt with fairly. Unexplained injuries, which were few, were routinely monitored.

HP9 Good assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring assessments and care maps were completed and most were opened for only a short time. Prisoners were well supported and there were very few incidents of self-harm.

HP10 The prison had developed a safeguarding policy, which outlined the support available for prisoners at risk and provided guidance for reporting concerns. It also acknowledged the need to integrate safeguarding in all areas of the prison. This was not embedded and care planning was not taking place.

- HP11 Progress had been made in employing more proportionate security measures, particularly in relation to strip-searching arrangements. However, disproportionate rules were still being applied in some cases, for example external workers were unable to take their mobile phones with them and various items of property were unnecessarily removed from newly arrived prisoners. A formal multidisciplinary review was carried out prior to deciding to return prisoners on indeterminate sentences to closed conditions, but for others this was exclusively a security-led decision.
- HP12 In our survey prisoners were more likely than those in comparator prisons to say it was easy to get drugs. However, the mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was low and testing arrangements were appropriate. The prison was reporting problems in controlling access to Spice (a synthetic drug) which was not detectable by MDT.
- HP13 Most prisoners were on the enhanced incentives and earned privileges (IEP) level. The process was applied fairly. Adjudications levels were low and charges were appropriately laid. Most adjudications were adequately investigated. Trends were routinely monitored but it was not clear how well they were being analysed by managers. Use of force was rare and records demonstrated that, when it did occur, it had been necessary and lawful.
- HP14 The new substance misuse strategy clearly identified the prison's approach to dealing with and supporting those with these problems. The integrated drug treatment system was well established and integrated with psychosocial support. Substance misuse needs were clearly identified and a counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs) worker usually saw prisoners promptly and carried out effective and timely individual assessments and follow up. Care plans were clear and focused on key issues. There were group programmes to support prisoners with drug and alcohol problems. Voluntary and compliance-based drug testing was conducted well and the focus on supporting men who were struggling was appropriate.

## Respect

---

HP15 Most rooms were single occupancy, but the small number of dormitories provided a less positive environment. Residential units and outside areas were very clean, but a few recess areas needed refurbishment. Staff-prisoner interactions were respectful and friendly. Officers congregated in the wing offices and should have been more visible, but most prisoners in our survey said that there was a member of staff they could approach. Governance arrangements in place did not reassure us that reports in our survey and by some black and minority ethnic prisoners of unequal outcomes were being adequately addressed. Complaints relating to diversity needed more robust investigation and attention. Support for foreign national and gay prisoners needed to be improved but the significant number of older and disabled prisoners were generally well supported. Complaints were well managed. Legal services were adequate to meet the demand. Health services were good, but dental waiting times were too long and medicines management processes poor. Prisoners were generally positive about the food. The shop was well run but prices were too high. On the basis of this full inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP16 The accommodation consisted mostly of single rooms that were well furnished and generally kept very clean. The dormitories provided a less positive environment for

newly arrived prisoners, but active steps were taken to minimise time spent in them. Some ablution areas needed to be refurbished and many required a deep clean. The external environment was excellent. The applications process was too cumbersome. However, in our survey most prisoners said that it was easy to make an application and that they were dealt with fairly. Prisoners were not able to have reasonable access to their stored property, which meant that they could not exchange items.

- HP17 We observed some good staff interactions and most prisoners in our survey said that staff treated them with respect. Most said that they had someone to talk to if they had a problem. The ethos was to encourage prisoners to take responsibility for their actions and decisions. Residential staff tended to congregate in wing offices with the door closed, and few prisoners said that staff spoke to them during association. Prisoners had personal officers although the quality of their work varied.
- HP18 There was no overarching equality and diversity policy. There were policies for race, foreign nationals and older prisoners, but only the latter was of an acceptable standard. The diversity and race equality officer had not received training in diversity, equalities management or investigations. There was some evidence of effective prisoner consultation relating to older prisoners and religion, but arrangements for foreign nationals were ineffective and prisoners in other groups were not consulted.
- HP19 Diversity incident report forms (DIRF) were not readily available on the wings. There was a lack of willingness to probe fully incidents relating to prisoners' complaints using this process or to focus on areas of the prison where specific trends had emerged. Management in this area was insufficiently robust and there was no external quality assurance.
- HP20 Monitoring was limited to race. Some outcomes for black and minority ethnic prisoners had been poor for some time and it was unclear if any action had been taken to address this. Many black and minority ethnic prisoners told us that officers were insufficiently aware of cultural differences and believed that this meant they were criticised for their behaviour more frequently than their white counterparts.
- HP21 Foreign nationals could receive additional free telephone credit and airmail letters, but prisoners who could not speak good English were only provided with interpretation services very occasionally. There was no evidence of translated material on notice boards.
- HP22 Prisoners with disabilities were mostly well managed and there was appropriate accommodation, but no care plans. In our survey, prisoners with a disability were less positive than other prisoners about a range of issues. Provision in the Lobster Pot, a day care centre for the over 50s population, was excellent. It reduced isolation, promoted health, identified needs and developed skills. The education and library had done some good work with Gypsy/Romany/Traveller prisoners. More engagement was needed with openly gay prisoners.
- HP23 Faith provision was good and covered all appropriate faiths. Prisoners knew about what was available. Provision included a variety of midweek activities, as well as festivals and regular services. The individual physical worship facilities were generally good, but communal areas were not inclusive of all faiths. The ablution facilities in the mosque needed to be extended to cope with the increase in the Muslim population.

- HP24 In our groups, prisoners said that they were afraid to make complaints for fear of being transferred to closed conditions or other repercussions. However, this was not borne out by our survey, which suggested prisoners felt very positive about complaints in comparison with other open prisons. Responses were timely, legible, generally respectful, and usually stated clearly whether the complaint was being upheld. There was a weekly quality assurance process, which resulted in some responses being re-drafted, and urgent matters were dealt with promptly.
- HP25 Prisoners had access to a legal services officer although demand was limited. Arrangements for legal visits were adequate.
- HP26 Our survey showed that prisoners were positive about all aspects of health care except dental waits. A health care professional saw all prisoners on arrival and we observed a thorough and patient-centred approach, which led to appropriate referrals. Access to the GP was good and prisoners were usually seen promptly. Prisoners with urgent health issues were seen on the same day. Access to the dentist was poor; first assessments were carried out within a maximum of six weeks, but those needing treatment waited up to eight months. There were a large number of prisoners on the waiting list. There was a good range of primary care services, including excellent access to the optician and community physiotherapy, which had enabled some prisoners to reduce or come off their opiate medications. Chronic disease management was effective, with designated clinics for those over 55 and good follow up of asthma, diabetes and coronary heart disease. Care plans were limited. The management of medications was poor.
- HP27 Mental health was well integrated with primary care services and easily accessed. There was excellent access to counselling and cognitive behavioural therapy. Prisoners spoke highly of the services and described how they valued the support they had received.
- HP28 There was reasonable consultation with prisoners about food and the provision of special meals for cultural and religious festivities. The majority of prisoners in our survey said the food was good or very good. However, black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive about the food. The shop was well run, but prisoners complained about high prices. Prisoners sometimes experienced delays in receiving their catalogue orders.

## Purposeful activity

---

HP29 Time out of cell was good. A more strategic approach to learning and skills was needed but there were sufficient activity places. Almost all prisoners were engaged in meaningful and good quality activities and a large number were working outside the prison. Prisoners were quickly allocated a work place, but expectations needed to be better managed. Opportunities to provide a vocational qualification needed to be better realised. The quality of education provision was good; the library was very good. The gym provided a good service, but was restricted by the lack of a sports hall. On the basis of this full inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

HP30 Time out of cell was good and prisoners had good access to the prison grounds.

- HP31 There was no formal long-term strategy for the continuous improvement and development of skills and work activities. Insufficient use was made of data; data on achievement and participation were not consolidated or used to set demanding targets. The prison had developed extensive quality assurance activities but the self-assessment process was insufficiently critical in its evaluation of the provision. Despite this, the effective management of risk had allowed for the introduction of new work and learning opportunities for prisoners, such as prison driving jobs.
- HP32 There were sufficient activity spaces to occupy the prison population purposefully. Virtually, all prisoners were employed and many took part in both vocational training and education. Approximately 140 prisoners worked outside the prison, significantly more than at the last inspection.
- HP33 New arrivals received a very informative induction to learning and skills that was supportively delivered by prisoners themselves. The information, advice and guidance service was particularly effective at ensuring that prisoners were focused on planning for their release. The system for allocating prisoners to activities was timely and equitable; however, the prison did not properly communicate to newly arrived prisoners how the process worked, so that their expectations could be managed realistically.
- HP34 In vocational training and work, tutors provided very effective individual coaching, which helped prisoners to develop their skills. Assessment practice was sound. Peer mentors and orderlies delivered very good support to other prisoners.
- HP35 Opportunities for paid and unpaid work experience via the 'Through the gate' (TTG) programme were good, and prisoners increased their teamwork skills and sense of responsibility. Most workshops and vocational areas were well resourced and enabled the development of relevant, employability skills. Most industry workshops were used to fulfil commercial contracts but opportunities to embed vocational qualifications were missed.
- HP36 Individual learning plans in the vocational areas were generally not used well to plan learning and to set realistic targets. The range of vocational training courses was too narrow with the only construction trade training offered being carpentry at level 1.
- HP37 Prisoners received an appropriate initial assessment of their literacy and numeracy needs. Despite some improvement since the last inspection, literacy and numeracy skills development were still not sufficiently embedded in vocational training and work.
- HP38 Teaching and learning in education were mostly good. Most lessons were appropriately challenging, engaging prisoners in a range of interesting tasks and activities. The education curriculum met the needs of most prisoners well. Outcomes for prisoners attending education were good with 90% of learners achieving a qualification successfully.
- HP39 The number of units gained by prisoners towards national vocational qualifications awards was high; however few prisoners gained the full awards that were the most valued by prospective employers. The standard of prisoners' work in education was generally good. Prisoners made good progress in education with their writing and spelling, including those whose first language was not English.

- HP40 Standards of work were particularly good in carpentry, barbering, catering and dry stone walling. Some skills development within prison industries lacked a clear focus. Over the past three years a significant number of prisoners had been offered full-time employment by TTG employers, or entered self-employment.
- HP41 Activity attendance and punctuality were good. Prisoners' attitude to learning was very good and they developed respectful relationships with their tutors.
- HP42 Prisoners benefited from very good access to a well managed library. A good range of reading materials and legal books were available, and the library was used well by prisoners. The library provided excellent support for education by providing additional study resources. It delivered particularly creative and innovative projects that enabled prisoners to produce bespoke books for their children.
- HP43 Prisoners had good access to physical education through a well planned and flexible programme that took into account their work and activities commitments. Although the very small number of qualified teaching staff meant that only a few qualifications were available to prisoners, success rates were good. Behaviour in the gym was excellent. Liaison with other departments such as health care and education were excellent. The gym provided prisoners with good opportunities to address specific health and fitness requirements. The lack of a sports hall severely restricted the provision of a broad and balanced PE curriculum, as indoor sports and team games could not take place.

## Resettlement

---

- HP44 The resettlement strategy did not reflect all the work being done or take into account the populations held. A limited needs analysis had been completed. There was not a sufficiently 'whole prison' approach to resettlement work. The accommodation and finance and debt needs of all prisoners were assessed when they arrived, and this was repeated before their release. There was no custody planning for short-term prisoners. Offender management arrangements were good, and most eligible prisoners had a sentence plan. Many prisoners were unhappy with the way release on temporary licence (ROTL) was managed, but we considered arrangements to be robust. Public protection arrangements were adequate, and the Sentinel project was an excellent initiative. Provision around the various reducing reoffending pathways was generally good, and visits provided a positive experience. On the basis of this full inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP45 The resettlement strategy did not reflect all the resettlement work provided in the prison, offered little examination of the prison's diverse population, and although it was based on a needs analysis, this was limited in scope. All resettlement pathways had named leads who attended the quarterly meetings.
- HP46 Electronic wing comments showed little evidence of wing staff's awareness of prisoners' sentence planning targets or resettlement needs. In contrast to specialist staff, personal officers were not effectively engaged in the resettlement process.
- HP47 There was no custody planning for the small number of short-term prisoners held. Prisoners 'in scope' (high risk) for offender management were appropriately

managed. The frequency of contact with OSs was good for those 'in scope', but less so for those 'out of scope'.

- HP48 The offender assessment system (OASys) was up to date, of good quality and 71% of men said that they had a sentence plan, similar to those in comparator prisons, but significantly better than 49% at the last full inspection.
- HP49 Decisions at ROTL boards were thorough and not risk averse. Prisoners in groups and individually expressed great dissatisfaction with access to ROTL but the process was being applied appropriately. In the survey, significantly fewer than in the comparator said that they had received information about ROTL. The reasons for this were unclear as relevant information was being provided.
- HP50 Public protection arrangements were sound and proportionate to risk. Prisoners were assessed on arrival and restrictions explained by an OS. The Sentinel project, which delivered a risk management process for high risk prisoners, was a very effective initiative.
- HP51 Life sentenced and indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) prisoners were managed by OSs; all IPPs had an assessment interview with a psychologist on arrival to highlight any further needs or support requirements.
- HP52 Prisoners in our survey were more negative than in comparator prisons about the provision of information about resettlement. However, there was a very good prisoner advice centre, which provided a range of relevant information. Prisoners who had been assessed as 'low risk' still found it difficult to resolve resettlement issues because they were denied even controlled access to the internet in the prison, although those working outside the prison had uncontrolled access.
- HP53 All prisoners were interviewed to identify their accommodation, finance, benefit and debt needs within 24 hours of arrival, and few were left without accommodation. Jobcentre Plus and debt advisors were available to provide support. The lack of spaces in approved premises, particularly in South Wales, was delaying the resettlement of some men.
- HP54 Very positive partnerships with community groups and employers provided prisoners with a good range of opportunities to gain work or work experience via the TTG project. A good proportion of prisoners gained employment on release. Approximately one third of prisoners who were discharged in the previous three months had gained full-time employment, which was impressive.
- HP55 All prisoners were seen by a health care professional before release; those on medication were given seven days of prescribed medication. Effective links with local community mental health teams had been established to help prisoners with severe and enduring mental health needs. The palliative care unit was a good initiative, but needed to be appropriately staffed.
- HP56 Prisoners with substance misuse issues who were due for release were identified eight weeks beforehand. They attended the relapse prevention and preparing for release programme. There were good links with community drug and alcohol services.



- HP57 Prisoners booked visits themselves and visits started on time. There was no visitor centre or family support worker. The visits room was very relaxed and prisoners were able to play with children in the play area, and use space outside. Prisoners had to wear jeans and a shirt with a collar in the visits room, which was unnecessarily prescriptive. Family days were open to all prisoners, there was a Storybook Dads scheme and a parenting course took place in the education unit.
- HP58 There were no offending behaviour programmes, but psychologists provided one to one work as necessary. OSs and managers recognised the need to address domestic violence.

## Main concerns and recommendations

---

- HP59 Concern: There was no overarching equality and diversity policy, key staff lacked appropriate training and monitoring was limited to race. Some poor outcomes for black and minority ethnic prisoners had not been addressed. Some minority prisoner groups had less confidence in staff than white prisoners. Diversity incidents and complaints were not adequately investigated.

**Recommendation: Strategic management and governance of equality and diversity should be improved so that the prison can meet its obligations in the Equality Act 2010 and unequal outcomes addressed.**

- HP60 Concern: A comprehensive resettlement strategy, which outlined current provision, the primary aims of resettlement work, public protection and the needs of the population was not in place. This would ensure that provision was appropriate in resettling prisoners safely back into the community.

