

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Lindholme

11–15 February 2013

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Glossary of terms

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

Crown copyright 2013

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	9
Healthy prison summary	11
1 Safety	21
<hr/>	
2 Respect	33
<hr/>	
3 Purposeful activity	45
<hr/>	
4 Resettlement	51
<hr/>	
5 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	61
<hr/>	
Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	69
II Prison population profile	70
IIIa Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews : closed prison	73
IIIb Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews : open prison	91
IV Photographs	107

Introduction

HMP Lindholme is a category C training prison with a category D wing that holds a total of about 1,000 men. The prison, near Doncaster, forms part of the 'South Yorkshire cluster' with HMP Moorland and HMP Hatfield. The category D side, 'I wing', had been used as an immigration removal centre (IRC) but this closed in January 2012 and the facility had been passed back for use by the Prison Service.

The inspection came at a difficult time for the prison. In November 2012 it was announced that all prisons in the South Yorkshire cluster would be moving into the private sector and, at the time of the inspection, the uncertainty this created added to the difficulty in running the prison.

However, these difficulties do not excuse the very poor findings of this inspection. Outcomes for prisoners across the prison as a whole were not good enough in too many areas, but the category D side was the worst establishment we have inspected in many years.

The category D side was separate from the main prison and should have provided an environment in which low-risk prisoners were prepared for release with purposeful activity and effective rehabilitation work. In practice, it appears that the funding that had been lost when the wing stopped being used as an IRC had not been replaced. The wing then had been forgotten and neglected, and so very little activity of any sort – by staff or prisoners – took place. It was an astonishing situation.

Reception, first night and induction arrangements on the category D side were perfunctory, and there was far too little subsequent contact between staff and prisoners. Prisoners on the wing were frightened. In our survey, 38% told us they had felt unsafe at some time, and 28% felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. This compared with 16% and 5% respectively at comparable prisons. Nothing had been done to address this. Drugs and alcohol were widely available and prisoners told us there were high levels of victimisation by other prisoners and staff.

The most basic services were not provided on the wing. There was no access to Listeners and no work on diversity and equality. Even chaplaincy services were inadequate. There were prayer meetings for Muslim prisoners but none for Christians, and some religious tensions were evident. In a recent incident, someone had defecated in the washing facilities for Muslim prayers; managers were unaware of this until we brought it to their attention.

The health needs of prisoners on the wing had not been assessed and it was difficult for prisoners to see a doctor if they were unwell. Staff were often not available to escort prisoners to health care on the category C side, and only 8% of prisoners told us it was easy to see a doctor, against the 59% comparator. There was simply no work or education available on site, apart from a few desultory domestic duties. The classrooms that had been used by the IRC were a sad sight, unused and piled high with discarded furniture and equipment. There was very little done to address prisoners offending behaviour or give them practical help to resettle successfully after release. There were a few opportunities for prisoners to maintain family ties or work outside the prison through release on temporary licence – but this was thoughtlessly limited because release and return times were not synchronised with the infrequent local bus service.

We brought our concerns about the category D side to the attention of the Chief Executive of NOMS immediately after the inspection. It was closed shortly afterwards and remains so. We welcome this and it should not re-open until the concerns we identify in this report have been

addressed. However, it is unacceptable that the situation was allowed to develop. There is a danger in increasingly large and complex establishments, with remote governing governors, that failings in one part of an establishment may not be evident from the performance data for the prison as a whole. Nevertheless, all it took on the category D side at Lindholme was to spend a few minutes walking through it, see the abandoned classrooms, observe the absence of staff and listen to the prisoners' concerns to realise something was seriously wrong. That should have been done sooner.

There were also significant problems in other parts of the prison. Most prisoners in the category C side were safe but care for those who needed extra support was inadequate. Procedures for supporting prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were poor. Too many of these men were held in the segregation unit. Little support was available for prisoners who were vulnerable and being victimised or bullied by other prisoners. The only option they were offered was to be confined to their cell with no access to the regime. Those who declined had to sign a disclaimer – but this did not absolve staff from the consequences of neglect. Those who accepted often continued to be bullied, with threats shouted through their door. Many said their mental health deteriorated and most were eventually transferred out of the prison with nothing done to tackle the underlying problems. Drugs and alcohol were easily available here too, and action to address this was poorly coordinated.

The quality of the accommodation was reasonable and relationships between staff and prisoners, although mixed, were better than on the category D side. Basic processes, such as complaints, applications, catering, laundry and the property store, needed improvement. However, health care on the category C side was reasonably good and met prisoners' needs.

The weaknesses in the prison's diversity and equality work had a significant impact on the category C side. Prisoners did not have confidence in formal processes for resolving problems, such as the discrimination incident report system. They had raised this in consultation meetings, it was evidenced by the very low number of discrimination complaints being made but nothing had been done. Prisoners from black and minority ethnic groups reported more negatively than white prisoners. There was little support for foreign national prisoners. The needs of prisoners with disabilities were not identified or met. One distressed disabled prisoner told us he was constantly taunted by other prisoners and bullied for payment if he had to ask them for assistance in any way. He felt unable to report the incident for fear of retaliation.

Purposeful activity was much better on the category C side and a bright spot in an otherwise depressing picture. Too many prisoners were locked up in the working part of the day for a training prison, but for those in work, education or training, outcomes were good, the quality of training and teaching was good, and there was good leadership and management. Some vocational training, such as the construction workshop and bakery, was outstanding, there was a generally good work ethic and prisoners received effective help with literacy and numeracy. There was a good library, although access was too restricted, and PE provision was very good.

Resettlement work on the category C side required improvement. Offender management was under-resourced and large caseloads limited the contact enthusiastic and focused offender management staff could have with prisoners. Practical resettlement services were also very stretched but, on the whole, work on employment and substance misuse issues was good. Arrangements for visits were limited and there was very little constructive work to help prisoners maintain or improve their relationships with their families and children.

There were no offending behaviour programmes and prisoners who needed these had to transfer to HMP Moorland for the duration of the programme. However, because prisoners

were anxious about where they would be accommodated and whether they would have a job when they returned to Lindholme, few chose to undertake the transfer, and nothing had been done to address these perceptions.

HMP Lindholme is a cause for real concern. The closure of the D side has reduced the immediate risks but legitimate prisoner grievances, the lack of activity, mixed staff-prisoner relationships and indications of some religious tensions, combined with the ready availability of drugs and alcohol, are an unhealthy mix. The uncertainty created by the prison's move to the private sector cannot be allowed to delay the urgent improvements that are required.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Lindholme is a category C training prison with a category D wing, primarily but not exclusively for prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP).

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

Public

Region/Department

Yorkshire and Humberside

Number held

842 category C and 87 category D prisoners

Certified normal accommodation

924 category C

124 category D

Operational capacity

1,010 – category C (reduced to 862 due to the current closure of G wing)

124 – category D

Date of last full inspection

29 October – 2 November 2007

Brief history

HMP Lindholme is located on the site of a former Royal Air Force (RAF) base, approximately 10 miles north of Doncaster. It covers an area of 100 acres within the perimeter fence and was opened as a prison in 1985.

Short description of residential units

The accommodation consists of six small units (A to F wings) of 64 beds on eight spurs. These buildings were part of the original RAF camp and are sited around the main exercise yard. On A to F wings, prisoners have access to their own rooms, with a room key, and to a communal landing, where there is a refrigerator, television, hot water boiler, shower basin and toilet.

G wing, with an operational capacity of 148, is temporarily closed. J and K wings each have space for 209 prisoners and provide modern cellular accommodation, with two wings of single cells, each with its own sanitation.

L wing (a 60-bed unit) is the newest accommodation and comprises 30 double cells with in-cell wet rooms containing a toilet, sink and shower. This unit acts as a first night centre and induction unit. It also accommodates some prisoners with physical and/or mental health disabilities.

The care and separation unit contains 20 cells and can hold a maximum of 22 prisoners.

I wing is a discrete category D wing with an operation capacity of 124, mainly IPP prisoners.

Name of governor/director

Marian Mahoney

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: NHS Doncaster

Provider: Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust

Learning and skills providers

The Manchester College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Roger Tyler

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.

HP5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be checked for implementation at future inspections

- **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines

- **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.

Safety

HP6 Reception processes were good. First night arrangements were perfunctory on the category C site but induction was comprehensive and informative. First night and induction arrangements on the category D site were inadequate. Most prisoners on the category C site felt safe but the care and safety of those who were more vulnerable was poor. Too many prisoners on the category D site felt unsafe. Levels of self-harm were not high but processes were weak. Security was generally proportionate on the category C site but excessive on the category D site. The availability and use of illegal drugs were high. The monitoring of use of force was weak. The use of segregation was high and reintegration planning poor. Clinical care for those requiring substance misuse treatment was good but there were too few interventions available. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the category C site and poor on the category D site.