**Recommendation: There should be a comprehensive resettlement strategy based on a thorough needs analysis of all categories of prisoner drawn from a variety of sources.**



# Section 1: Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Many prisoners had long journeys but escort vans were clean and prisoners said that escort staff treated them well. Some prisoners arrived with little knowledge about the prison and had insufficient time left to take advantage of the resettlement opportunities. Many waited unnecessarily in vans on arrival.
- 1.2 Many prisoners had long journeys to Leyhill. In our survey 63% of prisoners said that they had had journeys of over two hours which compared with 43% in comparator prisons. Most arrived in cellular vehicles which were in good condition. Prisoners were positive about their treatment by escort staff and had been given food during their journey.
- 1.3 Some prisoners who had been transferred had too little time left to serve to take advantage of the prison's resettlement opportunities; others had not received sufficient notice that they were being transferred or enough detailed information about the prison. Not all understood how the prison operated and others did not have the opportunity to notify family or to rearrange visits. There had been an increase in the number of prisoners who arrived with outstanding court matters. Over the previous 15 months there had been an average of six court movements per month.
- 1.4 Prisoners waited in vans unnecessarily if they arrived around lunchtime when reception was closed. From 16 January 2012 to 16 April 2012, 54 prisoners arrived between noon and 1pm. There were also occasions when prisoners arriving close to 5pm were sent to local prisons overnight to be returned the following day. Prisoners were taken off the van promptly once reception had opened.

### Recommendation

---

- 1.5 Prisoners should be given sufficient notice of transfer along with accurate information about the prison before they are transferred.

## Early days in custody

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.6 Our survey results regarding the early days of custody were overall very good compared with comparator prisons and there had been improvements since the last inspection. Reception was relaxed and support from orderlies was good. First night procedures were led by prisoner advice workers. Induction was comprehensive and for most prisoners covered all they needed to know about the prison.

## Reception

---

- 1.7 In 2011, on average 63 new arrivals, 46 discharges and 14 prisoner transfers passed through reception every month. Reception staff managed the discharge of those going on temporary release as well as facilitating prisoners' access to stored property.
- 1.8 Reception was relaxed and interactions we observed were mostly friendly. There was however little privacy should prisoners have wanted to disclose personal information to reception staff. Strip-searching of prisoners was handled appropriately, carried out only where there was a suspicion that a prisoner may have been concealing items. Rules about the property and clothing prisoners were allowed to keep in their rooms were overly restrictive (see section on security), which meant that some items allowed at their previous prison were taken from them and stored. This was a potential source of conflict with new prisoners.
- 1.9 The holding room was clean and an adequate size for the numbers received. Relevant information for new receptions was displayed but there was little available in languages other than English. Prisoners were offered a choice of canteen reception pack, were given £2 phone credit and could make a telephone call and have a shower once they moved to a residential unit.
- 1.10 Prisoner orderlies provided good support throughout reception procedures; they accompanied new receptions to the health care department and helped them carry their property to their allocated units.

## First night

---

- 1.11 Prisoners spent their first night on A or B unit depending on where spaces were available. Some were required to share accommodation in dormitories, which were basic, but most could move to a single room within a week (see section on residential units).
- 1.12 Prisoner advice workers provided new prisoners with good support on their first night. They provided prisoners with information about the induction programme, explained how various agreements between them and the prison, known as compacts, worked and offered informal advice from a prisoner's perspective. Distributing and helping prisoners to complete forms asking for medical information and about prisoners' passport details was inappropriate.
- 1.13 Residential officers had no significant involvement in first night procedures. Advice workers offered new prisoners a form which they could fill in to make a request to speak to a member of staff on their first night if they wanted to instead of this happening as a matter of routine.
- 1.14 Most prisoners felt safe on their first night, although those with a disability were slightly less likely to report this.

## Induction

---

- 1.15 The learning and skills department coordinated the two-week rolling induction programme. Staff reviewed annually a comprehensive induction booklet, which was available for prisoners through the library but only in English.
- 1.16 Induction, which started on the morning following reception, began with a meeting with an induction officer. Induction officers read information from a condensed version of the induction booklet and prisoners were given a copy of this. The session could have been used more effectively to generate discussion about transferring to open conditions. There was no specific training for induction officers. Prisoners were given the opportunity to have a private interview with the induction officer to ask questions.
- 1.17 Prisoners met individually with a member of the chaplaincy. They were taken on a walk with an induction officer to familiarise themselves with the prison boundaries and could collect prison clothing.
- 1.18 Over the following two weeks, prisoners were provided with a comprehensive introduction to the life of the prison. Some complained about it being too long, but the structured programme enabled prisoners to adjust to the prison and its regime over a period of time. If prisoners had certificates from courses they had completed previously, such as in manual handling, food hygiene or health and safety, they did not have to repeat them. Trained prisoner induction orderlies delivered some sessions using visual presentations; agencies delivered others including a financial advice workshop, careers, information and advice support and diversity and sexual health as part of the learning and skills contract (see section on learning and skills).
- 1.19 Ninety-eight per cent of prisoners who completed our survey said that they had been on the induction course. There was no routine prisoner evaluation of induction, but in our survey 82% said that it covered all they needed to know about the prison.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.20 All prisoners new to the prison should have a private interview with a member of staff from their first night unit to reassure them about any concerns they might have about moving to an open prison.

## 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). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

- 1.21 Most prisoners valued their place at Leyhill and behaved well. When it happened, bullying was associated with prisoners' offences, but this rarely manifested itself in violence. More prisoners than in comparator prisons felt able to report victimisation. Investigations were thorough, perpetrators were monitored and victims supported. Indicators of violence were monitored well.

- 1.22 There was little overt evidence of bullying and very few assaults. There had been two incidents and one fight reported since January 2012 and eight reports of unexplained injuries over the previous year.
- 1.23 Bullying incidents were often associated with prisoners' offences. They involved rumour, threat and subtle methods to intimidate mainly sex offenders who represented around 15% of the population. Many would have previously spent periods of their sentence on vulnerable prisoner units, which may have contributed to their feelings of insecurity. The governor had issued a notice to prisoners reminding them of the consequences of targeting individuals or groups of prisoners.
- 1.24 Findings from our survey about safety were similar to those from comparator prisons but responses concerning the victimisation of some minority groups were worse. Nineteen per cent of prisoners in our survey said that they had been victimised compared with 7% in comparator prisons; 8% said that they had been victimised because of their offence compared with 1% in comparator prisons. It was positive that 41% of those who had been victimised, compared with 24% in comparator prisons, said that they had reported victimisation to staff. Several older vulnerable prisoners said that they felt safe and supported.
- 1.25 The prison had conducted its own survey in March 2011, which had been completed by 56 prisoners (11%). In the survey, 86% said that they felt safe from being hurt by other prisoners. None reported being assaulted by another prisoner and 82% said that they felt safe from having their property taken. Prisoners completed exit surveys prior to release, which were also positive about safety.
- 1.26 The violence reduction policy and strategy had last been reviewed in May 2010. A senior manager and senior officer, as well as a safer custody coordinator led the safer custody strategy. A safer custody meeting covering both violence reduction and suicide prevention took place quarterly and was attended by staff from relevant departments, although the health care and security departments were not consistently represented. Reports were presented on the violence reduction and on ACCT procedures. Statistics and trends were discussed.
- 1.27 Incidents were investigated well by the safer custody senior officer and suspected perpetrators monitored and victims supported. A small number of bullies, who had been transferred out of the prison, had been dealt with fairly. One prisoner had been returned after allegations were proven to have been unfounded.
- 1.28 There was a three-stage strategy for managing allegations of bullying, but few were monitored for longer than one week – usually covertly as victims did not want alleged perpetrators challenged, and it was often difficult to establish facts. Since January 2012, 13 booklets had been opened to monitor suspected bullies and 19 to support victims. Regular entries were made in monitoring documents, which included reviews when appropriate and regular management checks. Victim support documents were similarly well completed. There had been a reduction in the number of monitoring booklets opened – from 148 in 2010 to 79 in 2011.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.29 Health care and security department representatives should attend the safer custody meetings consistently.

# Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.30 Prisoners at serious risk of self-harm were not held at Leyhill. The regime, environment and relationships supported good mental health. Incidents of self-harm were rare. The relatively few ACCT documents that were opened demonstrated that there was good support.
- 1.31 Prisoners who were considered to be at risk of self-harm could transfer to Leyhill. If the risks that emerged could not be managed in the open setting, prisoners were returned to closed conditions. There were very few incidents of self-harm and we were told that only two prisoners had been returned as a result of self-harm risks over the last year. There were good examples of liaison between Leyhill and other prisons relating to the transfer of prisoners who had been subject to ACCT procedures. There had been no self-inflicted deaths.
- 1.32 Relatively few ACCT documents had been opened – 31 in 2011 and nine in 2012 (to 17 April 2012). Most were opened to provide low level support and in some cases this could possibly have been more appropriately provided through personal officer work.
- 1.33 The local suicide prevention and self-harm management policy had last been reviewed in May 2010 and was a comprehensive document. The quarterly safer custody meeting was responsible for overseeing the governance of ACCT procedures (see section on bullying and violence reduction). A Listener and the Samaritans gave comprehensive reports and the reasons for opening ACCT documents were discussed.
- 1.34 ACCT documents included good assessments and individualised care maps were completed. Ongoing daily entries in ACCT documents revealed good care. In some cases health nurses and offender supervisors attended reviews. Most ACCTs were opened for only a short time and prisoners were supported well.
- 1.35 There had been no ACCT training for the last six months, but this was routinely raised at the safer custody meeting. An e-learning ACCT refresher presentation had been sent to staff and further training was planned.
- 1.36 There were 11 Listeners and two Listener suites with direct lines to the Samaritans and a Listener dormitory, but this had rarely been used overnight. Listeners reported the number of contacts they had had and there was good liaison with the Samaritans, which contributed to prisoners' induction, as well as between managers and Listeners.
- 1.37 There was good access to anti-ligature knives in emergency response boxes, which were checked daily.

## Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

---

### Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.<sup>1</sup>

- 1.38 Some resources were in place to help protect and support prisoners who were most at risk of exploitation, neglect or abuse. A safeguarding policy had been published but this had yet to be promoted and embedded throughout the prison. It covered relevant areas but needed to identify how it linked to local authority provision for safeguarding adults.
- 1.39 The prison had developed a safeguarding policy in March 2012. It outlined the support available for prisoners at risk, guidance for reporting concerns and the responsibilities of staff in promoting safeguarding. It acknowledged the need to integrate safeguarding in all areas of the prison but made no reference to the development of links with the local authority adult safeguarding team.
- 1.40 There were no individual care plans for those deemed at risk of harm or neglect. The development of a palliative care unit was a good initiative but needed to be appropriately staffed (see section on reintegration planning).

### Recommendations

---

- 1.41 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes.
- 1.42 Individual care plans should be developed for those prisoners identified as being at risk of harm or neglect.

## Security

---

### Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships.

Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- 1.43 Security arrangements were mostly appropriate. Security objectives were based on sound and reasoned analysis. While the mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was low, the inability to detect a known 'drug of choice', Spice, had made it difficult to judge levels of drug use accurately. Governance arrangements relating to transfers to closed conditions for discipline reasons required improvement.

---

<sup>1</sup> We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).



- 1.44 Security arrangements were largely proportionate. We were particularly pleased to see a much improved, proportionate approach to the searching of prisoners, with routine strip-searching now replaced by an intelligence-led only approach. However, prisoners on external work placements were still not allowed to use their own phones contrary to practice at other open prisons.
- 1.45 Intelligence was forthcoming from all disciplines of staff, and while dynamic security might have been improved if staff used a more pro-active approach to interacting with prisoners (see section on staff-prisoner relationships), security information report (SIR) submissions had averaged a reasonable 161 per month in the six months preceding inspection.
- 1.46 A monthly report was provided to the security committee, highlighting emerging trends in relation to SIRs, absconds and transfers back to closed conditions. The security committee met monthly and managers from all areas of the prison consistently attended. Security objectives that arose from further analysis were detailed, relevant and attention was paid to ensuring identified actions were carried out.
- 1.47 Twenty-three prisoners had absconded in 2011 – a considerable reduction from previous years. Although data relating to absconds was considered by the security committee, little information was gathered from prisoners themselves to establish whether there were factors in their decision to abscond such as bullying or violence that could be addressed.
- 1.48 SIRs were collated and analysed within appropriate timescales and managers ensured identified actions, for example, drug testing and room searches, were carried out in a timely enough fashion to ensure intelligence was still relevant. The intelligence-led MDT rate had been as high as 60%-70% per month during the previous year but had now dipped to below 20%. This was not as a result of any change in approach to testing authorisations on the part of managers but believed to be due to the synthetic drug Spice, which current MDT could not detect.
- 1.49 Drug testing facilities were good, with a soft furnished waiting room and a suitably clean sample and testing area. The random MDT rate was below 6%; this was indicative of pro-active work by the security department through successful target searches and an alteration of the prisoner access boundaries making drop-offs more difficult. However, the issues surrounding Spice (see above) made it difficult to judge levels of drug use accurately.
- 1.50 A multidisciplinary review was convened if there were concerns regarding the suitability of prisoners on indeterminate sentences for open conditions; they could then be transferred back to closed conditions. However, no such review took place for determinate sentenced prisoners. Instead the decision rested solely with the security department, which did not provide sufficient governance to ensure that the sanction of transfer was being used appropriately.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.51 Efforts should be made to collate information about the reasons prisoners abscond once they are returned to custody.
- 1.52 A transparent, multidisciplinary process should inform all decisions to transfer all prisoners to closed conditions. All new arrivals should be informed of this process and the circumstances under which they will be transferred to closed conditions.

## Incentives and earned privileges

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.53 Most prisoners were on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme. Review decisions were supported by associated records. The facilities list did not include some items available in the closed estate.
- 1.54 Approximately 80% of the population were on the enhanced level during the inspection; demotion to the basic level was rare and almost always preceded transfer to closed conditions.
- 1.55 Governance arrangements appeared appropriate. Prisoners changed levels on the basis of a review board chaired by a senior officer. All staff who had regular contact with the prisoner in question were asked to make submissions, but these were not always forthcoming. Most decisions to downgrade or upgrade a prisoner were justified in the relevant paperwork.
- 1.56 The facilities' list did not include some items that were usually available in closed prisons. An issue raised by prisoners in all our focus groups related to a number of items being removed from them despite the prison's supposedly relaxed security arrangements and the majority of them being on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme.

### Recommendation

---

- 1.57 The facilities' list should at the very least be comparable to those found in prisons in closed estates.

## Disciplinary procedures

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.58 Adjudications were low but it was not clear that managers were scrutinising trends or the quality of paperwork completed. The quality of enquiry appeared good, and most punishments were proportionate although there were some exceptions. Use of force was rare and there was no segregation unit.
- 1.59 Adjudication levels were reasonably low, with an average of just over five per week in the six-month period prior to the inspection. The majority of charges related to either breach of licence conditions while on temporary release, for example, late returns, or drug and alcohol related charges.
- 1.60 A quarterly adjudications report was provided for the senior management team (SMT) meeting, providing good analysis of a limited range of the previous quarter's adjudication statistics.

Minutes from the SMT meeting did not demonstrate what action had been taken to address emerging trends identified in the report.

- 1.61 Most of the adjudication records we sampled showed that there had been sufficient enquiry on the part of adjudicators, including appropriate dismissals where there was insufficient evidence to prove the charge in question. However, senior managers did not carry out routine quality assurance.
- 1.62 Punishments were mostly reasonable and consistent, but we did find some examples that appeared excessive, despite being in line with the local punishment guide. For example one prisoner had received 21 days' loss of earnings at 50% and 21 days' loss of private cash and access to the prison shop for disobeying an order.

## The use of force

---

- 1.63 Incidents requiring the use of force were extremely rare, with only one minor incident in the six months prior to inspection. Records submitted by staff demonstrated that the force employed had been necessary and lawful, and staff had used de-escalation techniques at the earliest opportunity.

## Segregation

---

- 1.64 There was no segregation unit at the prison.

## Substance misuse

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.65 Clinical substance misuse services met the needs of the very small number of men requiring reducing opiate substitute treatment. There was clear clinical oversight from a lead nurse and prescribing support from appropriately trained GPs. The substance misuse service was well integrated with the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) and the prison as a whole and it provided a helpful range of individual and group programmes for prisoners with a range of substance misuse problems.
- 1.66 Substance misuse services were commissioned by the South Gloucestershire Partnership and were provided by the Avon and Wiltshire Partnership Mental Health Trust. A new integrated model of service had begun on 1 April as part of the wider South Gloucestershire joint criminal justice and community service and was in the middle of a three-month implementation programme during our visit. In our survey 100% of men with substance misuse problems said that they had received helpful support compared with 84% in comparator establishments.
- 1.67 The IDTS was integrated with substance misuse services and the newly contracted service planned to cover community services from June/July. An IDTS needs assessment had been conducted to inform the new prison substance misuse strategy and integrated criminal justice treatment plan; there was a strong emphasis on recovery and rehabilitation in preparation for release.

- 1.68 Only nine men had received opiate substitutes in the previous year and none were receiving treatment during our visit. It was not clear whether such a small number on the IDTS was sustainable and appropriate and we understood that current staffing cover from HMP Eastwood Park to cover weekends was due to finish shortly.
- 1.69 The prescribing regime was based on reduction in preparation for release and symptom relief where required. Two men had been returned to sending prisons in the last year because they had been on higher substitution levels. We noted some flexibility in dealing with a prisoner who had arrived on a dose that fell outside the criteria for Leyhill, but who was allowed to stay as he had been due for home detention curfew.
- 1.70 Planned prescribing of naltrexone was managed safely, with 14 referrals in the last year, and there were effective links with community drug services to follow through on this work.
- 1.71 An alcohol protocol was being developed by the GP practice and prisoners could be prescribed alcohol related blockers.
- 1.72 Substance misuse services were well integrated with health care and the prison as a whole, and practitioners attended the induction programme. Prisoners were referred to services during screening at reception. They could also refer themselves or staff could refer them. They were usually seen for an initial assessment within three days.
- 1.73 Individual reviews were timely and used the international treatment effectiveness project mapping model to plan care. Records were generally clear and complete with evidence of constructive work to achieve prisoners' recovery outcomes.
- 1.74 There were 140 men on the total substance misuse caseload and 20 men were being seen weekly. There were approximately 400 men on voluntary and compliance based compacts and a quota of 200 tests. Links between the substance misuse team and testing staff were excellent. Testing staff we spoke to demonstrated a good understanding and provided strong support to men who were struggling.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.75 A review of the need for the IDTS programme should be undertaken.

# Section 2: Respect

## Residential units

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The prison was generally clean and well maintained, with excellent external areas. The standard of prisoners' rooms was good, but dormitories offered a less positive environment. B wing had landings for older prisoners, and adapted rooms and toilet facilities for those with mobility impairments. Access to cleaning materials, laundry facilities, and clean prison bedding and clothing was good. Prisoners complained about getting access to stored property. Most prisoners had confidence in the applications process.
- 2.2 The prison grounds were well kept and provided an excellent environment. There were three residential units. A and B wings housed prisoners being inducted and a mixture of long- and short-term prisoners. B wing had two landings for prisoners over the age of 50 and one spur with adapted cells for mobility impaired prisoners. C wing was considered to be the best of the three accommodation units, and prisoners could apply to live there if they met the well publicised criteria.
- 2.3 Most accommodation was in single rooms, which were well decorated and furnished. There were 10 dormitories, which were used only when all the single rooms were full; most of these were inadequately furnished and offered no privacy. Stays in the dormitories rarely exceeded a week.
- 2.4 Prisoners had lockable cabinets and privacy keys and could have their own personal bedding.
- 2.5 Communal areas were generally clean, and each wing had a large well equipped association area. Notice boards were well maintained, and touch screen 'kiosks' on A and B wings offered some information in eight languages. Each wing had a kitchen with limited equipment (see section on catering).
- 2.6 There were toilets and showers on each landing, but many of those on A and B wings were in need of refurbishment and most on B wing were dirty. Two landings had only one shower, which was insufficient, and some were not adequately screened. We found evidence that cleaning equipment had been incorrectly stored in the ablution areas with the possibility of cross contamination. The disabled toilet cubicle on B wing was being used inappropriately to store cleaning equipment.
- 2.7 Prisoners could wear their own clothes unless on the basic regime, and there was a good supply of suitable prison issue clothing for those who wanted it. Bedding and clothing issued by the prison was in a good state of repair and could be exchanged weekly. Prisoners on all wings had at least weekly access to a personal laundry service.

- 2.8 In our survey only 44% of prisoners, significantly lower than in comparator prisons (55%), said that they could normally access their stored property if they needed to. This appeared to relate to one for one swaps of items, which reception staff would not routinely facilitate.
- 2.9 Prisoners had good access to telephones but not all of them could be used in private, particularly two newly installed telephones on C wing. Foreign national and other prisoners, who did not receive domestic visits, could apply for phone credit in lieu. Mail was delivered promptly, and arrangements for privileged correspondence and mail monitoring were good.
- 2.10 The applications process was cumbersome, with four different logs maintained on each residential unit and others in the offender management unit (OMU) and reception. Applications could not be tracked, and management did not check the quality of responses. However, in our survey 98% of prisoners said that it was easy to make an application and 90% said that they were dealt with fairly.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.11 Dormitories should afford some privacy and be equipped so that each prisoner has a bed, chair, lockable cabinet, adequate storage for personal belongings and the use of a table.
- 2.12 Ablution areas on A and B wings should be deep cleaned and refurbished where necessary.
- 2.13 Prisoners should be able to access their stored property on request.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.14 Staff supervising cleaning parties should receive training to ensure the appropriate use and storage of cleaning materials and equipment.
- 2.15 Hoods should be fitted to the two newly installed telephones on C wing.

## Staff-prisoner relationships

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.16 Relationships between staff and prisoners were good, but interaction during association periods was limited. There was effective prisoner consultation. The personal officer scheme was well established, but the standard of personal officer reports was variable.
- 2.17 We observed some good staff interactions with prisoners, and 84% of prisoners in our survey said that staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem.
- 2.18 The personal officer scheme was well advertised to prisoners on all residential units. In our survey 79% of prisoners said that they had a personal officer, and 80% of these said that they

found them to be very helpful. Personal officer reports varied in quality and management checks did not always challenge poor quality entries.

- 2.19 Residential staff tended to congregate in wing offices, with the door closed. In our survey only 18% of prisoners said that staff spoke to them most or all of the time during association, and only 36% said that a member of staff had personally checked on them in the last week to see how they were getting on.
- 2.20 There were two monthly prisoner consultative committee (PCC) meetings; one discussed establishment-wide matters, the second focused on residential issues. Both were chaired by members of the senior management team, and were well attended by prisoner representatives. These forums were valued by prisoners, who felt that they were able to influence positive change within the establishment.
- 2.21 Prisoners on the PCC had been given an office in which to carry out their work and a second office housed the prisoner-led advice centre. Prisoners told us that they had found these services to be very useful and informative.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.22 Wing staff should pro-actively engage with prisoners and should not congregate in wing offices.
- 2.23 Management checks of personal officer reports should ensure that entries are balanced and detailed and indicate interaction.

## Equality and diversity

---

### Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic<sup>2</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.24 There was no overarching equality and diversity policy that recognised and addressed the needs of each protected group. Insufficient coordination of the work was compounded by the inadequate governance of processes to prevent certain groups, particularly black and minority ethnic, foreign national and gay men, from experiencing disadvantage. Key staff had received insufficient training.

## Strategic management

---

- 2.25 The diversity and race equality team (DREAT) meetings were chaired by the deputy governor bimonthly and were generally well attended by appropriate managers and prisoner

---

<sup>2</sup> The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

representatives. The systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment (SMART) data was available to staff, but not to prisoners, unless they attended these meetings. There was insufficient evidence that potential problems revealed by this data were promptly and systematically investigated. There was scope to monitor other equality strands and to better coordinate and promote equality and diversity activities across the prison.

- 2.26 Although the majority of staff had received 'Challenge it change it' training, we were not assured that staff were sufficiently alert to the potential for discrimination. There was no evidence that DREAT members had received training for their role, and the inexperienced DREAT coordinator had not received training in diversity, equalities management or investigation. There was a need for more clarity around the role of the two vacant prisoner equality representative posts.
- 2.27 Fewer diversity incident report forms (DIRFs) were submitted at Leyhill than at comparator prisons. Some staff and prisoners were unclear about their purpose, and they were not readily available on the wings during our inspection. The quality of investigations into DIRFs was poor; more thorough and challenging examination and more complete responses were required. Many prisoners told us that they feared repercussions if they complained, and in our survey more black and minority ethnic, disabled and older men reported victimisation by staff. There was no external quality assurance of the DIRF process.
- 2.28 Consultation arrangements for prisoners were mixed. Some effective consultation was in place relating to older prisoners and religion, but arrangements for foreign nationals were ineffective, and there was a marked reluctance to engage with the significant gay population. An impact assessment programme had been set up, but the small amount of work that had been carried out was of variable quality.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.29 Arrangements should be made to ensure that there is regular external community involvement and scrutiny of the work of the DREAT including DIRFS.
- 2.30 There should be consultation and support arrangements for each strand of equality. These should aim to identify areas of concern, initiate debate and action planning, seek authority from the DREAT and communicate back to prisoners.

## Protected characteristics

---

- 2.31 The main equality and diversity policy document was wordy and failed to address all strands of equality. A separate policy for older prisoners was much more accessible. Designated staff had responsibility for each protected characteristic, and some had worked successfully to identify and meet prisoners' needs. However, this work was not clearly coordinated or recorded in the diversity and race equality action plan (DREAP).
- 2.32 There was no routine identification of, or interventions for, prisoners convicted of racist offences. In our conversations, black and minority ethnic prisoners told us that officers were insufficiently culturally aware, and that this resulted in negative stereotyping. We saw no conclusive evidence of this, but the absence of officer race equality representatives on the wings, and the low number of black and minority ethnic staff reinforced this perception.



- 2.33 The education and library provider had worked with Gypsy/Romany/Traveller prisoners to encourage them to use the provision, and to ensure that Traveller families were able to collect visiting orders at the gate.
- 2.34 There was no data on how many of the 32 foreign national prisoners spoke English. One man, who was illiterate in his native language, spoke very little English. Although a telephone interpretation service was used infrequently in health care and in the OMU, he relayed his needs on the wing by arranging for a supportive friend to speak to his bilingual son and then to staff. This was unacceptable. The touch screens could translate key material, but the range of languages provided was insufficient to meet needs, and we were told that they were often out of order. A few prisoners, but no staff, had been identified as willing translators.
- 2.35 It was positive that foreign nationals could access additional free phone credit and airmail letters, including for Storybook Dads, even if they received visits. The governor had instructed that this privilege should be extended to British nationals who had close family abroad and did not receive visits, but there was some confusion about this.
- 2.36 There were no immigration detainees. An official from the United Kingdom Border Agency visited the prison fortnightly to help answer prisoners' queries, but no independent immigration advice was available.
- 2.37 The Lobster Pot, a day care centre run by the Resettlement and Care for Older Ex-offenders and Prisoners for the over 50s population, was an excellent resource. The various activities on offer, which attracted approximately two thirds of over 50s, included training and allowed staff to conduct a dynamic assessment of needs. As a result, the provision was evolving accordingly. Many, but not all, older men were located on B wing, and some benefited from the prisoner carers who worked there. There was a shortage of trained and paid prisoner carers, and a number of men helped out on a volunteer basis.
- 2.38 Retirement pay was £8 a week in contrast with a working wage of around £12.50, so this was comparatively low, but better than we often see. Men over 65 could apply for a free television.
- 2.39 The catering team supported the major religious festivals with Diwali and Eid as well as Christmas meals, which were available to all prisoners. There were ongoing concerns about cross contamination at the servery, affecting religious dietary requirements. We were concerned to be told that Muslim prisoners often chose not to continue working in the kitchen after an initial period.
- 2.40 A transgender prisoner was being reasonably well managed through the establishment of a compact.
- 2.41 Approximately 35 gay men had disclosed themselves in the prison but despite prisoner requests, there was no support group for them, and there was no obvious provision in the library. In our survey, some respondents reported victimisation by prisoners because of their sexuality, and this was confirmed in our conversations with prisoners.
- 2.42 A self-report questionnaire was used on induction to identify men with disabilities, but was insufficiently private. Many of the 170 prisoners with disabilities were positive about their care, and there were a number of examples of reasonable physical adjustments. However, in our survey, prisoners with a disability were significantly less positive than other prisoners about a range of issues: in particular, more felt unsafe and victimised by staff and prisoners. The absence of formal care planning meant that staff sometimes had insufficient information about

a prisoner's abilities to be able to make appropriate adjustments in how they managed him. However, good quality personal emergency evacuation plans were in place.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.43 Formal care planning for prisoners with disabilities should be introduced.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.44 The prison should appoint additional paid prisoner carers.
- 2.45 The process for identifying prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability should be confidential.

## Faith and religious activity

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.46 Faith provision was good. Faith leaders were appointed for all relevant religions and held regular services and celebrations in appropriate physical environments. Prisoners could attend a variety of midweek activities.
- 2.47 The physical worship facilities included a chapel, a mosque, a multi-faith room and space for other minority faiths, all of which were well presented and maintained. The chapel functioned as an all-day 'drop-in' pastoral centre and was staffed by prisoner orderlies when chaplains were not present. The reception area of the chapel was overtly Christian, and lacked other faith material. Muslim prisoners could attend the mosque for prayers throughout the working day, and during Ramadan they could attend at night. The ablution facilities in the mosque needed to be extended to cope with the number of prisoners attending straight from work; a bid to fund this had been submitted.
- 2.48 In our survey, most prisoners, and especially black and minority ethnic and older men, were very positive about religious provision at Leyhill in comparison with other open prisons. The chaplains were well known among prisoners who praised them for the way in which they supported them and their families during bereavements. The Imam worked hard to ensure that staff understood the requirements for religious observance during Ramadan. The chaplaincy liaised with the catering team to ensure that food for a variety of religious festivals was provided; this was often made available to the whole population.
- 2.49 There were a few links with community organisations, but the main emphasis was on encouraging men to explore their faith, and to seek their own religious communities close to home in preparation for release.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.50 The reception area of the chapel should be made more faith inclusive.

## Complaints

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

2.51 The management of complaints was generally good, but prisoners had some negative perceptions of the process. Information available about the process was good, and replies were prompt and appropriate.

2.52 Prisoners said they were afraid to make complaints for fear of being transferred to closed conditions, or other repercussions. These perceptions were not supported by our survey, which suggested that prisoners at Leyhill felt very positive about complaints in comparison with other open prisons. In our sample, replies were sent impressively quickly and most were legible, respectful, and clearly written. The practice of using discipline staff to log complaints, both when first received and when returned to the prisoner, undermined this good work.

2.53 Senior managers analysed and discussed complaints every month, but there was no evidence that any conclusions drawn, or actions planned as a result of these deliberations were shared, either with staff in general or with prisoners.

2.54 The number of complaints received was comparable with other open prisons. There was a robust weekly quality assurance process, which resulted in some responses being re-drafted, and advice being given to respondents.

### Recommendation

---

2.55 The prison should seek to understand the reasons for prisoners' anxieties about submitting complaints, and implement strategies to further improve confidence in the system.

## Legal rights

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

2.56 A trained legal services officer was available for any prisoner requiring assistance; adequate resources were in place for legal visits.

2.57 Prisoners had access to one trained legal services officer. This appeared adequate as there was little demand for their services as most prisoners were at a stage in their sentence where related matters had been dealt with or already had a solicitor to consult with.

- 2.58 Legal visits took place three times a week and there were adequate facilities with six private visiting booths available. In our survey 73% of prisoners reported that it was easy or very easy to communicate with their legal representative or solicitor, better than in comparator prisons.

## Health services

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.59 Health services provided men with access to high quality care. Our survey showed that significantly more men than in comparator prisons said that the quality of health care was good. Access to most primary care services was timely but men waited too long for dental treatment. Chronic disease management for the older population was responsive. Medicines management was poor. Mental health services were responsive and well integrated with both primary care and the wider prison.

## Governance arrangements

---

- 2.60 Health services were commissioned by NHS South Gloucestershire. Core primary care services were jointly provided by Bristol Community Health and general practice provider Hanham Health. Dental, optician and podiatry services were commissioned separately but all services were coordinated effectively on a day to day basis by the head of health care.
- 2.61 A health needs assessment had been completed in November 2011 and progress had been made against some of the identified improvement areas.
- 2.62 In our survey, significantly more prisoners (76%) than in comparator prisons (66%) said that the overall quality of health services was good or very good. The health care facility was clean although corridor areas were a little cluttered. There were appropriate consultation and treatment spaces and the patient waiting area was clean and welcoming.
- 2.63 Part-time registered nurses were the equivalent of less than two full-time posts and much of the service was delivered by two full-time health care support workers (HCWs). We witnessed some excellent care and interventions by the HCWs and, while supervision was good, they carried a disproportionate amount of responsibility.
- 2.64 Training needs had been identified and there were plans to ensure nursing staff's skills matched service needs. All nursing staff had up to date mandatory training and there was evidence that this covered a range of relevant clinical and governance issues such as safeguarding and conflict resolution. There was a system for checking nursing registration.
- 2.65 SystemOne, the electronic clinical information system, was used by all health care staff and there was a useful range of templates to ensure consistency. Care plans did not always reflect the complex needs of men with chronic diseases.