HP7 Most prisoners had fairly short journeys to the prison and reported positively about escort arrangements, but prisoners arriving at lunchtime were kept waiting on the van.

HP8 On the category C site, the reception area was clean and comfortable, prisoners were treated well by reception staff and good use was made of prisoner orderlies to welcome new arrivals. Most prisoners there felt safe on their first night. First night accommodation was well prepared but we were not assured that the brief first night interview was always held in private or that feelings of safety were fully explored. A comprehensive and informative induction was completed in two days.

HP9 Although new procedures were being developed, first night and induction arrangements for prisoners going to the category D site were inadequate. In our

survey, every indicator about the provision of information and feeling safe was below the comparator.¹

- HP10 On the category C site, most prisoners felt safe most of the time but the few more vulnerable prisoners felt unsafe and had a poor experience.
- HP11 On the category D site, far more prisoners felt unsafe than at similar prisons and they reported high levels of bullying and victimisation by other prisoners and staff. The monthly safer custody committee collated detailed information about bullying and self-harm and identified some reactive remedial action, but trends and patterns were not sufficiently analysed. Safety issues on the category D site had not been recognised or addressed.
- HP12 Levels of violence on the category C site were comparable with those at similar establishments, although the number of bullying incidents was comparatively high. The newly introduced anti-bullying procedures were well designed and used effectively to review behaviour. There were no victim support plans. Too many victims and vulnerable prisoners were segregated and isolated on a restricted regime on normal location. These prisoners told us that isolation did not stop them from being intimidated and felt they were being punished for being victims of bullying. Most of these prisoners were transferred to another establishment without anything being done to address the underlying issues of safety.
- HP13 The number of self-harm incidents across the prison was slightly higher than at comparable establishments. The number of prisoners on self-harm monitoring was similar to that at other category C prisons but the quality of the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documentation and indicators of care were generally poor. On the category C site, there was a well-trained and supported team of Listeners, and access to them had recently improved. There was no access to Listeners on the category D site.
- HP14 The security meeting was suitably focused on gang- and drug-related issues and generally took action to mitigate threats to the security of the prison. Security arrangements were generally proportionate on the category C site but conditions were excessively secure for those in category D 'open' conditions. The number of closed visits was extremely high and inappropriately applied. On both sites, prisoners told us that drugs were easily available, and the numbers of positive drug tests and finds were high. The dissolution of the drug strategy committee had resulted in a poorly coordinated approach between drug supply reduction and demand reduction efforts.

¹ **Inspection methodology:** There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections, we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance. (Adapted from Towl et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

- HP15 The incentives and earned privileges scheme was applied inconsistently and prisoners subject to the basic regime had insufficient opportunity to demonstrate improvement.
- HP16 The number of adjudications was high. Monitoring was effective, considered a wide range of data, and identified hotspots and trends.
- HP17 Force was not used excessively but the use of force meeting failed to analyse any data in order to identify trends or areas of concern. There was insufficient management scrutiny of use of force. Few planned use of force incidents were video-recorded. There had been no recorded use of special accommodation since 2011, although an unfurnished cell in the segregation unit had been used as a 'calm-down cell', and sometimes overnight, which had not been recorded and there were no safeguards in place.
- HP18 Use of segregation was high. The ban on smoking for prisoners located on the segregation unit was an inappropriate deterrent and the consequences had not been fully considered. Segregation unit cells were generally clean and well decorated. The regime was minimal and afforded no opportunities for activities, regardless of any risk posed, and access to showers and telephones was too infrequent. An impressive range of data was analysed at the quarterly monitoring meeting to identify trends and patterns. Reintegration and care planning processes were inadequate and almost half of those segregated were transferred to other prisons.
- HP19 Clinical care for prisoners requiring treatment for substance misuse was good. Clinical and psychosocial teams were well integrated and joint working was effective. The range of interventions available was limited and of relatively low intensity, with no on-site group work or peer support.

Respect

- HP20 Across both sites external areas, communal areas and cells were mainly clean. Staff-prisoner relationships were mixed and too often remote on the larger wings and the category D site. Fewer prisoners on the category D site than in similar prisons said that staff treated them with respect. Applications were poorly managed. Although complaints were well managed, prisoners lacked faith in the system. Prisoner consultation arrangements were poor. Equality and diversity provision was neglected and undeveloped and the needs of most minority groups were not met. The lack of faith provision, particularly on the category D site, was unacceptable and religious tensions were evident. Health services were reasonably good but compromised by poor access on the category D site. Food was reasonable but served too early. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the category C site and poor on the category D site.
- HP21 The quality and type of accommodation varied widely across the prison. Cells and communal areas across the category C site were generally clean. The older spur accommodation was often damp and scruffy, with broken furniture and equipment, but prisoners valued the relatively relaxed environment. Access to showers was good but some remained out of use, despite having been recently refurbished. Access to telephones was unnecessarily restricted. There was no monitoring of general applications and there was no system to record completions or assure us that

applications were responded to. Accommodation on the category D site was light, airy and in good condition.

- HP22 Staff-prisoner interactions on the spurs were generally good but were more remote on the larger wings and the category D site, where staff congregated in wing offices. In our survey, very few category C prisoners said that staff normally spoke to them during association. Fewer category D prisoners than at similar prisons said that staff treated them respectfully, and they and reported high levels of victimisation by staff. Case notes showed variable personal officer engagement. Prisoner consultation arrangements were inadequate across both sites.
- HP23 Equality provision lacked focus and was underdeveloped, with little coordination of services for minority groups. The equality strategy was out of date and not based on a local analysis of need, and the range of data analysed did not cover any protected characteristics other than race. There was no action plan. Prisoner representatives had reported that prisoners had little confidence in the discrimination incident reporting system, and few discrimination incident report forms were submitted. Those that had been received had been investigated to a reasonable standard and internal and external scrutiny was good.
- HP24 There were no formal support forums for minority groups and no identified lead members of staff for individual protected characteristics. Black and minority ethnic prisoners on both sites were negative across a wide range of areas of the regime, including safety and intimidation from staff and prisoners. Muslim prisoners on both sites reported less favourable treatment than non-Muslim prisoners, and religious tensions were evident on the category D site. Foreign national prisoners had little support, no access to independent advice and no regular access to UK Border Agency staff.
- HP25 There was no coordinated system to assess the needs of older prisoners or those with disabilities and there were no care plans for them, and we found a number of prisoners whose needs were not being met.
- HP26 Faith facilities on the category C site were adequate. Corporate worship was not reliably provided for all faiths. On the category D site, the only communal worship facilities and services provided were for Muslim prisoners.
- HP27 Prisoners on both sites had little confidence in the complaints system but we found that complaints were answered on time and quality assurance was reasonably effective.
- HP28 Health partnership and clinical governance arrangements were good. Prisoners were negative about the quality of health services but we found them to be reasonably good overall. Prisoners on the category D site were particularly negative, and we found that they had poor access to services, including the dentist and GP. There was a full range of clinics, including those for prisoners with long-term conditions. Pharmacy services were adequate. There was a wide range of integrated mental health services, although there was a notable delay in transferring prisoners to secure NHS services.
- HP29 Prisoners were negative about the food provided but the meals we inspected were adequate, with reasonable portion sizes and varied menus. Lunch was served before the scheduled time and the evening meal too early, particularly at weekends.

Purposeful activity

- HP30 For those working, time out of cell was reasonable but too many prisoners on the category C site were locked up during the day and too many were unemployed or not involved in activity. On the category C site, the management of learning and skills was good. Learning and skills provision was of a high quality, with an appropriate range and variety, and effective teaching, learning and coaching. Achievements were mainly outstanding but opportunities to accredit some work skills were missed. The category D site had no regular planned learning and skills provision. Most prisoners on this site were unemployed or underemployed in low-skilled domestic work. PE on the category C site was excellent but on the category D site was too limited. Library services were reasonable but access was limited across both sites. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good on the category C site and poor on the category D site.
- HP31 For most prisoners in full-time activity, time out of cell was reasonable, at nine hours a day, but unemployed prisoners were unlocked for less than two hours a day. Prisoners had good access to outdoor association all year round but evening association was too short and they were locked up too early. At any one time, around 20% of prisoners were locked up during the core day.
- HP32 The strategic management of learning and skills was good, with a strong focus on quality improvement. On the category C site, there were sufficient activity places to meet the needs of the population and the curriculum was based on an effective need analysis. Allocation to activities was appropriate and informed by sentence planning. However, over a quarter of prisoners were unemployed or not involved in activity at any one time.
- HP33 On the category C site, there was a good variety, range and standard of education, and vocational training was outstanding, with good opportunities for progression. The standards of coaching, teaching, learning and assessment were good. Accredited courses were well linked to employability. There was insufficient literacy and numeracy support in workshops.
- HP34 On the category D site, the quality of provision was inadequate. A lack of funding had left the site with no regular planned learning and skills provision. This meant that many prisoners on this site were unemployed or allocated to low-skilled domestic work which did not fully occupy them. Classrooms were empty and abandoned.
- HP35 On the category C site, prisoners in education and vocational training developed good personal and employability skills. The achievement of accredited qualifications was outstanding. In most work placements, prisoners developed a good work ethic, although this was not sufficiently well recognised or recorded. Achievements for prisoners on the category D site were inadequate, with work opportunities not being sufficient to develop a good work ethic.
- HP36 The category C library provided a good resource, with effective promotion of literacy. Access was compromised by closures because of a shortage of prison staff. On the category D site, the library was small and welcoming but provided no opportunities for private study or computer use, and access was restricted.