- 2.66 Several medicines audits had been completed in the last year, which had helped inform safe prescribing. The last infection control audit was in 2010 and was largely found to be compliant; a repeat was scheduled for April 2012.
- 2.67 Twenty-nine clinical incidents had been logged in the last year, with evidence of action taken and learning disseminated. One serious incident was reported regarding a death in custody from natural causes. The Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommended that protocols needed to establish what the NHS's responsibilities were at Leyhill and this was being addressed.
- 2.68 Prisoners used the main prison's complaints system, which was unsuitable for confidential health issues. The NHS's monitoring reports showed that there had been nine positive responses from prisoners over the last year.
- 2.69 Resuscitation kit in health care included oxygen and an automated defibrillator; there were daily checks of the seal and post use and weekly checks of the equipment. A significant proportion of all prison staff had undertaken emergency first aid and defibrillator training, and additional defibrillators were located in the gym, at the gate and on B wing.
- 2.70 Health promotion was developing with good access to smoking cessation services and weight management advice. There was an appropriate range of literature available in the waiting area. A new policy gave prisoners access to condoms both in the prison and for home leave.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.71 **The roles and responsibilities carried out by health care support workers should be reviewed to ensure the appropriate and safe delegation of clinical responsibilities.**

## Delivery of care (physical health)

---

- 2.72 Prisoners were screened by a nurse or health care support worker on arrival. We observed thorough screening with appropriate follow-through referrals to other services, including the GP, dentist and substance misuse workers.
- 2.73 Health care services were available between 8am and 5pm during the working week. Access to nursing staff was excellent and prisoners were able to see a GP within three to four days maximum and on the same day if they had urgent problems. The out of hours service was provided by the same GP practice. The application system worked well and men were able to attend appointments easily.
- 2.74 An optometrist and dispensing optician visited every month and offered men a good testing service and a wide range of spectacles, although some men waited too long. A regional retinopathy screening service visited every six months. There was a monthly podiatrist clinic with 30 men waiting to be seen; the longest wait was 17 weeks which was too long.
- 2.75 The physiotherapist provided two sessions a week and this had enabled some men with chronic pain to reduce their use of strong medication alongside supporting improved mobility and function.
- 2.76 Older prisoners were routinely invited to an over 55s screening clinic and dedicated nurses led arrangements for chronic disease management reviews. We observed an asthma review, which included both practical education on the use of inhalers and helpful health promotion

advice. External hospital appointments were rarely cancelled and some men were able to attend unescorted through release on temporary licence arrangements.

- 2.77 There were no formal arrangements through which prisoners could be assessed for and provided with loan equipment and continence aids to meet their daily living and mobility needs.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.78 There should be formal arrangements with local NHS and social care providers for the assessment and loan of mobility and functional aids.

## Pharmacy

---

- 2.79 Pharmacy services were provided by a community pharmacy and comprised a weekly two pharmacist visit and a brief daily visit by a pharmacy technician to deliver medication.
- 2.80 All prisoners had their medication in possession. It was usually prescribed for a month, but men working outside the prison were able to have two or three months' supply. There was no provision for men to obtain simple over the counter pain relief out of hours.
- 2.81 There had been a number of errors involving medication being placed into incorrectly labelled bags by the pharmacy supplier; incidents had been avoided as a result of vigilant health care staff.
- 2.82 Prisoners had no opportunity to speak to a pharmacist.
- 2.83 Medicines management was poor. There were draft in-possession and minor ailments policies, which had not been ratified. Standard operating procedures were limited and there was no evidence of staff training. A medicines and therapeutics committee had met once in November 2011 and had planned to meet quarterly.
- 2.84 Medicines use reviews had been conducted by the pharmacist for a trial period, which had proved useful both to prisoners and health care staff. All prisoners on codeine-based medications were assessed on arrival and prescribers worked to reduce this to a minimum.
- 2.85 Copies of the *British National Formulary* in the treatment rooms were out of date and there was no copy in the pharmacy room.
- 2.86 Fridge temperatures were recorded daily; temperatures outside the acceptable range were recorded on several occasions.
- 2.87 Stock management was poor. Some prescription only medicines were used by nurses under the minor ailments policy, named patient medications were being reused as stock and there were some out of date items. There was no audit of out of hours medicines and no evidence that the dates on medicines were being checked. Medication that had been returned by patients were stored in a cupboard instead of being returned to the supplier.
- 2.88 Nurses were accessing medicines from a minor ailments cupboard in the pharmacy and labelling these with the patient's name, drug name and dosage, which was contrary to the regulations. Nurses were also storing medications including prescription only medicines in one of the treatment rooms; there was no audit of this stock by the pharmacist.

- 2.89 The contract was due to change in June 2012, which would increase pharmacy and technician time at the prison.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.90 Medicines management should be strengthened to ensure appropriate policies are implemented, with linked staff training and safe effective stock management and storage.
- 2.91 Pharmacy-led clinics and medicines use reviews should be introduced to inform and educate prisoners and support resettlement.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.92 Men should be able to obtain simple pain relief for use outside health care opening hours.

## Dentistry

---

- 2.93 Dental services were commissioned from an independent dentist, who provided the equivalent of two and a half sessions per week.
- 2.94 There were 46 men on the new patient list and 80 waiting for treatment. First assessments were usually completed within six weeks. Men waited up to 32 weeks, which is unacceptable. In our survey, dental services were the only aspect of health care that significantly fewer men (48%) compared with the comparator establishments (55%), had rated as poor and this was a marked deterioration since our last full inspection.
- 2.95 Prisoners were able to access the full range of NHS dental treatments including prostheses and plates, excluding cosmetic procedures. There was no evidence of oral health promotion.
- 2.96 The dentist made records on SystemOne using a bespoke template and consultations and treatment were recorded on paper dental records (FP 25), which were stored in a locked cabinet. We noted evidence of soft tissue and periodontal examination. X-rays were analogue.
- 2.97 The surgery was clean but there was no physical separation between designated clean and dirty areas and old records were stored in boxes on the floor.
- 2.98 Servicing of most fixed equipment appeared to be up to date; we did not see records for servicing of the chair or arrangements for amalgam separation.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.99 The dental waiting lists should be reviewed and waiting times reduced to reflect NHS waiting times in the community.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.100 All equipment should be checked and serviced in accordance with national and professional requirements.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

---

- 2.101 Integrated mental health services were provided by the Avon and Wiltshire Partnership Mental Health Trust.
- 2.102 A community psychiatric nurse led the core service. There was also a therapist, who provided counselling and a range of therapeutic approaches, including cognitive behavioural therapy to support men with experience of trauma, post traumatic stress disorder, anxiety and other difficulties. A mental health nurse prescriber offered specialist prescribing and staff education. A forensic psychiatrist visited for a monthly half session and acted as the clinical link with regional tertiary services.
- 2.103 The service was accessible and men could self refer. New referrals were assessed within a maximum of seven days, usually sooner; urgent referrals could be seen on the same day. Out of hours and at the weekend, urgent and complex cases were referred to the out of hours GP service or diverted to a prison with inpatient facilities.
- 2.104 There were 40 men, who were currently being supported by the mental health service with up to 20 men requiring the care programme approach.
- 2.105 There was commendable collaborative work with other areas of the prison, such as the canteen and the gym, to support men with specific problems and help them develop coping strategies.
- 2.106 There had been very limited mental health awareness training during the past year for prison staff. The prison planned to start a new programme at the end of April.

## Catering

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.107 Most prisoners said the food was good or very good but black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive about the choice of food available. Facilities for prisoners to cater for themselves were limited.
- 2.108 There was a large, pleasant communal dining hall, where prisoners ate their meals. A strict landing rota controlled the order in which prisoners could attend the hall, ensuring they had equal opportunity to select their preferred food options. In our survey 70% of prisoners said the food was good or very good, an improvement from 39% at our last inspection. However, black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive about the food choices available and little had been done directly since our last inspection to ascertain their views.
- 2.109 Two food surveys carried out last year had received low response rates of 34 and eight respectively. There were no entries in the two prominently displayed food comments books when we looked. The catering team responded to suggestions from the PCC and chapel forums and prisoners with catering experience could cook special meals in the main kitchen for religious and cultural events.



- 2.110 Meals were based on a three-week cycle and menus indicated that there were healthy eating options; other diets were catered for as necessary. Vegetables and herbs grown in the prison were used in the main kitchen. Three meals were served each day; the main cooked meal was served in the evening, and prisoners returning late, received aircraft style meals. The food we sampled was satisfactory.
- 2.111 Prisoners attended food hygiene training during induction and the education department ran a full-time cookery skills course over five weeks, which was popular. Opportunities for prisoners to cook for themselves were limited, as wing kitchens only had microwaves and toasters; C wing also had fridges.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.112 The reasons for the apparent dissatisfaction of black and minority ethnic prisoners with the food should be explored.
- 2.113 Long-term prisoners should have facilities to allow them the opportunity to develop or retain cooking skills.

## Purchases

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.114 The standard shop contract operated well and a reasonable range of goods was available, but some new arrivals had to wait over a week for their first order.
- 2.115 The range of goods available in the prison shop was reasonable and the standard DHL prison shop contract generally worked well. Prisoners collected their own order on a weekly basis but complained that many items were more expensive than those available in supermarkets and other retailers.
- 2.116 The few new arrivals on a Friday had to wait over a week for their first order, although they had the opportunity to buy reception packs.
- 2.117 The system for ordering from catalogues was well used, and free. However, prisoners reported that there were sometimes considerable delays with Argos orders.
- 2.118 Consultation about the shop through the prisoner forum was meaningful and items were regularly rotated as a result.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.119 All prisoners, including new arrivals, should have weekly access to the prison shop.



## Section 3: Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

---

#### Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.<sup>3</sup>

- 3.1 Time out of cell was good. There was a good range of leisure activities, and outside areas offered an excellent environment.
- 3.2 Prisoners were allowed a good amount of time out of their cells. The first roll check was at 7.30am and the last at 11pm, after which prisoners remained in their rooms except to use the toilet. Routines were well publicised and adhered to and association was rarely cancelled. In our survey 84% of prisoners, considerably better than in comparator prisons (74%) said that they went out on exercise three or more times a week.
- 3.3 There was a very good range of leisure activities, and most prisoners we spoke to were very positive about the environment and activities open to them. Prisoners could access the impressive grounds in all weathers, and warm and waterproof clothing was available for those who required it. Efforts were being made to ensure that paths were suitable for mobility impaired prisoners to access the grounds.

### Learning and skills and work activities

---

#### Expected outcomes:

All prisoners can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after their sentence. The learning and skills and work provision is of a good standard and is effective in meeting the needs of all prisoners.

- 3.4 The prison had sufficient places to occupy prisoners fully in purposeful activities. The curriculum in education met the needs of prisoners, but the range of vocational training was too narrow and opportunities to deliver learning in industries and work were missed. Pass rates in the vast majority of courses were high, although too few prisoners were achieving the full vocational qualification. Learners benefited from good learning support from peer mentors and, overall, they were developing good educational and employability skills. Teaching was mostly good in education and learners received good training in the vocational areas where assessment practice was satisfactory. The library provision was excellent.
- 3.5 Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:  
  
Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:     Good

---

<sup>3</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Quality of learning and skills and work provision:

Satisfactory

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:

Satisfactory

## Management of learning and skills and work

---

- 3.6 The operational management of the learning and skills and work providers was good. Regular and open communication between the prison and providers supported the delivery of well-planned courses and ensured the learning and skills and work providers were well involved in monitoring and identifying quality improvements. Good management of risk demonstrated in the learning, skills and work activities had allowed the prison to introduce innovative and beneficial work and learning opportunities for prisoners, such as prison driving jobs.
- 3.7 Since the last inspection, the prison had implemented several changes to improve the quality of the provision delivered. In the skills for life programmes there was a greater emphasis on learning as opposed to passing exams, and a clearer structure was in place for the training prisoners had to take to prepare for resettlement. Although some new vocational work and learning opportunities had been introduced, others, such as fork lift driving, had been discontinued.
- 3.8 There was no formal long-term strategy for the continuous improvement and development of skills and work activities. The prison was not developing the provision in a sufficiently informed and planned way. It was positive that they reacted to the needs of prisoners but they failed to maximise all possible learning opportunities in some work areas. The prison made insufficient use and analysis of data to inform managerial decision making. Data on achievement and participation were only available in differing formats and were not consolidated to inform managers, set demanding targets across the provision or evaluate learner participation and achievement.
- 3.9 The prison had developed extensive quality assurance activities to monitor its learning, skills and work programmes, including the effective monitoring of the quality of teaching delivered by its providers. However, the prison's self-assessment process was insufficiently critical in its evaluation of the provision.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.10 The prison should plan an overall strategy for the development of the learning, skills and work provision that is well informed and consultative and maximises theoretical and practical learning opportunities in all areas.
- 3.11 The prison should improve the use and analysis of data to better inform managerial decisions on learners' participation, progress and achievement.

## Provision of activities

---

- 3.12 There were sufficient activity spaces to occupy the prison population purposefully. Virtually, all prisoners were employed and in addition 45% of them took part in education and 43% in vocational training, which meant that all prisoners were occupied on a full-time basis.
- 3.13 The prison offered the equivalent of 114 full-time spaces in its education provision. Prisoners attended education on a part-time basis on day release from work, although those requiring a

more intensive education intervention could attend full time. Approximately 10 prisoners attended education full time. Education was delivered throughout the week, from Monday to Friday and during two evenings. Thirteen prisoners were engaged in distance learning, undertaking a qualification through the Open University, and a further four were attending college on day release.

- 3.14 There was the equivalent of 109 full-time spaces available in vocational training. This included catering, carpentry, barbering, industrial cleaning and dry stone walling, although the latter course was only offered twice a year.
- 3.15 Prisoners had access to very comprehensive work provision. There were 147 full-time spaces available in the contract workshops and these included wood machinery, printing, packing, distribution and laundry. Some of these were contracted directly with the Ministry of Justice and produced goods such as stationery for the prison estate. Forty orderlies were occupied on a full-time basis as were an additional 78 cleaners.
- 3.16 Approximately, 140 prisoners worked outside the prison, many of them full time. Of these, 39 carried out a paid job and eight were engaged in paid charity work. Forty-seven prisoners were working outside under staff supervision as part of their sentence plan.
- 3.17 New arrivals received a very informative induction to learning and skills that was supportively delivered by prisoners themselves. The information, advice and guidance service was particularly effective at ensuring that prisoners were focused on planning for their release.
- 3.18 Waiting lists were short and well managed according to priority need and length of sentence and the allocation to activities process was timely and equitable. However, the prison did not properly inform newly arrived prisoners about how they would be allocated to work.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.19 **The prison should improve communications with newly arrived prisoners with regards to how work spaces will be allocated to them.**

## Quality of provision

---

- 3.20 Teaching and learning in education were mostly good. Most lessons provided a good level of challenge through a range of interesting tasks and activities. In a few lessons, there was too great a reliance on teachers imparting knowledge and less emphasis on discussion and questioning. Prisoners received an appropriate initial assessment of their literacy and numeracy needs followed by a more in-depth diagnostic. Peer mentors and orderlies delivered very good learning support to prisoners who had been identified as requiring additional assistance. Prisoners gained feedback throughout lessons and in most cases by recording their progress towards targets on simple but effective progress documents. These complemented well their regular progress evaluation tutorials. The education curriculum met the needs of most prisoners well.
- 3.21 In vocational training and work, tutors provided very effective individual coaching, mentoring and general support, which developed prisoners' skills and professional interests well. Assessment practice was sound. Individual learning plans in the vocational areas were generally not used well to plan learning or to set realistic targets. Instead they were primarily a very basic record of achievement and contained broad and, often, imprecise goals. The range of vocational training courses was too narrow. The only construction trade training offered was

a carpentry course at level 1. The number of accredited vocational training spaces available was very small and failed to reflect the prison population and its interests. The opportunities for paid and unpaid work experience via the Through the gate (TTG) programme were of good quality.

- 3.22 Most workshops and vocational areas were resourced to a sufficiently high commercial standard to provide relevant, up to date employability skills development. The roof of the carpentry workshop was in a very poor condition, and had been for many years. Rain leaked copiously onto floors, equipment and work benches; a standard that would not be acceptable in an external commercial carpentry workshop. Despite some improvement since the last inspection, literacy and numeracy skills development were still not sufficiently embedded in vocational training and work.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.23 The prison should increase the range of construction trade training at levels 1 and 2 and vocational courses to meet the needs and interests of prisoners.
- 3.24 The prison should repair the roof of the carpentry workshop as a matter of priority to ensure that the carpentry workshop meets industry standards.
- 3.25 The prison should further embed discrete literacy and numeracy skills development in vocational training and work.

## Education and vocational achievements

---

- 3.26 Outcomes for prisoners attending education were good with 90% of the learners achieving a qualification successfully. There was, however, some variation in success among different courses and prisoners in numeracy programmes at levels 1 and 2 achieved less well. The standard of prisoners' work in education was generally good. In domestic cookery, prisoners prepared food of outstanding quality. Prisoners made good progress with their writing and spelling, including those whose first language was not English.
- 3.27 In vocational training, the number of units gained by prisoners towards National Vocational Qualifications (NVQ) awards was high. However, the number of prisoners gaining the full awards most valued by employers was very low on almost all NVQ programmes. Many prisoners made good progress in the development of employability and craft skills. Standards of work were particularly good in carpentry, barbering, catering and dry stone walling. Skills development within prison industries lacked theory and practical focus. Prisoners undertaking the TTG programme had developed their employability and self-confidence and improved their communication skills. Approximately 140 prisoners worked outside the prison while completing their sentence.
- 3.28 Attendance and punctuality at education, vocational training and work were good. Prisoners' attitude to learning was very good and they developed respectful relationships with their tutors.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.29 The prison should improve the success rates for learners undertaking numeracy qualifications at levels 1 and 2.

- 3.30 The prison should increase the number of full NVQ awards achieved by learners that are most valued by employers to improve prisoners' employability options.

## Library

---

- 3.31 Prisoners benefited from very good access to a well stocked and very well managed library, which was open every day, in the evenings and at weekends, when it was successfully run by well trained orderlies. There was a good range of newspapers and magazines, DVDs, music CDs, fiction and non-fiction books, foreign language texts, graphic novels and quick reads. Legal texts and Prison Service Orders were also available. Membership and borrowing rates were high and stock loss was particularly low.
- 3.32 The library provided good support to education through resource boxes, which were compiled according to the various topics being studied. The good consultation exercise with prisoners meant that the library served their varied needs well.
- 3.33 Many creative and innovative projects that promoted literacy and reading well were managed by the library, enabling prisoners to produce bespoke books and audio books for their children and families.

## Physical education and healthy living

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.34 The promotion of healthy living to prisoners was good. Prisoners had good access to the gym but the lack of a sports hall limited the range of provision available. The range of accredited gym programmes was reasonable and success rates were high but only a few prisoners took a qualification.
- 3.35 The physical education (PE) department was managed well and had a very inclusive and productive ethos. Gym orderlies, well qualified peer mentors and key workers provided excellent support for the PE manager and his two instructors. They worked together extremely well to provide as much high quality PE as possible, given the very low staffing levels.
- 3.36 Prisoners had good access to physical education through a well planned and flexible programme that took into account the significant number of prisoners who were attending activities during the day. These prisoners could access PE from 7.30am each morning and at the end of the working day and during mornings at the weekend. Approximately 55% of prisoners accessed PE frequently.
- 3.37 The department had excellent links with other departments such as health care and education. Remedial PE, through the exercise referral and the 'Fit for life' programmes, provided prisoners with excellent opportunities to address specific needs related to health (including mental health) and fitness. Prisoners attending these programmes had an individual fitness plan against which their progress was monitored frequently. There was also specific provision for prisoners aged over 50. Take up of this very good remedial provision was very high as was the demand for PE courses that supported smoking cessation.

- 3.38 A small number of qualifications were available to prisoners; success rates were good. However, the very small number of qualified staff able to teach these programmes greatly limited the amount of formal accreditation that prisoners could achieve.
- 3.39 The lack of a sports hall restricted severely the ability to provide a broad and balanced PE curriculum as indoor sports and team games could not be played. This presented a serious shortcoming in what was otherwise very good quality provision. It was welcome that the prison had plans to address this.
- 3.40 Although behaviour in the gym was excellent, in the evenings and at weekends there was only one instructor to supervise all provision, including the showers.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.41 **The prison should increase the amount of accredited qualifications achieved by prisoners.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.42 The prison should increase the number of staff supervising the gym in the evenings and at the weekend.



# Section 4: Resettlement

## Strategic management of resettlement

---

### Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival to the prison. Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need. Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

- 4.1 The resettlement strategy was insufficiently comprehensive, based on a limited needs analysis and identified need was not acted upon. There was no 'whole prison' approach to resettlement. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used extensively but many prisoners expressed dissatisfaction with the process.
- 4.2 The resettlement strategy 2011-12 covered all pathways including three extra pathways for offender management, public protection and older prisoners. It did not adequately describe the resettlement services available or the diverse prison population. There were no separate policies to describe the aim of the offender management unit (OMU) or the public protection procedures in place (see section on offender management).
- 4.3 The needs analysis was based on information provided by 160 new receptions in October and November 2010; no use was made of data available from the offender assessment system (OASys). Analysis was limited in scope and did not identify the needs of prisoners across all protected characteristics, or specific groups of prisoners.
- 4.4 Identified needs were not used to inform the action plan and it was not clear whether the needs analysis had led to the creation of new services, or how the resettlement strategy had shaped future plans.
- 4.5 Resettlement strategy meetings took place quarterly, chaired by the head of resettlement and attended by pathway leads. Minutes showed that there had been no representative from health care at any meetings during the last year even though the terms of reference required this.
- 4.6 Resettlement provision was not an agenda item at prisoner consultation meetings and there was a lack of a 'whole prison' approach to resettlement. Wing staff's comments in electronic wing records showed little evidence that they were aware of resettlement needs or involved in the sentence management processes. Wing staff and staff from other areas rarely contributed to sentence planning meetings (see section on offender management). In our survey, 29% of prisoners said that a member of staff had helped them prepare for release, similar to comparator prisons.
- 4.7 Although prisoners' immediate employment or education activity and accommodation were recorded on release, resettlement outcomes for prisoners following release were not monitored.
- 4.8 From October 2011 to March 2012, of the 126 prisoners who had been eligible for home detention curfew (HDC), 99 (78%) were granted HDC.

- 4.9 From September 2011 to February 2012, over 11,000 ROTL of all kinds had been granted for determinate and indeterminate sentenced prisoners. Many prisoners expressed great dissatisfaction with access to ROTL, and in the survey, significantly fewer than in comparator prisons said they had received information about ROTL or had received ROTL. Black and minority ethnic prisoners were significantly more positive than white prisoners about receiving ROTL.
- 4.10 Prisoners were given information about ROTL during induction, at the advice centre and verbally and in writing by offender supervisors but there were no HDC or ROTL surgeries.
- 4.11 The qualifying ROTL periods for indeterminate sentenced prisoners consisted of a testing programme beginning with supervised external work that progressed to unsupervised work placements, and ultimately to overnight release. Offender supervisors spent a significant amount of time managing 'testing' arrangements and delays sometimes occurred with applications because offender managers were undertaking victim charter checks with victim contact units, or there were difficulties finding a space in approved premises.
- 4.12 Suitability for ROTL was decided at weekly risk assessment boards, which appropriately and rigorously assessed public protection, risk management and victim issues although more needed to be done to reassure prisoners of this.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.13 All prison staff should be clear about their responsibilities to support the resettlement process.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.14 All prisoners, including those serving indeterminate sentences should be consulted about resettlement services and continued efforts should be made to help prisoners have realistic expectations of the ROTL process.

## Offender management and planning

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.15 The resettlement strategy did not describe the governance and work of the OMU or public protection procedures. The OMU was appropriately resourced and managed. Sentence plan review boards often did not include contributions from staff outside the OMU. There was a clear commitment to the management of risk of harm to others but the prison needed to ensure that multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) meetings were completed six months pre-release and that relevant risk management plans were in place. The Sentinel project, which provided a risk management process for high risk prisoners, added value to public protection work. There were no forums where indeterminate sentences prisoners could raise issues specific to their needs.

- 4.16 The OMU was an additional pathway in the resettlement strategy. The strategy stated: 'The offender management unit has to be central in becoming the driving force through which prisoners' risk and resettlement needs are identified, planned and achieved.' However, it did not describe the governance, staffing and work of the OMU, links to other departments, or describe its future development (see main recommendation HP60).
- 4.17 The OMU was led by the Head of the OMU and included two offender management teams. The caseload of both teams included some offenders who were 'in scope' for offender management arrangements and some who were not. Team 1 was made up of a mix of prison officers, seconded probation service officers and administrators and managed those prisoners serving more than 12 months who were not covered by Team 2. Team 2 consisted of seconded probation officers and administrators and managed all indeterminate prisoners (ISPs) and the highest risk determinate prisoners such as sex offenders and those convicted of offences against children. A third 'custody team' of case administrators supported the offender management unit arrangements.
- 4.18 Many of the case administrators were part time, in the process of changing from specialist to generic roles and many did not feel confident about this. All offender supervisors were supervised by the senior probation officer, and staff were generally positive about their supervision and management. All staff were clear about their purpose to promote the reduction of reoffending and public protection.
- 4.19 In our survey 90% of men said they had a named offender supervisor significantly higher than in comparator prisons.
- 4.20 Offender supervisors working with in-scope prisoners each had caseloads of about 45; other supervisors had around 70. In addition, offender supervisors produced between four and eight OASys records per month.
- 4.21 The available statistics showed that OASys assessments were generally up to date. OASys data were quality checked and countersigned by a manager but it was not clear if they read the offender supervisors' records of contact with the prisoner, or noted if any action was required.
- 4.22 Inspectors contacted offender managers for information regarding 30 of the most recently released men; we received only eight replies. Fifty per cent said that they had been very involved in the sentence planning process and that the quality of sentence planning and liaison with OMU staff was good; the remainder were less positive.
- 4.23 Inspectors read case files relating to 20 in-scope prisoners. Files were generally well organised and included public protection documents. Some contained security information. It was positive to see an amalgamation of information in one file.
- 4.24 Most OASys assessments had been completed by offender managers at the start of a prisoners' custodial sentence in a previous prison. In 14 cases the likelihood of reoffending had been sufficiently assessed.
- 4.25 An OASys initial sentence plan had been completed in the required timescales in the majority of cases and was informed by relevant assessments in nearly two-thirds. The objectives in plans addressed the likelihood of reoffending and the management of risk of harm. However, nearly two-thirds were not outcome focused, logically sequenced and failed to describe planned levels of contact or, where relevant, cover child protection.

- 4.26 Sentence plans had been shared with all other relevant parties involved in 12 cases and attention had been paid to the methods most likely to be effective in half of them.
- 4.27 There was evidence that prisoners understood the steps they had to take to achieve their sentence plan objectives.
- 4.28 In the survey 71% said they had a sentence plan – a significant improvement from 2007 (49%), but far fewer prisoners (68%) felt that they had been involved in the development of their plan than in 2007 (86%).
- 4.29 Many sentence plan reviews only involved the offender manager, offender supervisor and prisoner; other staff working with the prisoner did not always attend or provide reports. It was not usual practice to invite family members where appropriate.
- 4.30 Offender supervisors were not using the prison computer system P-Nomis to record significant details of work with prisoners so that wing staff could be aware of this, and a contact sheet of information was saved separately. It was not clear whether wing staff could or would have accessed the OASys and this meant that work with prisoners could have been fragmented and inconsistent.
- 4.31 In-scope of offender management prisoners were seen frequently by offender supervisors, out-of-scope prisoners less often; there was uncertainty about the required level of contact. In the survey, significantly more prisoners than in comparator establishments said that their supervisor was working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets.
- 4.32 The quality of contact was good; supervisors effectively engaged with prisoners and there were examples of supervisors delivering purposeful and programmed one to one work. There was scope for more of this work, but supervisors said that they did not have sufficient time.
- 4.33 There was evidence that offender supervisors motivated and supported prisoners and reinforced positive behaviour. In the majority of cases, there was evidence that interventions encouraged and challenged prisoners to take responsibility for their actions and decisions related to offending. Victim awareness work had already been undertaken in 15 cases and, in one case, it was planned that the work would be delivered before the prisoner's release. However there were four cases where there were no plans in place to carry out this work.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.34 **Minimum contact levels between offender supervisors and prisoners should be agreed and details made available to prisoners.**
- 4.35 **Sentence plan review boards should receive contributions from and be attended by other staff involved with the prisoner.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.36 Records should evidence the effective management oversight of individual cases.

## Public protection

---

- 4.37 Although the resettlement strategy contained a pathway for public protection there was no separate policy to describe the arrangements in place.
- 4.38 All prisoners were screened for public protection issues on arrival, and cases were discussed at monthly interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) meetings, which also reviewed prisoners involved with Sentinel (see below) and reviewed existing monitoring arrangements.
- 4.39 In the majority of applicable cases from our sample, there had been sufficient management oversight of the offender supervisor's contribution to assessment and planning, as well as of the management of prisoners posing a risk of serious harm to others. This included all cases with child protection issues.
- 4.40 Screening for sufficient initial risk of serious harm had been completed in 19 cases out of 20. All required an initial full risk of serious harm analysis and this had been completed sufficiently well in 11 cases. In seven cases there was insufficient information or analysis about previous offending. In the majority of cases the risk of serious harm analysis accurately reflected risks to children, the general public, known adults, staff and prisoners. Seven cases contained insufficient risk management plans.
- 4.41 There were 309 prisoners potentially subject to MAPPAs on release. Of these 71 were already identified as being level 1 cases, 62 were level 2, four level 3 and the remaining 172 were MAPPAs where a MAPPA level had not yet been set. All cases in our sample met the criteria for MAPPAs. In seven cases the MAPPAs process had not been activated because the prisoner had more than six months to serve until their anticipated date of release; of the remainder, MAPPAs processes had been used effectively in six out of 13 cases.
- 4.42 Staff contributed to MAPPAs meetings in person, through video conferencing or submitting a report. There were six MAPPAs cases where the prisoners had less than six months to serve before release, and it was not clear if the MAPPAs panel had been notified as required, or if a meeting had been arranged or had taken place.
- 4.43 In the sample, sufficient measures were in place in the prison to protect children from potential harm caused by the prisoner.
- 4.44 Appropriate priority had been accorded to victim safety in 16 out of 17 relevant cases. Where there was an identifiable victim or potential victim there was evidence that the risk of harm was effectively managed.
- 4.45 The Sentinel project, a risk management process for high risk prisoners, managed by the psychology department, provided enhanced monitoring for 20 very high risk prisoners on ROTL for six months. Each prisoner was allocated a psychologist whom he met monthly and the process included meetings with staff and individuals he had contact with inside and outside the prison. At the end of the process a final case review was held and the psychologist provided a report for the parole board outlining how risk had been managed and any other information that was relevant to future risk management.
- 4.46 Sentinel awareness training had been delivered to all prison staff, and to hostel employees and external employers.

- 4.47 A total of 177 prisoners had been returned to closed conditions in 2011. Case conferences were held when a prisoner had broken the rules and staff from across the establishment met to share information, and consider whether he should stay in open conditions. This provided a safeguard against making quick and potentially erroneous decisions and was particularly important for indeterminate sentenced prisoners. However there was no published guidance about the governance and operation of the meetings, or any analysis of decisions made to identify any trends and inform practice and a less rigorous process was in place for determinate sentence prisoners (see section on security).

## Recommendations

---

- 4.48 Risk management plans should robustly address the risk of harm to others in the community as well as in custody.
- 4.49 The IRMT should discuss all high risk MAPPA prisoners six months before their release, ensuring that, when necessary, MAPPA pre-release and supervision plan review boards are organised and OASys reviewed.