HP37 On the category C site, gym facilities and resources were of a high standard. Access was good and usage high. There was effective promotion of healthy living. Staff were well qualified, courses well planned and achievements high. On the category D site, although access was good, the range of facilities and resources was inadequate and unstructured.

Resettlement

HP38 The strategic management of resettlement had recently improved but was not informed by a needs analysis. The management of risk of harm was hindered by infrequent offender supervisor contact. Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments and reviews were mainly up to date. Home detention curfew processes were good. Public protection and recategorisation processes were reasonable but had insufficient offender supervisor involvement. Resettlement provision on the category C site was poorly coordinated and most of the provision was only adequate. Prisoners on the category D site had some opportunities for working outside the prison but were poorly prepared for open conditions and for release. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the category C site and poor on the category D site.

HP39 A new reducing reoffending strategy and action plan had been developed but the needs analysis was not sufficiently comprehensive and had not informed the strategy. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used on both sites to support reintegration but some practical obstacles significantly limited prisoners' time out on day release.

HP40 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments were mainly up to date but too many prisoners arrived without an assessment and took offender supervisors away from their core work. Offender supervisors were clear and enthusiastic about their responsibilities but had large caseloads, which limited their ongoing and meaningful contact with prisoners. As a result, the services were largely reactive and not always focused on the management of risk. Contact with the category D prisoners was particularly poor. In our survey, fewer prisoners than in comparator establishments on both sites felt that they were being helped to achieve their targets by offender supervisors or other staff in the prison. Case recording and information exchange between other staff and the offender management unit were weak and undermined the management of risk of harm. Home detention curfew processes were sound.

HP41 Public protection concerns were clearly identified when prisoners arrived at the prison, and monitoring was used appropriately and reviewed at regular intervals. Weekly interdepartmental risk management team meetings were not always well attended and offender supervisors did not participate.

HP42 Recategorisation reviews were mainly completed on time but prisoner requests for transfer were not always informed by the offender supervisor or sentence plan.

HP43 There was little provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners on either site.

HP44 Offender supervisors made referrals to resettlement services, as needed, for all prisoners on arrival, but planning for release was not well developed or coordinated. On both sites, fewer prisoners than at similar establishments said that they had been helped to prepare for release. Far fewer prisoners on the category D site than at

similar prisons felt that they had been given greater responsibility than when they had been in a category C prison or prepared for open conditions.

- HP45 The range of accommodation services was adequate on the category C site but the effectiveness of accommodation advice and support given by Shelter was not routinely monitored and far too many prisoners failed to attend their appointments. Those on the category D site did not have routine access to accommodation advice.
- HP46 On the category C site, an effective employability course was delivered alongside training in job application and job search techniques. Advice and guidance workers had a good understanding of local labour markets and had developed links with colleges, but there were insufficient links with employers.
- HP47 On the category D site, some links had been made within the community to provide unpaid work but too few prisoners had the opportunity to work out and the variety of activities was limited. General employment and training advice for prisoners on this site was poor and they did not have routine access to careers advice, support with CV writing or help with job search.
- HP48 Health discharge planning arrangements were adequate for prisoners with physical and mental health needs. For those with substance misuse issues, there were links with local and regional drug intervention programme teams. Prisoners received good overdose and relapse prevention information before release.
- HP49 Finance and debt advice was limited across both sites. Few prisoners knew where to go for finance advice. Prisoners on the category D site did not have access to benefits advice. Basic savings accounts were available.
- HP50 The children and families pathway was underdeveloped, with infrequent family days and no family or parenting services other than Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children). Visits arrangements were adequate across both sites but there was poor provision for visiting children. Prisoners on the category D site had good access to town visits.
- HP51 There were no structured interventions for tackling offending behaviour at either site. Prisoners were expected to transfer to neighbouring HMP Moorland to access programme places there but too few places were available and prisoners' reluctance to transfer, and disincentives for transfer, had not been addressed.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP52 Concern: Too many prisoners on the category D site, and more than at similar prisons, felt unsafe. Safety issues on the site had not been recognised, considered or addressed.

Recommendation: Prisoners on the category D site should be consulted about their feelings of safety, and all data relating to safety should be collated and analysed and action taken to make the prison safer.

- HP53 Concern: Vulnerable prisoners and victims of bullying on the category C site were routinely segregated (often on normal location), isolated and subject to a very

restricted regime. No support was provided and many were transferred out without their safety issues being addressed.

Recommendation: Vulnerable prisoners and victims of bullying should not be routinely segregated on normal location. They should have a support plan and access to association and activities, and their underlying safety issues should be addressed.

HP54 Concern: Equality and diversity provision was neglected and undeveloped. There was evidence of the needs of many prisoners from minority groups not being identified or met. No data were collected to monitor equality of access or treatment of prisoners from any groups other than black and minority ethnic prisoners.

Recommendation: Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners with protected characteristics are identified, assessed and met and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood.

HP55 Concern: The category D site opened in early 2012 without the necessary funding in place, leaving prisoners without access to planned learning and skills and health provision.

Recommendation: Suitable planned on-site health and learning and skills services which meet the needs of the population should be provided on the category D site.

HP56 Concern: There was inadequate specialist resettlement help available for prisoners with accommodation, employment or finance issues, and this was especially acute on the category D site. Those services provided were not monitored for their effectiveness, so it was not possible to say how many prisoners had been released with or without help.

Recommendation: Specialist resettlement support should be made available and the services available should be monitored to establish how many prisoners are helped.

HP57 Concern and subsequent action: Following the inspection, the category D side of the prison was closed and prisoners located there transferred to other establishments after we brought our concerns to the attention of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS). It should not reopen until our concerns are addressed and our recommendations implemented.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Most prisoners had short journeys to the prison and were treated well by escort staff. Prisoners were often kept waiting on the escort van at lunchtime.
- 1.2 Most prisoners had fairly short journeys to the prison and reported that vans were clean, they had been provided with food and drink, and that escort staff had treated them well.
- 1.3 Reception was closed over lunchtime. Although there were arrangements for disembarking prisoners into a holding cell to await the return of reception staff after their lunch break, in practice this didn't always happen, and several prisoners told us that they had had to wait on the escort van.

Recommendation

- 1.4 Prisoners should be disembarked promptly from the escort van.

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.

- 1.5 Reception processes were efficient, staff were welcoming and good use was made of a prisoner orderly. Not all confidential reception and first night interviews were carried out in sufficient privacy. First night arrangements on the category C site were reasonable but lacked adequate attention to prisoners' feelings of safety. Induction on the category C site was comprehensive and informative. Category D site prisoners did not get a reliable first night and induction process, resulting in too many feeling unsafe.
- 1.6 All prisoners, whether being received into the category C or D site, were processed through the category C reception building. The reception processes we observed were mostly carried out efficiently and respectfully. The reception area was clean, and prisoners waiting to be processed were seated in a comfortable area and provided with a hot drink and food if it was a mealtime. A prisoner orderly provided informal support and information while undertaking administrative tasks. He was also a Listener (a prisoner trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) but new arrivals were not asked directly, in private, if they wanted the support of a Listener.

- 1.7 Cell sharing risk assessments were checked with prisoners in private, and health assessments were carried out in a separate room.
- 1.8 When reception processes had been completed, prisoners were held in a room containing information about the prison, and a telephone which could be used by those who had had PIN telephone numbers added to the system. Although we saw prisoners being moved to first night accommodation or to the category D site within an hour of completing reception processes, prisoners in our survey and our groups reported delays of more than two hours. We were told that this happened when large numbers of prisoners arrived at the same time.
- 1.9 All new prisoners on the category C site spent their first few days on a dedicated induction wing which had double cells with integral shower facilities. These cells were clean and well equipped. An interview was completed on their first night which checked if they had any concerns, but this was not always done in private. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments said that they had been offered information about the support and services available in the prison following their arrival. We were shown a printed information booklet which was available but not routinely provided. There was a prisoner information representative on the wing but he did not have a role in providing a first night briefing. Night staff did not routinely speak to new arrivals about how they were feeling. However, in our survey more prisoners on the category C site than at comparator establishments (88% versus 83%) said that they had felt safe on their first night.
- 1.10 Induction for prisoners on the category C site started on the next working day after arrival, and included a structured briefing by induction staff. Prisoners told us that this had been helpful and informative, giving them opportunities to ask questions. On the following day, an assessment of education, employment and vocational needs was carried out, leading to a plan being prepared for each prisoner. Although there was no specific assessment of resettlement needs at this stage, a prisoner accommodation representative spoke to all new prisoners, and any resettlement needs could be incorporated into their sentence plan by their offender supervisor, whom they met later in their sentence.
- 1.11 On the category D site, first night and induction arrangements were inadequate. New first night and induction procedures had recently been introduced but for most prisoners they had been inconsistent and unreliable. Although new prisoners were supposed to meet the senior officer, this did not always happen. A prisoner information representative had prepared some very basic information, which he gave to prisoners, but this was not backed up with a thorough induction process. In our survey, only 14% of category D prisoners, against the 63% comparator, said that they had been told what was going to happen to them on arrival, and only 56%, against the 96% comparator, that they had been on an induction course. Far fewer prisoners than in similar prisons (66% compared with 92%), said that they had felt safe on their first night.

Recommendations

- 1.12 Newly arrived prisoners should be offered access to a Listener.
- 1.13 On both sites, first night procedures should include a private interview with a member of staff which addresses feelings of safety, and night staff should make themselves known to new arrivals.
- 1.14 Prisoners should be provided with up-to-date written information about the prison on their first night.

- 1.15 All new prisoners on the category D site should be given a full reception, welcome and briefing about the site on their first night and they should receive a thorough induction.

Housekeeping point

- 1.16 The prisoner information representatives should meet all new prisoners to check if they require any information.

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.

- 1.17 Survey findings about feelings of safety and victimisation on the category C site were mostly in line with comparator establishments but those on the category D site were disturbingly negative. Extensive data were provided at the monthly safer custody meeting but it was not analysed sufficiently. Anti-bullying procedures were well designed but there was no victim support planning. The isolation of bullied prisoners on the category C site was detrimental to their well-being and did not address the underlying issues. The large number of prisoners feeling unsafe and experiencing victimisation on the category D site was not being addressed.
- 1.18 In our survey of the category C site, just under a third of prisoners said that they had ever felt unsafe, which was in line with comparator establishments. Levels of victimisation from other prisoners were also in line with those at other category C establishments. However, 36% said that they had been victimised by staff, which was worse than the 25% comparator.
- 1.19 On the category D site, 38% of respondents to our survey said that they had ever felt unsafe and 28% that they currently felt unsafe, both of which were far worse than the comparators (16% and 5%, respectively). Similarly, 33% said that they had been victimised by other prisoners, and 47% by staff, against the 9% and 16% comparators, respectively (see main recommendation HP52).
- 1.20 There was a monthly safer custody meeting for the South Yorkshire prison cluster (HMPs Moorland, Hatfield and Lindholme) and this considered a range of information about violence at Lindholme, and identified some remedial action, but there was insufficient analysis of trends or identification of patterns to direct strategy.
- 1.21 On the category C site, there were good links between violence reduction and residential and security departments to identify incidents of violence and bullying. Security information and wing records were checked to ensure that all incidents were identified and investigated. The number of assaults on prisoners was similar to that at comparable prisons but there were more bullying incidents, with 198 reported in the six months before the inspection, which equated to 21 per 100 prisoners compared with an average of nine.
- 1.22 The anti-bullying procedures were well designed and we observed them being used effectively on the residential units to monitor and review behaviour. However, the targets set were not sufficiently personalised to the behaviour of the prisoner concerned. There was no victim

support planning, and procedures for protecting victims were poor. Vulnerable prisoners and victims of bullying were routinely offered isolation from other prisoners in cellular accommodation on the wings. At the time of the inspection, there were 17 prisoners located on the wings listed as vulnerable or victims. Those who declined isolation were required to sign a disclaimer. Other than the segregation unit, there was no dedicated accommodation for those at risk from other prisoners, so victims opting for isolation were locked up for most of the day and could not participate in the regime.

- 1.23 Prisoners who were isolated told us that they had little ongoing contact with staff, including safer custody staff, and that they felt abandoned. Their intimidation continued, with other prisoners threatening them through their doors, and some felt that the isolation was having an effect on their mental health, that they were being punished for being bullied, and that nothing was being done to address the causes of bullying. When we examined outcomes for isolated prisoners, we found that few had been reintegrated and most had been transferred to another establishment without anything being done to address the underlying issues of safety (see main recommendation HP53).
- 1.24 On the category D site, there was little violence but some prisoners, notably sex offenders, received abuse and threats from others because of their offence and were reluctant to leave their rooms. Neither the staff on this site nor the safer custody staff were sighted on these issues and they were not being addressed.

Recommendations

- 1.25 **The safer custody meeting should analyse the data provided, to identify patterns and trends and set strategic objectives across both sites.**
- 1.26 **There should be plans for victims of assaults and bullying which identify how they can be supported and kept safe.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.27 **Targets in anti-bullying plans should be personalised to the behaviour of the prisoner concerned.**

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.

- 1.28 **There was no local safer custody strategy, and information provided to the safer custody meeting was not sufficiently analysed to inform strategy. Not all staff were trained in suicide prevention. Deaths in custody and serious self-harm incidents were analysed and action was taken. Self-harm monitoring procedures were not well implemented in many cases. Listener provision on the category C site was adequate but very poor on the category D site.**

- 1.29 There was no safer custody strategy document which was specific to the establishment. Information about self-harm incidents was monitored and reported to the safer custody meeting but this was not analysed sufficiently to identify patterns and trends. There was a programme of training for staff in self-harm and suicide prevention, but only 78% of them were in date for this.
- 1.30 The category C site had safer cells for prisoners at risk of self-harm and used a spacious Listener suite for constant observation, although their use was not logged or monitored. In the previous year there had been two incidents of serious self-harm, which had been investigated thoroughly and action plans developed, regarding both the ongoing care of the prisoner and learning for staff. In the six months before the inspection, 75 acts of self-harm had been recorded, which was slightly higher than the average for category C training prisons.
- 1.31 A total of 99 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents had been opened in the six months before the inspection, which was in line with the number at comparable establishments. At the time of the inspection, there were between six and eight ACCT documents open, which was typical for the prison. The quality of assessment, care planning and interaction with prisoners was poor in many instances. We found examples of insufficient detail in assessments, care plans which had not been updated following reviews, poor attendance at reviews, critical issues left unresolved and contact entries in the wing files showing no interaction with prisoners.
- 1.32 In the previous six months, 12 prisoners had remained on the segregation unit after ACCT documents had been opened. This was of concern because prisoners in segregation were not allowed to smoke, which could have been an added stressor to those in crisis (see also main recommendation HP53 and section on segregation).
- 1.33 Since the previous inspection, there had been three deaths in custody at the establishment. Reports on two had been received from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman, and comprehensive action plans had been completed in response to the recommendations.
- 1.34 On the category C site, there was a team of trained Listeners, who told us that they were well supported and that access to their services had improved from a poor position. This poor history was reflected in our survey, in which only 41% of prisoners on the category C site, against the 58% comparator, said that they were able to speak to a Listener at any time. Listeners visited prisoners in their own cells; the Listener suite was never used for this purpose.
- 1.35 On the category D site, a Listener had not been appointed. In our survey, only 12% of prisoners, against the 58% comparator, said that they could speak to a Listener at any time.

Recommendations

- 1.36 There should be a local safer custody strategy which makes reference to the specific needs of the population held.
- 1.37 All staff should have up-to-date training in self-harm and suicide prevention.
- 1.38 The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) assessment, planning and care should be improved and this should be reflected in the quality of case records.
- 1.39 There should be adequate provision of Listener services on the category D site.

Housekeeping points

- 1.40 The use of safer cells and constant observation for prisoners at risk should be logged and monitored.
- 1.41 The Listener suite should be used for meetings between Listeners and prisoners.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.42 There was no adult safeguarding policy or training for staff, except in the health care department, where procedures were developing.
- 1.43 The prison did not have an adult safeguarding policy or general training for staff in identifying and reporting safeguarding concerns.
- 1.44 Health services staff had been trained in adult safeguarding and further training was planned for managers. Links with social services were being developed.

Recommendation

- 1.45 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.

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.

- 1.46 Security was well managed and procedures were generally proportionate on the category C site. The availability of drugs was high, as was the drug testing positive rate. Closed visits were often inappropriately applied. Drug supply reduction measures were yielding some significant results but there was insufficient analysis of positive test data. The mandatory drug testing suite was in a poor condition.