## Good practice

---

- 4.50 *The Sentinel project, a risk management process, provided enhanced monitoring for a small number of prisoners on ROTL. This assisted the prisoners, staff and the parole board to better assess how risk of harm associated with these prisoners could best be managed, and if relevant, reduced.*

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

---

- 4.51 There were 31 prisoners on indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPPs) and 131 lifers. The resettlement strategy did not state how it would meet the needs of this group.
- 4.52 On arrival indeterminate sentenced prisoners met the senior probation officer who provided verbal and written information about their management, and they were allocated to a psychologist who carried out a risk assessment.
- 4.53 Of a total of 103 operational staff, 21% had received 'Life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century' training to manage indeterminate sentenced prisoners and six staff (5.8%), had undertaken the more recent 'Managing indeterminate sentences and risk' training.
- 4.54 Many indeterminate sentence prisoners expressed frustration with the ROTL 'testing' process (see section on resettlement) and difficulty accessing information about this, but there were no specific forums where prisoners could raise issues of importance to them.
- 4.55 Parole assessments were up to date.

# Reintegration planning

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.56 There was no sentence planning for prisoners with sentences of less than 12 months although some needs were assessed on arrival and pre-release. Trained peer advisors provided good support, but their work was hampered by a lack of internet access. There were effective accommodation and financial support services. There had been some excellent achievements in supporting prisoners to gain work on release. Arrangements for meeting the health, drug and alcohol issues of prisoners were in place. Arrangements for palliative care were excellent but the new unit required sustainable staffing. No targets had been set to address the needs identified under the children and families pathway and there was no qualified family support but the visits experience was good. There was a need to introduce intervention to address domestic violence.
- 4.57 There was no sentence planning for the few prisoners with sentences of less than 12 months, and no staff member took responsibility for tracking their progress.
- 4.58 Prisoners were expected to help themselves and a wide range of information, help and advice was available from three suitably trained peer advisors in the advice centre, which was open six days a week. Prisoners were made aware of the advice centre during induction. In our survey 83% of prisoners said that they had been given more responsibility at Leyhill than in closed conditions, similar to comparator prisons and an increase from 74% in 2007.
- 4.59 Advice workers had access to telephones but their work was hampered by lack of email and internet access.
- 4.60 Prisoners were seen eight weeks before their release so that any outstanding issues could be identified and acted on. The type of planned accommodation and employment or education activity of each prisoner was recorded on release.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.61 All prisoners serving sentences of less than 12 months should have a sentence plan overseen by a named member of staff.
- 4.62 Peer advice workers should have access to email and internet.

## Accommodation

---

- 4.63 In the survey 7% of prisoners said that they had arrived with housing problems significantly fewer than in the comparator prisons. Offender managers in the community arranged suitable accommodation for life sentenced prisoners and IPPs but a lack of spaces in approved premises, particularly in South Wales, delayed ROTL opportunities for some prisoners.

- 4.64 Peer advisers saw all newly arrived prisoners within 24 hours to identify any housing needs and helped prisoners to search and apply for accommodation. Applications for most accommodation providers could only be made electronically and were managed by the voluntary sector coordinator as peer advisers did not have access. Prisoners could book telephone calls in the centre to speak to housing providers directly.
- 4.65 Only two prisoners had been released without an address in 2011.

## Employment, training and education

---

- 4.66 Prisoners benefited from very good partnerships with community groups and employers. The prison had developed very productive links with approximately 30 community groups and a similar number of employers, which provided a very good range of opportunities for prisoners to gain work or work experience via the 'Through the gate' (TTG) project. The 'Sofa' project provided very valuable opportunities for prisoners who had traditionally been difficult to place in employment or training, to gain work experience. Similarly, the prison had formed a strong partnership with the Sue Ryder organisation at national level and this had proven to be particularly effective in providing retail and supervisory experience to many prisoners.
- 4.67 Approximately one third of prisoners who had been discharged in the last three months had gained full-time employment upon release, which was impressive in the current economic climate. The prison supported prisoners well with their further education, training and employment needs by delivering individualised information, advice and guidance throughout their sentence and, specifically, before their release. The links with probation services were developing well and the transfer of prisoners' achievement information was effectively managed.

## Health care

---

- 4.68 Prisoners were seen a month prior to release and offered information about registering with a GP. They were given a month's supply of prescribed medication and a written health care summary. For men with complex health needs, a copy of the summary was sent to the community GP with their consent.
- 4.69 Some good work, involving discipline staff, was taking place regarding the transfer of prisoners. This enabled men with longstanding mental health problems to make a smooth transition to open conditions. Links with community mental health teams for men subject to the care programme approach were effective. Community mental health teams either visited the prison or made contact by telephone prior to the prisoner's release.
- 4.70 Palliative care arrangements including links with local hospice services were excellent and the new unit was a positive development but lacked sustainable staffing. Before the unit had been built, a prisoner had been successfully cared for on a residential wing over the last year, involving positive collaboration between health care and prison staff to ensure high quality care and a dignified death.

## Drugs and alcohol

---

Group work focused on preparation for release and relapse prevention and there was specific work on cannabis, benzodiazepines and crack cocaine. There was an alcohol workshop for men who only had alcohol problems. Men working out and/or going out on ROTL were



prepared well; this included work towards ensuring that they did not fall through the net with respect to prescribing.

## **Finance, benefit and debt**

---

- 4.71 In the survey 8% of prisoners, significantly lower than in comparator prisons, said that they had arrived with money worries. Peer advisers saw all new prisoners within 24 hours of their arrival to identify any finance needs, and booked appointments for prisoners with a money advice worker employed by A4E, who was available one day a month. A Jobcentre Plus worker, based in the prison two days a week, gave advice on benefits, grants and social fund loans, and set up fresh claim appointments before prisoners' release.
- 4.72 A budgeting and money management course was available as part of the pre-release course and a Citizens Advice Bureau worker delivered a financial literacy session to prisoners during induction.
- 4.73 Prisoners were able to open a bank account with Bristol Credit Union.

## **Children, families and contact with the outside world**

---

- 4.74 In our survey 47% of prisoners said that they had children under the age of 18, and 40%, significantly fewer than in comparator establishments, said that staff had helped them to maintain contact with their family and friends. Only 24% of prisoners said that it was easy for their family and friends to visit, significantly lower than the 57% in comparator prisons.
- 4.75 The needs analysis (see section on resettlement) identified the number of prisoners with children, but did not identify the quality of relationships with partners. The analysis reported numerous reasons why prisoners did not have visits from their children. These included details relating to an ex-partner's reluctance or refusal to allow visits, children's ill health or disability, and prisoners feeling unable to cope with seeing the child leave. No targets had been set to address these needs in the action plan.
- 4.76 There was no qualified family support worker to help prisoners maintain contact and help re-build relationships where appropriate.
- 4.77 The children and family pathway had a named lead worker and frequent pathway meetings took place, but they excluded visitor and prisoner representation. Minutes of meetings showed that there was a focus on existing services such as family days, rather than on developing new initiatives to meet identified needs.
- 4.78 Prisoners who had been sole carers for their child could apply for free letters and phone calls from children. However, telephone calls from children or opportunities to deal with arrangements for them were not generally available. Four family days took place annually organised by a Prison Advice and Care Trust play coordinator, who also managed volunteers in the visits room. Family members were not invited to sentence planning meetings.
- 4.79 Prisoners booked visits themselves by completing a visiting order application. There continued to be no visitors centre and the waiting room was unlocked only 30 minutes before the start of visits. Cold drinks were the only refreshments available from a vending machine until visitors were in the visits room.

- 4.80 Visits were available on Tuesdays, Thursdays and at weekends. The prison was not easily accessible by public transport, although a free bus ran from Bristol once a month. Visitors said that they were treated well by staff and that visits generally started on time. It was good to see that an indication by a drug dog did not automatically result in the visitor concerned having to leave.
- 4.81 The visits room was relaxed and prisoners could play with their children in a supervised play area or enjoy the outside area. Although prisoners were no longer required to wear a prison issue shirt in the visits room, they were still required to wear blue jeans and a top with a collar as well as a green ID badge; there seemed no good reason for this in an open prison.
- 4.82 Prisoners were able to attend a family relationships course in the education department and could record their own story CD for children (through Storybook Dads); this facility had also been much used to send messages to mothers and partners at recent Valentine's and mother's days.
- 4.83 There was little evidence in electronic wing records that wing staff were aware of the family dynamics of prisoners or any resettlement needs.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.84 Targets should be set to meet the needs identified by prisoners relating to contact with family and friends.
- 4.85 A qualified family support worker should be employed.
- 4.86 Prisoners should be able to wear their own choice of clothing in the visits room.
- 4.87 A properly equipped visitors centre should be provided.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.88 There should be provision for incoming calls from children or opportunities to deal with arrangements for them.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 4.89 Prisoners were expected to have completed all necessary reoffending work before their arrival and consequently, no related programmes were available. All prisoners serving an indeterminate sentence were allocated to a psychologist on arrival who undertook a needs and risk assessment, and psychologists worked one to one with those who required specialised cognitive skills follow-up work or support. The need to address domestic violence was identified but such an intervention had not been provided, mainly due to the cost.
- 4.90 The psychologist also managed the prisoners involved in the Sentinel process and had delivered training to staff (see section on public protection).
- 4.91 An independent living skills course was available in education providing long-term prisoners with the knowledge and skills to 'live responsibly and productively' on release; these included tutorials and workshops, as well as escorted trips in the community.

- 4.92 In the survey 54% of prisoners said that they had done something or that something had happened to them that would make them less likely to offend in the future, similar to those in comparator prisons, but significantly fewer than 73% in 2007.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.93 Interventions to address domestic violence should be introduced.

## Additional resettlement services

---

- 4.94 The needs analysis did not identify prisoners' experiences of trauma such as violence and/or sexual, physical and emotional abuse. The extent of these experiences among the population were unknown and, although offender supervisors could, and did, refer prisoners to a therapist who supported those disclosing trauma at twice weekly sessions, the service was not advertised and was not generally known to prisoners.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.95 The work of the therapist should be advertised to prisoners.



# Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

## Main recommendations

To the governor

- 
- 5.1 Strategic management and governance of equality and diversity should be improved so that the prison can meet its obligations in the Equality Act 2010 and unequal outcomes addressed. (HP59)
  - 5.2 There should be a comprehensive resettlement strategy based on a thorough needs analysis of all categories of prisoner drawn from a variety of sources. (HP60)

## Recommendations

To the governor

---

### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.3 Prisoners should be given sufficient notice of transfer along with accurate information about the prison before they are transferred. (1.5)

---

### Early days in custody

- 5.4 All prisoners new to the prison should have a private interview with a member of staff from their first night unit to reassure them about any concerns they might have about moving to an open prison. (1.20)

---

### Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.5 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.41)
- 5.6 Individual care plans should be developed for those prisoners identified as being at risk of harm or neglect. (1.42)

---

### Security

- 5.7 Efforts should be made to collate information about the reasons prisoners abscond once they are returned to custody. (1.51)
- 5.8 A transparent, multidisciplinary process should inform all decisions to transfer all prisoners to closed conditions. All new arrivals should be informed of this process and the circumstances under which they will be transferred to closed conditions. (1.52)

## **Incentives and earned privileges**

---

- 5.9 The facilities' list should at the very least be comparable to those found in prisons in closed estates. (1.57)

## **Substance misuse**

---

- 5.10 A review of the need for the IDTS programme should be undertaken. (1.75)

## **Residential units**

---

- 5.11 Dormitories should afford some privacy and be equipped so that each prisoner has a bed, chair, lockable cabinet, adequate storage for personal belongings and the use of a table. (2.11)
- 5.12 Ablution areas on A and B wings should be deep cleaned and refurbished where necessary. (2.12)
- 5.13 Prisoners should be able to access their stored property on request. (2.13)

## **Staff-prisoner relationships**

---

- 5.14 Wing staff should pro-actively engage with prisoners and should not congregate in wing offices. (2.22)
- 5.15 Management checks of personal officer reports should ensure that entries are balanced and detailed and indicate interaction. (2.23)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.16 Arrangements should be made to ensure that there is regular external community involvement and scrutiny of the work of the DREAT including DIRFS. (2.29)
- 5.17 There should be consultation and support arrangements for each strand of equality. These should aim to identify areas of concern, initiate debate and action planning, seek authority from the DREAT and communicate back to prisoners. (2.30)
- 5.18 Formal care planning for prisoners with disabilities should be introduced. (2.43)

## **Complaints**

---

- 5.19 The prison should seek to understand the reasons for prisoners' anxieties about submitting complaints, and implement strategies to further improve confidence in the system. (2.55)

## **Health services**

---

- 5.20 The roles and responsibilities carried out by health care support workers should be reviewed to ensure the appropriate and safe delegation of clinical responsibilities. (2.71)

- 5.21 Medicines management should be strengthened to ensure appropriate policies are implemented, with linked staff training and safe effective stock management and storage. (2.90)
- 5.22 Pharmacy-led clinics and medicines use reviews should be introduced to inform and educate prisoners and support resettlement. (2.91)
- 5.23 The dental waiting lists should be reviewed and waiting times reduced to reflect NHS waiting times in the community. (2.99)

### **Catering**

---

- 5.24 The reasons for the apparent dissatisfaction of black and minority ethnic prisoners with the food should be explored. (2.112)
- 5.25 Long-term prisoners should have facilities to allow them the opportunity to develop or retain cooking skills. (2.113)

### **Purchases**

---

- 5.26 All prisoners, including new arrivals, should have weekly access to the prison shop. (2.119)

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

---

- 5.27 The prison should plan an overall strategy for the development of the learning, skills and work provision that is well informed and consultative and maximises theoretical and practical learning opportunities in all areas. (3.10)
- 5.28 The prison should improve the use and analysis of data to better inform managerial decisions on learners' participation, progress and achievement. (3.11)
- 5.29 The prison should improve communications with newly arrived prisoners with regards to how work spaces will be allocated to them. (3.19)
- 5.30 The prison should increase the range of construction trade training at levels 1 and 2 and vocational courses to meet the needs and interests of prisoners. (3.23)
- 5.31 The prison should repair the roof of the carpentry workshop as a matter of priority to ensure that the carpentry workshop meets industry standards. (3.24)
- 5.32 The prison should further embed discrete literacy and numeracy skills development in vocational training and work. (3.25)
- 5.33 The prison should improve the success rates for learners undertaking numeracy qualifications at levels 1 and 2. (3.29)
- 5.34 The prison should increase the number of full NVQ awards achieved by learners that are most valued by employers to improve prisoners' employability options. (3.30)

### **Physical education and healthy living**

---

- 5.35 The prison should increase the amount of accredited qualifications achieved by prisoners. (3.41)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 5.36 All prison staff should be clear about their responsibilities to support the resettlement process. (4.13)

### **Offender management and planning**

---

- 5.37 Minimum contact levels between offender supervisors and prisoners should be agreed and details made available to prisoners. (4.34)
- 5.38 Sentence plan review boards should receive contributions from and be attended by other staff involved with the prisoner. (4.35)
- 5.39 Risk management plans should robustly address the risk of harm to others in the community as well as in custody. (4.48)
- 5.40 The IRMT should discuss all high risk MAPPA prisoners six months before their release, ensuring that, when necessary, MAPPA pre-release and supervision plan review boards are organised and OASys reviewed. (4.49)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.41 All prisoners serving sentences of less than 12 months should have a sentence plan overseen by a named member of staff. (4.61)
- 5.42 Peer advice workers should have access to email and internet. (4.62)
- 5.43 Targets should be set to meet the needs identified by prisoners relating to contact with family and friends. (4.84)
- 5.44 A qualified family support worker should be employed. (4.85)
- 5.45 Prisoners should be able to wear their own choice of clothing in the visits room. (4.86)
- 5.46 A properly equipped visitors centre should be provided. (4.87)
- 5.47 Interventions to address domestic violence should be introduced. (4.93)

### **Housekeeping points**

---

#### **Bullying and violence reduction**

---

- 5.48 Health care and security department representatives should attend the safer custody meetings consistently. (1.29)



### **Residential units**

---

- 5.49 Staff supervising cleaning parties should receive training to ensure the appropriate use and storage of cleaning materials and equipment. (2.14)
- 5.50 Hoods should be fitted to the two newly installed telephones on C wing. (2.15)

### **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.51 The prison should appoint additional paid prisoner carers. (2.44)
- 5.52 The process for identifying prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability should be confidential. (2.45)

### **Faith and religious activity**

---

- 5.53 The reception area of the chapel should be made more faith inclusive. (2.50)