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

- 1.47 At the category C site, physical and procedural security arrangements were generally proportionate, with the exception of the high number of closed visits (57), most of which had been inappropriately imposed for non-visits-related issues. Security arrangements for those on the category D site were disproportionate for 'open' conditions: the residential unit on the latter site was surrounded by a full-height, enclosed security fence; access to the association areas was locked off during the day; residential landings were locked off at night; and any movements to the category C site were escorted, thereby restricting access to regime services and activities (see sections on health services and learning and skills and work activities). Levels of dynamic security were variable across the prison, from good in the older accommodation to remote in the larger wings and on the category D site, where too many staff spent far too long in wing offices. Security assessments for workplace allocation did not cause undue delay in access to activities.
- 1.48 Safety arrangements in the older wings (see paragraph 2.2) were compromised by security restrictions. Wing based night staff did not have keys to the locked spurs so they could not enter to deal with an emergency such as a fire or self-harm. Staff told us they would have to await the arrival of the night orderly officer.
- 1.49 In our survey, prisoners at both sites said that drugs and alcohol were easy to get hold of. This was further supported by a high number of finds of drugs, including anabolic steroids and alcohol (on the category C site) and by the establishment's mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate of 11.04% for the previous six months. The MDT figures were not analysed on a per-wing basis, thus missing the opportunity for analysis of drug use 'hot-spots' or to differentiate between the open and closed sites.
- 1.50 The suspicion testing programme was conducted in a timely manner, and the positive rate was 27.5% for the previous six months. There was additional evidence of the use of some non-detectable drugs, including 'new psychoactive drugs' such as 'Spice' and mephedrone, on the open site, while the main drugs of choice on the closed site were (detectable) cannabis and illicit buprenorphine, the latter being trafficked in rather than diverted from prescribing within the prison.
- 1.51 The MDT suite was dirty and poorly ventilated. Contaminated waste bins were located within one metre of the testing urinal, posing a risk of contamination of tests. Some of the holding cells contained graffiti. The use of flattened cardboard boxes as strip-search mats was unacceptable.
- 1.52 The well-attended security meeting was suitably focused on gang- and drug-related issues and generally took appropriate action to mitigate threats to the security of the prison. An excellent level of cooperation with the local policing unit enhanced the range of information available and supported the prison's action on drug trafficking and gang-related activity. However, links with health services and substance misuse staff were not adequate to coordinate drug supply and demand reduction following the dissolution of the drug strategy committee (see section on substance misuse).
- 1.53 The prison's large perimeter was difficult to police but effective community links had been established with Neighbourhood Watch schemes that bordered the prison and also with its rural neighbours to mutual benefit, following concerns of trespassing to enable drug 'throw-overs' along the more remote areas of the perimeter.
- 1.54 Around 400 security information reports (SIRs) were submitted and analysed each month, which produced actions for the following month. Key threats were regularly identified as being the ingress and use of drugs, the availability of mobile telephones, and threats and violence.

Monthly security objectives were produced but were over-complicated and not disseminated effectively to the wider prison.

Recommendations

- 1.55 Closed visits should be imposed only for visits-related activity.
- 1.56 Security conditions for prisoners on the open site should be in line with those at other open sites and proportionate to the risks posed.
- 1.57 Security arrangements at night time on the older category C site wings should be amended so that prompt assistance and intervention can be provided in an emergency.
- 1.58 Drug testing figures should be collated by type and separated by wing and site to provide effective management information.

Housekeeping points

- 1.59 Mandatory drug testing facilities should be kept clean, tidy and free from graffiti, to create a respectful and uncontaminated testing and waiting environment.
- 1.60 Strip-searching should be conducted on mats that are adequate for the purpose.
- 1.61 Monthly security objectives should be regularly disseminated to all staff in the prison.

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.

- 1.62 More prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that the incentives and earned privileges scheme was fair. Improvement objectives for those on the basic level were inadequate.
- 1.63 In our survey, a similar percentage of prisoners to the comparator said that the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was fair. Application of the system was inconsistent across the prison, mainly because of the differing levels and quality of case note entries and management oversight.
- 1.64 The IEP policy outlined the benefits of each grade and also the consequences of non-compliance. In addition to the 'IEP basic', there was also a 'bullying basic' level; target setting for both was simplistic and neither type of basic regime afforded sufficient opportunity to demonstrate improvements in behaviour. Prisoners almost always remained on basic for at least 28 days, and recorded monitoring was too infrequent.

Housekeeping points

- 1.65 The incentives and earned privileges system should be applied consistently across the prison.
- 1.66 The application of sanctions and subsequent monitoring of all prisoners subject to the basic regime should be applied as prescribed in the policy document.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.67 The number of adjudications was high. The use of force was comparable with that at similar prisons but there was insufficient management oversight. Use of the special cell was unregulated. The number of prisoners segregated was high but it was well monitored. The segregation unit was generally clean and in good order but the regime was very poor.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.68 The overall number of adjudications (1,065 for the previous six months) was high compared with that at other category C prisons. The most frequent charges were for having unauthorised articles, disobeying orders and exhibiting threatening behaviour. The deputy governor quality checked 10% of adjudications and chaired the quarterly monitoring meeting, which considered a wide range of data and identified emerging trends and issues, and amended the disciplinary award tariff accordingly. The adjudication processes we observed were sound and prisoners were fully engaged throughout.

The use of force

- 1.69 The use of force was not high and was similar to that at other category C prisons. The quarterly use of force meeting was, in effect, a training planning meeting and there was no monitoring or analysis of incidents to identify any trends. There was insufficient management scrutiny of use of force and, although written records of incidents were mainly completed to a good standard, too many lacked health care input on injury-to-prisoner forms. Many showed evidence of effective use of de-escalation techniques and that prisoners involved in such incidents were not routinely handcuffed.
- 1.70 Planned interventions were rarely video-recorded and there had been no recorded use of special accommodation since 2011. However, we found evidence of the use of special accommodation as a 'calm-down' cell, sometimes overnight, and this was confirmed by staff; this had not been subject to the appropriate level of authorisation or monitoring.

Recommendations

- 1.71 The use of force committee should formally review all uses of force and examine data to identify trends and emerging issues.
- 1.72 All use of force dossiers should include a fully completed F213 (injury to prisoner) form.
- 1.73 All planned interventions should be video-recorded for evidential and training purposes.
- 1.74 All incidents of use of special accommodation should be properly authorised, monitored, formally recorded and reviewed.

Segregation

- 1.75 Use of segregation was consistently high, at around 14. In addition to those segregated on the unit, a number of prisoners deemed to be vulnerable were segregated on residential units (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention). In an attempt to deter prisoners from opting to be segregated, there was a ban on smoking on the unit. The consequences of this action, particularly for those prisoners in crisis (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention), had not been fully considered and there was inadequate support for prisoners who smoked
- 1.76 Segregation cells were mainly clean and reasonably decorated, with little graffiti. Some of the moulded toilet units were dirty and badly scaled. Prisoners on the unit had access to showers and telephones only on alternate days. They could not associate with other prisoners on the unit, even in the small exercise yards, regardless of any risk posed. There was no access to any work or education either on or off the unit and, although we were told that, subject to risk assessment, prisoners could attend religious services, we found no evidence of this taking place. Staff on the unit interacted well with those in their care and all prisoners we spoke to said that they were treated well.
- 1.77 The quarterly segregation monitoring and review group meeting reviewed a wide range of segregation data to identify trends and patterns. Additionally, a weekly meeting was held to consider all segregated prisoners across the site and attempt to improve their locations. However, the results of this meeting did not feed into individual prisoners' case notes, and reintegration planning was generally inadequate, with almost half of all those segregated being transferred out of the prison.
- 1.78 Daily recording provided an indication of prisoners' behaviour but the record sheets were never fully completed, and visits to the unit by key staff were not always recorded.

Recommendations

- 1.79 The smoking ban in the segregation unit should be reviewed and the consequences for prisoners in crisis considered.
- 1.80 All prisoners in the segregation unit should have daily access to showers and telephone calls.

- 1.81 Opportunities for associated activity (including exercise) should be introduced, subject to appropriate risk assessment.
- 1.82 A formal reintegration and care planning process for segregated prisoners should be introduced.

Housekeeping points

- 1.83 Toilets should be deep-cleaned and maintained in an acceptable condition.
- 1.84 Daily prisoner records should be fully completed.

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.

- 1.85 Clinical care for prisoners requiring treatment for substance misuse was good. Clinical and psychosocial teams were well integrated and joint working was effective. The range and intensity of psychosocial interventions were too limited. The drug strategy meeting had been absorbed into the security meeting, resulting in a lack of involvement from substance use treatment services in the prison's strategic approach to tackling drug use and supply.
- 1.86 The substance use strategy document was out of date and there was no current needs analysis to inform future service development. The ratio of reducing doses compared with maintenance was good, at 86 to 113, showing a healthy focus on recovery-centred treatment.
- 1.87 Opiate substitution medications were administered in a dedicated substance use service building, separate from the general health care department, which was beneficial for prisoners' privacy and gave them daily access to clinical and psychosocial support. Five prisoners from the category D site were escorted daily to the facility on the closed site to receive their opiate substitution medication.
- 1.88 Clinical and psychosocial teams were co-located and well integrated, with joint attendance at clinical reviews and regular multidisciplinary team meetings. Most prisoners expressed satisfaction with their clinical treatment and support.
- 1.89 The range of psychosocial interventions was limited to one-to-one work, of relatively low intensity, using adapted integrated drug treatment system materials and an alcohol awareness package. No on-site group work was available, and there was no access to either Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous. Prisoners who needed to engage in group programmes had the option of transferring to nearby HMP Moorland or to other establishments (see also section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour). Although the waiting time to access the Building Skills for Recovery course (BSR) was minimal, at just under two weeks, prisoners told us that, for many, the necessity for a transfer was a significant barrier to engagement. They also told us that they were disappointed with the lack of higher intensity rehabilitation opportunities, including peer support and counselling, to help them to understand their substance use and to deal with loss.

- 1.90 In our survey on the closed site, fewer respondents than at comparator prisons (66% versus 81%) said that they had found the drug and alcohol support help useful. On the open site, fewer said that they had received help with alcohol (44% versus 77%), and that they had found the support useful (33% versus 86%).
- 1.91 The drug strategy meeting had been disbanded and absorbed into a cluster-wide security meeting, resulting in a reduced level of involvement and integration by substance use treatment services in the establishment's strategic approach to tackling drug use and supply. Consequently, there was a poorly coordinated approach between demand reduction efforts and the otherwise reasonably effective drug supply reduction approach (see also section on security).

Recommendations

- 1.92 An in-depth substance use needs analysis should be conducted to update the drug and alcohol strategy and develop substance use interventions of sufficient intensity and ease of access to meet the needs of the prison's population.
- 1.93 Peer supporters and self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous should be put in place.
- 1.94 The prison should ensure an integrated approach to tackling both drug supply and demand reduction.

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 quality of accommodation was variable but generally clean and tidy, and most communal areas were clean. Access to showers was good but to telephones was over-restrictive on some wings.
- 2.2 The quality and type of accommodation on the category C site varied widely across the prison, from old Royal Air Force billet accommodation on the spurs (A–F wings) to three fairly modern larger units (G, J and K wings; G wing was not in use at the time of the inspection) and a small, 30-cell discrete unit (L wing; the induction unit). On the older units, there was free access to showers and toilets on each landing even at night when the door at the end of the landing was locked (see paragraph 1.48 regarding safety of night arrangements). Cells on the larger units had integral toilets and daily access to communal showers. The induction wing had integral showers and toilets and provided the best accommodation in the prison.
- 2.3 Cells and communal areas across the category C site were generally clean. Some of the older spur accommodation was damp and scruffy, with some broken furniture and association equipment, although prisoners valued the relatively relaxed environment and good access to staff. There was limited access to some showers on the newer wings because of delays in the reopening of the recently refurbished shower rooms. Most showers across the prison were clean and in good order.
- 2.4 Prisoners on the category D site had large, light and airy rooms which were clean, well furnished and maintained. Some shower fittings were broken and some shower rooms were dirty, with poor drainage and broken and missing wall tiles. In spite of a large number of wing cleaners, the stairwells on this site were dirty and had not been cleaned for some time.
- 2.5 Access to telephones on the larger wings on the category C site was unnecessarily restricted as they were switched off during the working day and there was limited time available for evening association (see recommendation 3.4). Mail was distributed within 24 hours of arrival at the prison and posted out on the day of submission.
- 2.6 Prisoners in our groups were negative about access to cleaning materials and the quality of prison-issue clothing. We saw prisoners washing their own prison clothes to ensure that they had serviceable clothing rather than risk exchanging them at the weekly kit change. Prisoners could not have any clothing or possessions sent in and had to buy personal clothing from the prison shop. Laundry facilities were reasonable, although delays in repairing some equipment caused problems on the larger wings.
- 2.7 Applications were initially logged but neither the quality nor timeliness of replies was monitored and we were not assured that all applications were answered.

- 2.8 Prisoners told us that they had to wait for long periods to retrieve their stored property, and on the category C site we saw some such applications that were over three months old; access to stored property was much better on the category D site.
- 2.9 The offensive display policy was out of date and allowed the displaying of some offensive material.

Recommendations

- 2.10 The shower rooms on the category D site should be refurbished and regularly cleaned and maintained.
- 2.11 Replies to applications should be logged and monitored for timeliness.
- 2.12 Prisoners should be able to access their stored property within 14 days.

Housekeeping points

- 2.13 Wing laundry equipment should be maintained in good order.
- 2.14 The offensive display policy should be updated and enforced.

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.

- 2.15 The quality of staff–prisoner relationships varied across the prison but overall was worse than at comparator prisons. Personal officer entries in electronic and written records and the level of management checks were inconsistent. Consultation arrangements were poor.
- 2.16 Staff–prisoner relationships varied across the prison, from reasonably good on the older residential units to remote on the larger wings and the category D site. In our category D site survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons (58% against 76%) said that staff treated them respectfully, that their personal officer was helpful and that they had a member of staff to turn to if they had a problem. Almost 50% of prisoners on this site reported victimisation from staff, which was higher than at similar prisons.
- 2.17 On the category C site, fewer than at comparator prisons said that they had a personal officer, that staff spoke to them during association or checked in with them to see how they were getting on, and that they had a member of staff to turn to if they had a problem.
- 2.18 We saw generally polite and respectful relationships on the older spur accommodation and induction wing, but on the larger wings and the category D site staff were regularly to be found in wing offices, and the interactions we saw were often curt and businesslike; prisoners told us that this was the norm. We also regularly saw prisoners left waiting outside the larger wings for long periods waiting for staff to acknowledge them and let them in.

- 2.19 Consultation arrangements were poor; there had been few wing representative meetings across either site since July 2012.
- 2.20 The quality of personal officer entries in electronic case notes and written records, and of subsequent management checks, ranged from poor on some wings to regular and meaningful on others.

Recommendations

- 2.21 Regular, meaningful prisoner consultation meetings should be introduced.
- 2.22 Staff case note entries should be regular and meaningful and a system of regular quality checks should be introduced.

Housekeeping point

- 2.23 The process for admitting prisoners back onto the wings outside of main movement should be reviewed.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic³ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.24 Equality provision was undeveloped, with little coordination of services for minority groups. The equality strategy was out of date and there was no action plan. Prisoner representatives had previously reported that prisoners had little confidence in the discrimination incident reporting system but no action had been taken to remedy this. There were no formal support forums for minority groups. Our survey responses from black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners on both sites were more negative than those from their white and non-Muslim counterparts for many aspects of the regime, and religious tensions were evident on the category D site. Foreign national prisoners had little support and no regular access to UK Border Agency staff. There was no coordinated system to assess the needs of older prisoners or those with disabilities and we found a number of prisoners whose needs were not being met.

Strategic management

- 2.25 The equality manager worked across the three South Yorkshire prisons (HMPs Moorland, Hatfield and Lindholme). Provision for equality at the establishment was undeveloped and lacked strategic focus, and there were no identified lead members of staff for any of the

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

protected characteristics. There were no formal support groups for prisoners of any minority groups and there was little coordination of the few services provided for these prisoners.

- 2.26 The equality strategy was out of date and was not based on a local analysis of need. It did not cover all the protected characteristics or give details on how equality was managed locally. The equality action team, covering all three prisons, met monthly by video link. Prisoner representatives and a representative from the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) attended. The range of data analysed at the meetings focused solely on race. There was insufficient interrogation and scrutiny of the data provided to the meeting (see main recommendation HP54).
- 2.27 The 11 prisoner equality representatives attended monthly prisoner equality group meetings with the equality manager, but prisoners from the category D site were not always able to attend. Minutes demonstrated that significant issues raised by prisoners were not acted on. Prisoner representatives had identified that prisoners in general did not have confidence in the discrimination incident reporting system but no action had been taken to remedy this. Discrimination incident report forms were freely available. Nineteen had been received in the previous six months, which was very low. Those that had been received had been investigated to a reasonable standard, and internal scrutiny was good. Effective oversight was provided by an independent panel.