### **Health services**

---

- 5.54 There should be formal arrangements with local NHS and social care providers for the assessment and loan of mobility and functional aids. (2.78)
- 5.55 Men should be able to obtain simple pain relief for use outside health care opening hours. (2.92)
- 5.56 All equipment should be checked and serviced in accordance with national and professional requirements. (2.100)

### **Physical education and healthy living**

---

- 5.57 The prison should increase the number of staff supervising the gym in the evenings and at the weekend. (3.42)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 5.58 All prisoners, including those serving indeterminate sentences should be consulted about resettlement services and continued efforts should be made to help prisoners have realistic expectations of the ROTL process. (4.14)

### **Offender management and planning**

---

- 5.59 Records should evidence the effective management oversight of individual cases. (4.36)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.60 There should be provision for incoming calls from children or opportunities to deal with arrangements for them. (4.88)

5.61 The work of the therapist should be advertised to prisoners. (4.95)

### **Example of good practice**

---

5.62 The Sentinel project, a risk management process, provided enhanced monitoring for a small number of prisoners on ROTL. This assisted the prisoners, staff and the parole board to better assess how risk of harm associated with these prisoners could best be managed, and if relevant, reduced. (4.50)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Rosemarie Bugdale	Inspector
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Martin Owens	Inspector
Jessica Broughton	Researcher
Olayinka Macauley	Researcher
Alice Reid	Researcher

### **Specialist inspectors**

Nicola Rabjohns	Health care and drugs inspector
Deborah Hylands	Pharmacy inspector
Jane Poole	Care Quality Commission inspector
Nick Crombie	Ofsted inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted inspector
Nigel Scarff	Lead probation inspector
Eileen O'Sullivan	Probation inspector
Ian Simpkins	Probation inspector

## Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	0	490	97.4
Recall	0	13	2.6
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0
Remand	0	0	0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	0	0
Less than 6 months	0	3	0.6
6 months to less than 12 months	0	17	3.4
12 months to less than 2 years	0	18	3.6
2 years to less than 4 years	0	29	5.8
4 years to less than 10 years	0	43	8.5
10 years and over (not life)	0	192	38.2
ISPP	0	37	7.4
Life	0	164	32.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age	24	-
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	82	16.3
30 years to 39 years	143	28.4
40 years to 49 years	134	26.6
50 years to 59 years	86	17.1
60 years to 69 years	45	8.9
70 plus years	13	2.6
Please state maximum age	83	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	0	481	95.6
95.4% foreign nationals	0	22	4.4
Not stated	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	0	0
Uncategorised sentenced	0	0	0
Cat A	0	0	0
Cat B	0	0	0
Cat C	0	20	4
Cat D	0	483	96
Other	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	0	358	71.2
Irish	0	2	0.4
Other white	0	18	3.6
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	7	1.4
White and Black African	0	0	0
White and Asian	0	2	0.4
Other Mixed	0	1	0.2
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	20	4
Pakistani	0	12	2.4
Bangladeshi	0	1	0.2
Other Asian	0	9	1.8
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	32	6.4
African	0	9	1.8
Other black	0	13	2.6
Chinese or other ethnic group			
Chinese	0	1	0.2
Other ethnic group	0	1	0.2
Not stated	0	17	3.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	2	0.4
Church of England	0	154	30.6
Roman Catholic	0	62	12.3
Other Christian denominations	0	50	9.9
Muslim	0	52	10.3
Sikh	0	13	2.6
Hindu	0	2	0.4
Buddhist	0	10	2
Jewish	0	0	0
Other	0	10	2
No religion	0	147	29.2
Not stated	0	1	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

#### Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	67	13.3
1 month to 3 months	0	0	119	23.7
3 months to 6 months	0	0	79	15.7
6 months to 1 year	0	0	137	27.3
1 year to 2 years	0	0	65	12.9
2 years to 4 years	0	0	29	5.8
4 years or more		0	7	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

**Unsentenced prisoners only**

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

Main offence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	0	60	11.9
Sexual offences	0	74	14.7
Burglary	0	29	5.8
Robbery	0	49	9.7
Theft and handling	0	32	6.4
Fraud and forgery	0	33	6.6
Drugs offences	0	87	17.3
Other offences	0	131	26
Civil offences	0	0	0
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	0	8	1.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>100</b>

# Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

---

## Prisoner survey methodology

---

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

## Choosing the sample size

---

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

At the time of the survey on 26 March 2012 the prisoner population at HMP Leyhill was 489. The sample size was 210. Overall, this represented 43% of the prisoner population.

## Selecting the sample

---

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

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. No respondents required an interview.

## 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;
- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- to 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, 170 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 35% of the prison population. The response rate was 81%. In addition to the four respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 19 questionnaires were not returned and 17 were returned blank.

## 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 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 13 open prisons since April 2008.

- The current survey responses in 2012 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Leyhill in 2007.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

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.

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

## Summary

---

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question 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 is excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data is 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 has been weighted for comparison purposes.

# Survey results

## Section 1: About you

<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	<i>Under 21</i> .....	0	(0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i> .....	28	(16%)
	<i>30 - 39</i> .....	43	(25%)
	<i>40 - 49</i> .....	54	(32%)
	<i>50 - 59</i> .....	28	(16%)
	<i>60 - 69</i> .....	12	(7%)
	<i>70 and over</i> .....	5	(3%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you on recall?</b>		
	Yes.....	12	(7%)
	No.....	155	(93%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	<i>Less than 6 months</i> .....	4	(2%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i> .....	7	(4%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i> .....	11	(6%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i> .....	25	(15%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i> .....	54	(32%)
	<i>10 years or more</i> .....	13	(8%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i> .....	18	(11%)
	<i>Life</i> .....	38	(22%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)</b>		
	Yes.....	9	(5%)
	No.....	158	(95%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	Yes.....	167	(99%)
	No.....	2	(1%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	Yes.....	168	(99%)
	No.....	2	(1%)
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)....</i>	125 (74%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese....</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	4 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i> .....	5 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> ..... 4 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....	10 (6%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> ..... 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i> ....	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> ..... 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i> ....	12 (7%)	<i>Arab</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> .....	6 (4%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> ..... 0 (0%)

Asian or Asian British - 1 (1%)  
 Bangladeshi.....

**Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?**  
 Yes..... 3 (2%)  
 No..... 163 (98%)

**Q1.10 What is your religion?**

None .....	40 (24%)	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
Church of England.....	65 (39%)	Jewish.....	1 (1%)
Catholic.....	24 (14%)	Muslim .....	10 (6%)
Protestant.....	1 (1%)	Sikh .....	9 (5%)
Other Christian denomination.....	7 (4%)	Other.....	6 (4%)
Buddhist .....	4 (2%)		

**Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?**

Heterosexual/straight .....	155 (93%)
Homosexual/gay .....	5 (3%)
Bisexual.....	6 (4%)

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

Yes .....	33 (20%)
No.....	135 (80%)

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

Yes .....	15 (9%)
No.....	154 (91%)

**Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?**

Yes .....	93 (55%)
No.....	77 (45%)

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

Yes .....	79 (46%)
No.....	91 (54%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

**Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?**

Less than 2 hours .....	59 (35%)
2 hours or longer.....	106 (63%)
Don't remember .....	4 (2%)

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

<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	59 (35%)
Yes .....	85 (51%)
No.....	20 (12%)
Don't remember .....	4 (2%)

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

<b>My journey was less than two hours</b> .....	59 (35%)
Yes .....	17 (10%)
No.....	92 (54%)

	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes .....	132 (78%)
	No.....	30 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	8 (5%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes.....	153 (90%)
	No.....	16 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	70 (41%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	78 (46%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	17 (10%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i> .....	130 (76%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i> .....	32 (19%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i> .....	15 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes.....	159 (94%)
	No.....	10 (6%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (1%)

### Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	154 (91%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	4 (2%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes.....	157 (94%)
	No .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	7 (4%)
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	68 (40%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	87 (51%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	11 (6%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (1%)

- Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |   |         |  |           |
|---|---------|--|-----------|
| <i>Loss of property</i> .....           | 14 (8%) | <i>Physical health</i> .....                         | 13 (8%)   |
| <i>Housing problems</i> .....           | 11 (7%) | <i>Mental health</i> .....                           | 12 (7%)   |
| <i>Contacting employers</i> .....       | 2 (1%)  | <i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> ..... | 4 (2%)    |
| <i>Contacting family</i> .....          | 15 (9%) | <i>Getting phone numbers</i> .....                   | 5 (3%)    |
| <i>Childcare</i> .....                  | 1 (1%)  | <i>Other</i> .....                                   | 2 (1%)    |
| <i>Money worries</i> .....              | 13 (8%) | <b>Did not have any problems</b> ...                 | 101 (60%) |
| <i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> .. | 4 (2%)  |  |           |
- Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?**
- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Yes .....                              | 34 (21%)  |
| No.....                                | 30 (18%)  |
| <b>Did not have any problems</b> ..... | 101 (61%) |
- Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>Tobacco</i> .....                  | 105 (63%) |
| <i>A shower</i> .....                 | 71 (42%)  |
| <i>A free telephone call</i> .....    | 77 (46%)  |
| <i>Something to eat</i> .....         | 87 (52%)  |
| <i>PIN phone credit</i> .....         | 87 (52%)  |
| <i>Toiletries/basic items</i> .....   | 82 (49%)  |
| <b>Did not receive anything</b> ..... | 14 (8%)   |
- Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Chaplain</i> .....                            | 109 (66%) |
| <i>Someone from health services</i> .....        | 135 (81%) |
| <i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> .....               | 80 (48%)  |
| <i>Prison shop/canteen</i> .....                 | 43 (26%)  |
| <b>Did not have access to any of these</b> ..... | 14 (8%)   |
- Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <i>What was going to happen to you</i> .....                                     | 118 (72%) |
| <i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> ..... | 88 (53%)  |
| <i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> .....                         | 110 (67%) |
| <i>Your entitlement to visits</i> .....  | 101 (61%) |
| <i>Health services</i> .....   | 119 (72%) |
| <i>Chaplaincy</i> .....  | 103 (62%) |
| <b>Not offered any information</b> .....   | 19 (12%)  |
- Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- |                             |           |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Yes .....                   | 159 (94%) |
| No.....                     | 8 (5%)    |
| <i>Don't remember</i> ..... | 3 (2%)    |
- Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**
- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Have not been on an induction course</b> ..... | 3 (2%)    |
| <i>Within the first week</i> .....                | 160 (95%) |
| <i>More than a week</i> .....                     | 1 (1%)    |
| <i>Don't remember</i> .....                       | 5 (3%)    |

**Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?**  
*Have not been on an induction course*..... 3 (2%)  
 Yes ..... 136 (80%)  
 No..... 27 (16%)  
 Don't remember ..... 4 (2%)

**Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?**  
*Did not receive an assessment*..... 17 (10%)  
 Within the first week ..... 96 (57%)  
 More than a week ..... 34 (20%)  
 Don't remember ..... 20 (12%)

### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

**Q4.1 How easy is it to:**

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
<i>Communicate with your solicitor / legal representative?</i>	68 (41%)	53 (32%)	11 (7%)	8 (5%)	1 (1%)	24 (15%)
<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	43 (29%)	44 (30%)	12 (8%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	46 (31%)

**Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?**  
*Not had any letters* ..... 36 (21%)  
 Yes ..... 29 (17%)  
 No..... 105 (62%)

**Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?**  
 Yes ..... 87 (52%)  
 No..... 4 (2%)  
 Don't know ..... 77 (46%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	168 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	163 (98%)	1 (1%)	3 (2%)
<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	151 (90%)	14 (8%)	3 (2%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	141 (84%)	25 (15%)	2 (1%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	71 (44%)	36 (22%)	56 (34%)

**Q4.5 What is the food like here?**  
*Very good*..... 18 (11%)  
*Good* ..... 100 (59%)  
*Neither* ..... 37 (22%)  
*Bad*..... 10 (6%)  
*Very bad*..... 4 (2%)

<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)
	Yes.....	98 (58%)
	No.....	71 (42%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?</b>	
	Yes.....	138 (81%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	31 (18%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes.....	102 (61%)
	No.....	17 (10%)
	<i>Don't know/N/A</i> .....	49 (29%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes.....	130 (76%)
	No.....	2 (1%)
	<i>Don't know/N/A</i> .....	38 (22%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i> .....	39 (23%)
	Very easy.....	67 (40%)
	Easy.....	34 (20%)
	Neither.....	1 (1%)
	Difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	23 (14%)

## Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>			
	Yes.....	167 (98%)		
	No.....	0 (0%)		
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (2%)		
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications:</b>			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		<b>Not made one</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	14 (9%)	130 (82%)	15 (9%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	14 (9%)	121 (77%)	23 (15%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes.....		96 (58%)	
	No.....		12 (7%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		58 (35%)	
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints:</b>			
	<i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		<b>Not made one</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	106 (64%)	38 (23%)	21 (13%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	106 (68%)	36 (23%)	15 (10%)

<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>	
	Yes.....	15 (10%)
	No.....	134 (90%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i> .....	53 (33%)
	Very easy.....	27 (17%)
	Easy.....	31 (19%)
	Neither.....	39 (24%)
	Difficult.....	8 (5%)
	Very difficult.....	2 (1%)

## Section 6: Relationships with staff

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes.....	141 (84%)
	No.....	26 (16%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	Yes.....	139 (84%)
	No.....	27 (16%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes.....	61 (36%)
	No.....	107 (64%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	14 (8%)
	Never.....	44 (26%)
	Rarely.....	37 (22%)
	Some of the time.....	42 (25%)
	Most of the time.....	19 (11%)
	All of the time.....	11 (7%)
<b>Q6.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	36 (21%)
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	71 (42%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	43 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	19 (11%)
<b>Q6.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i> .....	36 (21%)
	Very helpful.....	55 (33%)
	Helpful.....	50 (30%)
	Neither.....	18 (11%)
	Not very helpful.....	6 (4%)
	Not at all helpful.....	3 (2%)

## Section 7: Safety

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes.....	28 (17%)



No..... 141 (83%)

**Q7.2 Do you feel unsafe now?**

Yes ..... 5 (3%)  
 No..... 164 (97%)

**Q7.3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<b>Never felt unsafe</b> ..... 141 (85%)	<i>At mealtimes</i> ..... 7 (4%)
<i>Everywhere</i> ..... 7 (4%)	<i>At health services</i> ..... 2 (1%)
<i>Association areas</i> ..... 8 (5%)	<i>Visits area</i> ..... 4 (2%)
<i>Reception area</i> ..... 1 (1%)	<i>In wing showers</i> ..... 6 (4%)
<i>At the gym</i> ..... 5 (3%)	<i>In gym showers</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i> ..... 4 (2%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> ..... 6 (4%)
<i>At work</i> ..... 5 (3%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> ..... 9 (5%)
<i>During movement</i> ..... 4 (2%)	<i>In your cell</i> ..... 6 (4%)
<i>At education</i> ..... 7 (4%)	<i>At religious services</i> ..... 0 (0%)

**Q7.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?**

Yes ..... 32 (19%)  
 No..... 138 (81%)

**Q7.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> ..... 14 (8%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> ..... 0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> ..... 19 (11%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>Medication</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i> ..... 3 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i> ..... 1 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> ..... 4 (2%)
<i>You are from a Traveller community</i> ..... 0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i> ..... 3 (2%)
<i>Your age</i> ..... 3 (2%)
<i>You have a disability</i> ..... 2 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i> ..... 5 (3%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i> ..... 13 (8%)
<i>Gang related issues</i> ..... 0 (0%)

**Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?**

Yes ..... 23 (14%)  
 No..... 145 (86%)

**Q7.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> ..... 9 (5%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> ..... 0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i> ..... 0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> ..... 10 (6%)
<i>Medication</i> ..... 0 (0%)
<i>Debt</i> ..... 0 (0%)

Drugs.....	0 (0%)
Your race or ethnic origin.....	2 (1%)
Your religion/religious beliefs.....	1 (1%)
Your nationality.....	3 (2%)
You are from a different part of the country than others.....	4 (2%)
You are from a Traveller community.....	0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation.....	0 (0%)
Your age.....	1 (1%)
You have a disability.....	4 (2%)
You were new here.....	3 (2%)
Your offence/crime.....	5 (3%)
Gang related issues.....	0 (0%)