Protected characteristics

- 2.28 Approximately 30% of prisoners on the category C site and 35% on the category D site were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. In our survey, these prisoners reported more negatively across a wide range of areas. For example, compared with white prisoners, fewer on the category C site said that staff treated them with respect (66% versus 79%) and more said that they had been victimised by staff (45% versus 32%). On the category D site, fewer black and minority ethnic than white prisoners said that staff treated them with respect (43% versus 68%) and that staff spoke to them during association (0% versus 21%). Black and minority ethnic prisoners on both sites reported victimisation by staff and prisoners across a range of issues.
- 2.29 In our survey, 3% of prisoners on the category C site and 5% on the category D site said that they were Gypsy, Romany or Travellers. The chaplaincy provided a weekly support group for these prisoners and health services staff held regular Traveller meetings to discuss health matters. Traveller prisoners told us that they had problems booking visits as their families often did not have permanent addresses; the prison could not provide reassurance that this did not happen.
- 2.30 Foreign nationals represented 6% of the population on the category C site and 2% on the category D site. Three prisoners were held solely under immigration powers beyond their sentence expiry date. Foreign national prisoners did not have access to independent immigration advice or regular access to UK Border Agency (UKBA) staff. UKBA staff told us that they visited foreign national prisoners at the prison when they had specific documents to issue to them but did not respond to prisoner applications to see them.
- 2.31 The foreign national strategy was out of date and not based on a needs analysis. We found no information displayed in languages other than English and no evidence that professional telephone interpreting services were used.

- 2.32 There were 188 Muslim prisoners across both sites at the time of the inspection. On both sites, our survey responses from Muslim prisoners were more negative than those from non-Muslim prisoners for many aspects of the regime. There was evidence of some religious tension. Prisoners individually and in our groups told us that religious tension was evident on the category D site and that the Muslim washing facilities for prayers had been defecated in. This matter, although known about by some staff, had not reached the attention of managers and had not been adequately dealt with. Non-Muslim prisoners on the category D side told us they were aggrieved because religious services were only available for Muslim prisoners. In our survey, more Muslim than non-Muslim prisoners on this site said that they had been victimised by prisoners (28% versus 3%) and by staff (44% versus 3%) because of their religious beliefs. Only 39% said that they were working in the prison, compared with 80% of non-Muslim prisoners. At the time of the inspection, two prisoners who claimed to belong to an extreme racist organisation were held in segregation because they had attempted, without success, to organise a racist protest.
- 2.33 In our survey, 129 prisoners on the category C site and nine on the category D site reported a disability – considerably more than the 77 prisoners recorded in the prison list, which was out of date. There was no coordinated provision of services or social care plans for those with disabilities, and we came across prisoners whose needs were not being met. There was no evidence of personal emergency evacuation plans for those who clearly needed them. There were also no prisoner carers, and one prisoner with a disability said that he was constantly taunted by other prisoners and bullied for payment if they assisted him in any way; he felt unable to report the incidents for fear of recrimination. Adapted cells were poorly equipped and one inappropriately contained bunk beds. These cells were located at the opposite end of the landing from the staff offices and adapted washing facilities.
- 2.34 There were 75 prisoners over the age of 50, the oldest being 80. The disability and older people's policy related to all three establishments and was not based on a needs analysis for any of the sites. It was out of date and little of the policy had been implemented at Lindholme. There was no formal provision of care or activities for older prisoners beyond classes in the gym.
- 2.35 In our survey, 2% of prisoners on the category C site and 6% on the category D site identified themselves as gay or bisexual. There was no confidential means for a prisoner to report their sexuality or gender issues, and no specific support provided (see main recommendation HP54).

Recommendation

- 2.36 **Foreign national prisoners should have access to written information in their own language, and professional interpreting services should be used when required.**

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.

- 2.37 Faith facilities on the category C site were adequate and the chaplaincy team was well integrated into the regime but corporate worship was not reliably provided. On the category D

site, the only communal worship facilities and regular corporate worship provided were for Muslim prisoners.

- 2.38 Faith facilities on the category C site were adequate and included a chapel and a multi-faith room. The only permanent member of staff was the part-time Muslim chaplain, and all other faiths on this site were provided for through sessional chaplains. In spite of vacancies in the team, they were well integrated into the regime, attended key meetings and provided a limited number of additional faith activities. Generic duties were shared and the team worked well together. Corporate worship for prisoners other than Muslims was not regularly provided. In our survey on this site, fewer prisoners than in similar prisons said that their religious beliefs were respected.
- 2.39 Faith provision on the category D site was inadequate, with communal worship facilities and regular corporate worship provided only for Muslim prisoners. In our survey on this site, only 23% of prisoners, against the 57% comparator, said that their religious beliefs were respected, 33%, against the 64% comparator, that they could speak to a religious leader of their faith in private and only 22%, against the 51% comparator, that it was easy to attend religious services.

Recommendation

- 2.40 Regular corporate worship and adequate faith facilities should be provided for all faiths on both sites.

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.

- 2.41 The responses to our survey about all aspects of complaints were negative but we found that processes were mostly good. Responses to complaints were reasonable.
- 2.42 The processes for collection, distribution and ensuring the timeliness of complaints were good. The subject and source of complaints were analysed and reported to the senior management team for remedial action.
- 2.43 In our survey, only 25% of prisoners on the category C site and 20% of prisoners on the category D site (against the 34% and 46% comparators, respectively) said that complaints were dealt with fairly. In the responses we saw, the replies were generally reasonable but some responses restated the prison rule concerned rather than addressing the reasonableness of the restriction being complained about.

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.

2.44 Two legal services officers provided legal cover on the category C site but had not received recent training. Prisoners on the category D site did not have access to these services.

2.45 On the category C site, two legal services officers based in the library provided a legal signposting service and assisted prisoners in contacting solicitors and obtaining relevant telephone numbers. Prisoners on the category D site did not have access to these services. The legal services officer we spoke to had not had any recent training.

Recommendation

2.46 Legal services officers should have up-to-date training and be accessible by those on the category D site.

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.

2.47 The overall quality of health services was reasonably good but this was not reflected by the feedback from our survey, particularly on the category D site. Partnership and clinical governance arrangements were good. There was a reasonable range of clinics, and wing-based services were available on the larger wings. Pharmacy services were adequate but did not maximise the use of staff expertise. Access to dental services was reasonable and action had been taken to reduce the waiting lists. Access to mental health services was good, although there were delays in transferring prisoners to secure NHS services.

Governance arrangements

2.48 Health services were commissioned by NHS Doncaster. Primary care and mental health services were provided by Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust. Out-of-hours services were available and effective. The establishment was managed as part of a cluster arrangement with HMPs Moorland and Hatfield. Governance and monitoring arrangements were good. There was a wide range of clinical audit, and there were action plans to improve services.

2.49 An infection control audit had been undertaken within the previous year. The health needs assessment had been reviewed in 2012, although this had not included the needs of prisoners

from the category D site. Policies and procedures were in place. Clinical supervision was available and there was a good programme of training

- 2.50 Emergency resuscitation equipment, including oxygen and automated electronic defibrillators, was available in the health care suites. There were defibrillators available in the gym, on the larger wings (J and K), on the care and separation unit and on the induction wing; however, not all officers knew where they were located. The first-aid equipment was not sufficiently widely available and there was no standardised process for checking and replacing used products.
- 2.51 We saw some respectful interactions between health services staff and prisoners. There were no health care prisoner representatives and there was no effective prisoner consultation. The number of health care complaints had reduced over the previous year.

Recommendations

- 2.52 There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment that includes the needs of category D prisoners.
- 2.53 All staff should know where the emergency equipment is kept and all first-aid equipment should contain a standardised range of products that are checked regularly. Sufficient officers should be trained in first aid and resuscitation skills.
- 2.54 Feedback from prisoners should be used to develop health services.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.55 In our survey, only 36% of prisoners on the category C site and 18% on the category D site rated the overall quality of health care as good, both of which were worse than the comparators of 45% and 68%, respectively. The waiting time to see the doctor was one week. Nursing services were wing based on the category C site, and action was being taken to triage men to prevent inappropriate referrals to the GP. In our survey on the category C site, 65% of prisoners said that it was easy to see the nurse, which was better than the 58% comparator.
- 2.56 There was a wide range of nurse-led clinics on the category C site, including asthma, smoking cessation and immunisations, and there was good access to sexual health services. There were links with the gym to provide rehabilitation, and weight management clinics were carried out. There were regular meetings with Travellers to discuss health issues. However, these services were not widely advertised and not all prisoners were aware of their availability.
- 2.57 Prisoners from the category D site had fewer available services on site. There was daily access to a nurse, but no other nurse-led clinics were available on site and the range of health services was not publicised. There were occasional physiotherapy clinics available. Prisoners had to be escorted to appointments for the doctor and dentist on the category C site. We were told that there were not always sufficient staff to escort prisoners. In our survey, only 8% of category D prisoners were satisfied with the availability of the doctor, against the 59% comparator (see main recommendation HP55).
- 2.58 SystemOne (the electronic clinical record system) was used. Record keeping was generally adequate.

- 2.59 A range of health promotion literature was being developed, although this was not always available in languages other than English or in a suitable format for prisoners who had difficulty in reading. Some health promotion events were held collaboratively with gym staff.
- 2.60 The health care administrators managed outside hospital appointments. Some appointments had been cancelled over the previous summer because of insufficient escort opportunities; the resulting delays had started to be addressed.