**Q7.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?**

<b>Not been victimised</b> .....	125 (76%)
Yes.....	16 (10%)
No.....	23 (14%)

### Section 8: Health services

**Q8.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	19 (12%)	25 (15%)	71 (44%)	14 (9%)	30 (18%)	4 (2%)
The nurse	6 (4%)	63 (38%)	80 (48%)	10 (6%)	6 (4%)	1 (1%)
The dentist	36 (22%)	14 (9%)	25 (15%)	6 (4%)	51 (31%)	31 (19%)

**Q8.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?**

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	30 (18%)	42 (26%)	59 (36%)	15 (9%)	13 (8%)	5 (3%)
The nurse	9 (5%)	74 (45%)	60 (36%)	12 (7%)	8 (5%)	3 (2%)
The dentist	56 (35%)	23 (14%)	26 (16%)	19 (12%)	20 (13%)	15 (9%)

**Q8.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?**

<b>Not been</b> .....	9 (5%)
<i>Very good</i> .....	46 (28%)
<i>Good</i> .....	73 (44%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	20 (12%)
<i>Bad</i> .....	13 (8%)
<i>Very bad</i> .....	5 (3%)

**Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?**

Yes.....	89 (53%)
No.....	80 (47%)

**Q8.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?**

<b>Not taking medication</b> .....	80 (47%)
Yes, all my meds.....	87 (51%)
Yes, some of my meds.....	2 (1%)
No.....	0 (0%)

**Q8.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?**

Yes.....	26 (16%)
No.....	141 (84%)

<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison</b> (e.g. psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<b>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</b> .....	141 (85%)
	Yes .....	20 (12%)
	No .....	5 (3%)

## Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	16 (9%)
	No .....	153 (91%)
<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	16 (9%)
	No .....	153 (91%)
<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy .....	35 (21%)
	Easy .....	28 (17%)
	Neither .....	8 (5%)
	Difficult .....	2 (1%)
	Very difficult .....	3 (2%)
	Don't know .....	90 (54%)
<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy .....	20 (12%)
	Easy .....	22 (13%)
	Neither .....	6 (4%)
	Difficult .....	9 (5%)
	Very difficult .....	6 (4%)
	Don't know .....	104 (62%)
<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	4 (2%)
	No .....	162 (98%)
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	2 (1%)
	No .....	165 (99%)
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<b>Did not /do not have a drug problem</b> .....	148 (92%)
	Yes .....	10 (6%)
	No .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q9.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<b>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</b> .....	153 (94%)
	Yes .....	8 (5%)
	No .....	2 (1%)

<b>Q9.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i> .....	148 (90%)
	Yes .....	16 (10%)
	No .....	0 (0%)

## Section 10: Activities

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	
						<i>Very difficult</i>	
	Prison job	6 (4%)	76 (46%)	68 (41%)	8 (5%)	6 (4%)	2 (1%)
	Vocational or skills training	21 (13%)	28 (18%)	68 (43%)	16 (10%)	15 (9%)	10 (6%)
	Education (including basic skills)	17 (11%)	33 (21%)	85 (54%)	9 (6%)	10 (6%)	4 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	69 (45%)	15 (10%)	31 (20%)	21 (14%)	11 (7%)	7 (5%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i> .....					19 (12%)	
	Prison job .....					130 (80%)	
	Vocational or skills training .....					33 (20%)	
	Education (including basic skills) .....					47 (29%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes .....					7 (4%)	
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	6 (4%)	65 (44%)	64 (44%)	12 (8%)		
	Vocational or skills training	23 (20%)	55 (48%)	26 (23%)	11 (10%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	14 (11%)	72 (59%)	31 (25%)	6 (5%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	36 (33%)	41 (38%)	20 (19%)	11 (10%)		
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....					6 (4%)	
	<i>Never</i> .....					14 (8%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....					51 (31%)	
	<i>About once a week</i> .....					43 (26%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....					52 (31%)	
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....					21 (13%)	
	Yes .....					138 (83%)	
	No .....					7 (4%)	
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....					33 (20%)	
	<i>0</i> .....					39 (24%)	
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....					34 (21%)	
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....					37 (22%)	
	<i>More than 5</i> .....					22 (13%)	

<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	3 (2%)
	0.....	2 (1%)
	1 to 2 .....	22 (13%)
	3 to 5 .....	32 (19%)
	More than 5.....	109 (65%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	7 (4%)
	0.....	6 (4%)
	1 to 2 .....	11 (7%)
	3 to 5 .....	10 (6%)
	More than 5 .....	132 (80%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....	4 (2%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....	16 (10%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....	34 (21%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....	94 (57%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (5%)

### Section 11: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	Yes.....	66 (40%)
	No.....	98 (60%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes.....	24 (15%)
	No.....	141 (85%)
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes.....	14 (8%)
	No.....	152 (92%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	25 (15%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	27 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	42 (25%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	44 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (3%)

### Section 12: Preparation for release

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	Yes.....	156 (93%)
	No.....	12 (7%)

<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/NA</i> .....	12 (7%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	19 (11%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	92 (55%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	90 (54%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	53 (32%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	151 (90%)
	<i>No</i> .....	17 (10%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	116 (71%)
	<i>No</i> .....	48 (29%)
<b>Q12.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	48 (29%)
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	35 (21%)
	<i>Involved</i> .....	44 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	10 (6%)
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	18 (11%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	9 (5%)
<b>Q12.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	48 (31%)
	<i>Nobody</i> .....	26 (17%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i> .....	71 (45%)
	<i>Offender manager</i> .....	50 (32%)
	<i>Named/personal officer</i> .....	26 (17%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i> .....	25 (16%)
<b>Q12.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	48 (31%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	72 (46%)
	<i>No</i> .....	21 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	14 (9%)
<b>Q12.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	48 (30%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>No</i> .....	93 (59%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	10 (6%)
<b>Q12.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	48 (30%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	64 (41%)
	<i>No</i> .....	27 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	19 (12%)
<b>Q12.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	12 (7%)
	<i>No</i> .....	82 (51%)

Don't know ..... 68 (42%)

**Q12.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?**  
 Yes ..... 45 (29%)  
 No ..... 111 (71%)

**Q12.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	47 (30%)	56 (36%)	54 (34%)
Accommodation	49 (32%)	46 (30%)	59 (38%)
Benefits	41 (27%)	64 (42%)	48 (31%)
Finances	49 (33%)	48 (32%)	53 (35%)
Education	49 (33%)	54 (36%)	45 (30%)
Drugs and alcohol	71 (49%)	47 (32%)	28 (19%)

**Q12.13 Have you been provided with information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	110 (69%)	50 (31%)
Resettlement overnight release	105 (68%)	50 (32%)

**Q12.14 Have you had access to the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	79 (52%)	74 (48%)
Resettlement overnight release	69 (45%)	86 (55%)
Special purpose leave	24 (17%)	114 (83%)

**Q12.15 Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release?**

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	38 (23%)	125 (77%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc.)?	43 (26%)	121 (74%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	136 (83%)	27 (17%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course?	38 (23%)	126 (77%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address?	41 (25%)	120 (75%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future?	88 (54%)	74 (46%)

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Leyhill 2012

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

#### Key to tables

		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>170</b>	<b>1362</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	3%	7%	2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	7%	9%	7%	16%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	11%	5%	11%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	4%	5%	0%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	100%	99%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	21%	27%	21%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	3%	2%	
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	11%	6%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	7%	1%	7%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	10%	20%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	9%	5%	9%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	51%	55%	49%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	47%	54%	47%	51%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	63%	43%	63%	44%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	78%	73%	78%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	16%	15%	16%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	78%		78%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	90%	88%	90%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	87%	67%	87%	71%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	77%	96%	77%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	19%	7%	19%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	94%	94%	94%	87%



Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	91%	76%	91%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	94%	84%	94%	77%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	91%	73%	91%	82%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	40%	46%	40%	38%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	9%	8%	7%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	7%	13%	7%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	4%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	9%	15%	9%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	4%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	8%	12%	8%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	3%	8%	3%	6%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	8%	5%	8%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	7%	5%	7%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	3%	2%	3%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	3%	13%	3%	
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	53%	50%	53%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	63%	80%	63%	62%
3.6	A shower?	42%	60%	42%	68%
3.6	A free telephone call?	46%	49%	46%	66%
3.6	Something to eat?	52%	75%	52%	76%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	52%	50%	52%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	49%	54%	49%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	66%		66%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	81%		81%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	48%		48%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	26%	16%	26%	30%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	72%	59%	72%	59%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	53%	46%	53%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	67%	52%	67%	45%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	61%	57%	61%	49%
3.8	Health services?	72%	64%	72%	
3.8	The chaplaincy?	62%	51%	62%	
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	94%	91%	94%	92%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	98%	97%	98%	94%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	82%	72%	82%	67%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	90%	58%	90%	
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	73%	61%	73%	58%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	59%	51%	59%	56%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	17%	28%	17%	21%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	52%	38%	52%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	97%	99%	95%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	98%	86%	98%	97%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	90%	73%	90%	68%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	84%	77%	84%	89%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	44%	55%	44%	39%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	70%	36%	70%	39%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	58%	48%	58%	73%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	81%	54%	81%	73%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	58%	61%	61%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	77%	61%	77%	68%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	61%	49%	61%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	98%	88%	98%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	90%	74%	90%	69%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	84%	69%	84%	72%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	66%	58%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	65%	37%	65%	34%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	71%	45%	71%	57%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	10%	20%	10%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	36%	40%	36%	52%
<b>SECTION 6: Relationships with staff</b>					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	84%	71%	84%	76%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	84%	73%	84%	73%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	36%	51%	36%	
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	18%	17%	18%	12%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	79%	64%	79%	70%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	80%	73%	80%	76%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 7: Safety</b>					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	17%	15%	17%	18%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	3%	5%	3%	5%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	19%	7%	19%	11%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	3%	8%	8%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	5%	11%	
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	0%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	0%	2%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	0%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	1%	2%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	0%	2%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%	2%	
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	2%	3%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	1%	8%	
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 7: Safety continued</b>					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	14%	17%	14%	9%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	7%	5%	6%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	8%	6%	
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	5%	2%	
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%	3%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	1%	3%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	5%	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	2%	3%	
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	41%	24%	41%	7%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 8: Health services</b>					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	59%	59%	59%	
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	86%	77%	86%	
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	24%	29%	24%	
	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:				
8.2	The doctor?	75%	72%	75%	77%
8.2	The nurse?	85%	76%	85%	83%
8.2	The dentist?	48%	55%	48%	76%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	76%	66%	76%	70%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	53%	41%	53%	39%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	100%	100%	
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	16%	13%	16%	
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	81%		81%	
<b>SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	9%	10%	9%	6%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	9%	8%	9%	3%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	38%	32%	38%	50%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	25%	14%	25%	
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	3%	3%	3%	
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	1%	0%	1%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	76%	100%	76%	
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	79%	100%	79%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	100%	84%	100%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 10: Activities</b>					
	Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:				
10.1	A prison job?	87%	61%	87%	
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	61%	39%	61%	
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	75%	39%	75%	
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	30%	35%	30%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.2	A prison job?	80%	76%	80%	
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	20%	21%	20%	
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	29%	30%	29%	
10.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	4%	9%	4%	
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	96%	92%	96%	
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	46%	46%	46%	
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	80%	77%	80%	
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	60%	69%	60%	
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	89%	84%	89%	
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	66%	70%	66%	
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	67%	70%	67%	
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	57%	50%	57%	
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	57%	58%	57%	69%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	83%	77%	83%	
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	36%	57%	36%	49%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	84%	74%	84%	70%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	80%	87%	80%	89%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	57%	45%	57%	55%
<b>SECTION 11: Friends and family</b>					
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	40%	52%	40%	
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	15%	23%	15%	15%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	8%	12%	8%	14%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	24%	57%	24%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Leyhill 2012	Open prisons comparator	HMP Leyhill 2012	HMP Leyhill 2007
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 12: Preparation for release</b>					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	93%	93%	93%	
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	12%	8%	12%	
12.2	Contact by letter?	60%	42%	60%	
12.2	Contact by phone?	59%	71%	59%	
12.2	Contact by visit?	35%	58%	35%	
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	90%	55%	90%	
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	71%	72%	71%	49%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	68%	70%	68%	86%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
12.6	nobody?	24%	39%	24%	
12.6	Offender supervisor?	65%	35%	65%	
12.6	Offender manager?	46%	43%	46%	
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	24%	17%	24%	
12.6	Staff from other departments?	23%	17%	23%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	67%	83%	67%	84%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	6%		6%	
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	58%		58%	
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	8%	0%	8%	
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	29%	31%	29%	
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
12.12	Employment?	51%	81%	51%	
12.12	Accommodation?	44%	38%	44%	
12.12	Benefits?	57%	45%	57%	
12.12	Finances?	47%	50%	47%	
12.12	Education?	55%	58%	55%	
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	63%	56%	63%	
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	69%	93%	69%	
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	68%	95%	68%	
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.14	Resettlement day release?	52%	79%	52%	
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	45%	83%	45%	
12.14	Special purpose leave?	17%	59%	17%	
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	23%	22%	23%	13%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	26%	26%	26%	21%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	83%	81%	83%	74%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	23%	19%	23%	11%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	25%	43%	25%	32%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	54%	57%	54%	73%



## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Leyhill 2012

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>134</b>
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	30%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	11%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	56%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	84%	88%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	77%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	91%	95%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	89%	92%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	46%	38%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	88%	79%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	91%	94%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	99%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	67%	75%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	100%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	61%	72%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	56%	59%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	78%	82%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	59%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	91%	72%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	100%	98%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	64%	56%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff in this prison treat you with respect?	80%	86%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	77%	85%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	22%	17%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	84%	78%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	17%	16%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	2%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	14%	20%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	9%	12%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	14%	14%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	9%	5%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	3%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	58%	59%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	86%	86%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	50%	53%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	9%	18%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	32%	40%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	77%	81%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	6%	24%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	36%	27%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	4%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	60%	57%
10.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	43%	34%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	74%	86%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	80%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	41%	61%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	12%	16%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	14%	7%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	65%	70%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	71%	67%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	64%	48%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	63%	39%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	26%	15%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	25%	23%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	34%	24%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	81%	84%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	22%	23%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	9%	30%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability, age - over 50) HMP Leyhill 2012

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

#### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>					<b>33</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>125</b>
1.5	Are you a foreign national?		10%		4%		7%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		100%		99%		100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?		100%		99%		100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?		10%		23%		13%	24%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?		3%		2%		0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?		0%		8%		2%	7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?						35%	14%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		13%		8%		11%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		58%		54%		54%	55%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?		85%		87%		85%	88%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?		82%		75%		78%	76%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%			97%		93%	94%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?		91%		91%		91%	91%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	62%			35%		38%	40%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	61%			86%		75%	84%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%			95%		93%	94%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?		100%		98%		100%	98%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	80%			72%		84%	69%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?		100%		99%		100%	99%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	72%			70%		85%	64%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	38%			63%		52%	60%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?		88%		80%		87%	79%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%			63%		71%	57%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	70%			78%		85%	74%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?		97%		99%		98%	98%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%			60%		69%	54%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff in this prison treat you with respect?	88%	83%	89%	83%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	85%	83%	89%	82%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	28%	16%	23%	16%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	82%	78%	78%	79%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	28%	14%	20%	15%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	2%	7%	2%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	37%	15%	25%	17%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	18%	10%	13%	10%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	6%	1%	7%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	0%	2%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	28%	10%	20%	11%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	7%	6%	9%	5%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%	2%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	2%	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	3%	0%	2%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	13%	0%	5%	2%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	60%	58%	70%	55%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	90%	85%	84%	87%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	76%	46%	73%	45%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	35%	11%	16%	16%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	33%	39%	22%	44%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	73%	82%	79%	80%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	23%	19%	19%	21%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	33%	27%	16%	33%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	3%	2%	5%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	60%	54%	58%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	22%	40%	14%	44%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	85%	84%	87%	83%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	80%	72%	82%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	62%	57%	61%	56%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	15%	15%	16%	14%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	7%	9%	2%	11%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	67%	69%	75%	67%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	67%	68%	79%	64%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	40%	55%	52%	51%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	36%	47%	44%	45%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	12%	19%	24%	15%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	13%	25%	22%	24%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	19%	28%	29%	25%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	74%	86%	86%	83%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	32%	21%	43%	17%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	31%	25%	31%	24%