Recommendation

- 2.61 A full range of health promotion literature should be available for prisoners who do not speak English or who have difficulty in reading.

Housekeeping point

- 2.62 The range of health services and clinics available should be more widely publicised.

Pharmacy

- 2.63 A limited level of pharmacy services was provided. Patients did not have regular direct contact with the pharmacy technician and there were no pharmacy-led clinics.
- 2.64 All medicines were supplied by Lloyds Pharmacy; we were told that there was often a delay of three to four weeks in obtaining stock in this way. Faxed copies of prescriptions were sent to the prison but the pharmacist from Lloyds did not regularly visit the prison so was unable to check the original prescription against the faxed copy.
- 2.65 Many patients received their medication in-possession, subject to a risk assessment. However, the in-possession policy was out of date. Patients did not sign for receipt of their in-possession medication.
- 2.66 Alongside nursing staff, the pharmacy technician administered medicines four times during the day, in the pharmacy and in treatment rooms on the wings on the category C site, and occasionally visited the wings to perform checks on medication storage and stock levels of 'special sick' medication (immediate health treatment without an appointment). A nurse administered medication daily from the category D site and the men held their medication in-possession. On Friday evenings and at weekends, nursing staff took medication in locked trolleys to patients in their cells. When we observed the administration of medicines, overall patient confidentiality and security were maintained, although there was not always a discipline officer nearby on the larger wings (J and K), which meant that the queues could become noisy.
- 2.67 Patient group directions were in place but were limited. A number of medicines were available for use as special sick and there was a policy to support this.
- 2.68 Clinical governance practices in the pharmacy were good, and the standard operating procedures were adequate and up to date. Pharmaceutical stock was managed safely. SystemOne was used effectively to record prescribing and administration information and to contact prescribers.
- 2.69 The controlled drugs register in the pharmacy was not compliant with the national regulations.

- 2.70 A drugs and therapeutics committee met regularly.

Recommendations

- 2.71 The pharmacist and pharmacy technician should be supported to develop pharmacy services such as pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews.
- 2.72 The larger wings should have a discipline officer managing the medicine queues.
- 2.73 A range of patient group directions should be introduced, to enable the supply of more potent medications and avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor.

Housekeeping points

- 2.74 The system of relying on faxed prescriptions should be subject to audit.
- 2.75 Patients should sign to indicate that they have received all medicines supplied as in-possession. The in-possession policy should be updated.
- 2.76 The controlled drugs register in the pharmacy should be compliant with the national regulations.

Dentistry

- 2.77 The dentist and dental nurse were available three days a week. There was no access to a dental hygienist but the dentist undertook this role. Access to the dentist was satisfactory. The waiting list was monitored and had been reduced as a result of extra dental sessions being held. In our survey, 14% of category C prisoners, in line with the comparator, but only 5% of category D prisoners, against the 30% comparator, said that it was easy to see the dentist. Monitoring of dental services for category C and category D prisoners was amalgamated and the extent to which the category D prisoners could access the dentist was unclear.
- 2.78 Equipment was maintained and was in working order. Infection control was generally satisfactory but there was not a separate area for decontamination.

Recommendations

- 2.79 Category D prisoners should be consulted about their views of the dental services and access to the dentist for category D prisoners should be monitored.
- 2.80 The dental equipment and environment should comply with infection control requirements, including the availability of a separate decontamination area.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.81 There was good access to mental health services. The integrated mental health team consisted of a clinical lead member of staff and registered mental health nurses. There was a caseload of 58 patients for secondary care and 31 patients for primary mental health care. Prisoners could attend 'improving access to psychological therapies', which provided primary

care support for those with problems such as anxiety or sleep disturbances. A psychologist and consultant psychiatrist were available weekly. There were reasonably good links with the chaplaincy, which offered bereavement counselling. Mental health awareness training was offered to discipline officers, but take-up had been low and on the induction wing, where prisoners with mental health difficulties tended to be accommodated, not all officers had received this training.

- 2.82 Weekly interdisciplinary team meetings were held to discuss prisoners with complex mental health needs. There were good links with local secure services for these prisoners, and five had been transferred in the previous year. There had been unacceptably long delays in transferring two prisoners, which had required the intervention of commissioners.
- 2.83 There were plans to develop services for people with learning disabilities and personality disorders from April 2013.

Recommendations

- 2.84 Officers should receive training in mental health awareness.
- 2.85 The length of time that prisoners wait for assessment and transfer to secure mental health services should be reduced.
- 2.86 A full range of mental health services should be provided, including for personality disorders and learning disabilities.

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.

- 2.87 Prisoners were negative about the food provided but the meals we inspected were adequate, with reasonable portion sizes and varied menus. Lunch was served before the scheduled time and the evening meal too early, particularly at weekends.
- 2.88 The kitchen was in a poor state of cleanliness, repair and decoration, although a new kitchen was due to open shortly after the inspection which would provide good facilities. In our survey, only 12% of prisoners on the category C site and 13% on the category D site, against the 29% and 42% comparators, respectively, said that the food was good or very good.
- 2.89 The meals we inspected were adequate, although the breakfast packs provided were too small. Portion sizes for other meals were reasonable and the menu was varied. Provision for specialist and medical diets was very good, with meetings taking place between catering staff and individual prisoners, and personal menus were devised when needed.
- 2.90 The heated food trolleys were dirty and in poor repair. Serveries and trolleys were left dirty and with food in them overnight on the wings. Servery workers did not all wear the correct clothing and some serveries did not have adequate screening. Lunch was served before the scheduled time and the evening meal too early, particularly at weekends.

- 2.91 There had been no discussion about food at a prisoner consultation meeting since May 2012 and there was no evidence of a recent food survey having taken place. Food comments books were checked weekly and responses given.

Recommendations

- 2.92 Serveries and trolleys should be left clean overnight, and servery workers should wear appropriate protective clothing.
- 2.93 Prisoners should be regularly consulted about the food.

Housekeeping points

- 2.94 Serveries should be adequately screened.
- 2.95 Meals should be served at the scheduled times and the evening meal should be served later.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.96 New prisoners could wait too long for their first full order. Prisoners could only order from catalogues every three months and had to pay an administration fee. Consultation with prisoners about the shop was poor.
- 2.97 Newly arrived prisoners could wait up to 11 days for their first full shop order, although they were given reception grocery packs. The warehouse facility was on-site and disputes could be dealt with quickly.
- 2.98 Prisoners could make purchases from a reasonable range of catalogues but could only do so every three months. An administration fee was charged with each order. Consultation arrangements about the shop were poor and had not taken place for some time.

Recommendation

- 2.99 Prisoners should be able to place catalogue orders more frequently and should not be charged an administration fee for orders.

Housekeeping point

- 2.100 Consultation with prisoners should take place regularly.

Section 3: Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1 For most prisoners in full-time activity, time out of cell was reasonable, at nine hours a day. Unemployed prisoners were unlocked for less than two hours a day. Prisoners had good access to outdoor association all year round but evening association was too short and prisoners were locked up too early. Twenty per cent of prisoners were locked up during the core day.
- 3.2 Fully employed prisoners experienced nine hours out of their cells during the week but less than seven hours at weekends. However, unemployed prisoners had less than two hours out of cell a day. Evening association periods during the week were short and prisoners were locked up too early, at 6.30pm on Monday to Thursday and at 4.30pm on Fridays and at weekends. As shop purchases were issued through a controlled unlock on a Saturday morning, prisoners spent 19 hours continuously locked in their cell. This had an impact on their ability to contact family and friends and have access to staff. In our roll checks during core day periods, 20% of the population was locked in their cells and not engaged in activity. On the category C site, older prisoners and those with disabilities were not always unlocked during the core day and no activities were provided for them.
- 3.3 Association areas were reasonable, but there was little association equipment and most of it was in a poor state of repair. Outdoor association was available all year round. Exercise yards were mainly bleak but with some seating and there were pleasant gardens on the category D site.

Recommendations

- 3.4 Evening association periods should be extended.
- 3.5 Prisoners who are unemployed (through no fault of their own), older or have disabilities should be unlocked during the core day, with regime activities provided.

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

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

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

3.6 The management of learning and skills on the category C site was good, with a clear strategic direction and a strong focus on quality improvement. The self-assessment process was comprehensive and linked to an effective development plan. The collection, analysis and use of management information data were good. Teaching, training, learning and assessment were good. Achievements on accredited courses were mainly outstanding but opportunities to accredit some work skills were missed. Prisoners developed good personal and social skills, with improved confidence and self-esteem. The variety and range of vocational training were excellent. Attendance at activities was poor. Library facilities were appropriate but access was not sufficiently good. There was no regular learning and skills provision on the category D unit because of a lack of funding.

3.7 Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision in the category C site:

Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities:	good
Quality of learning and skills and work activities (including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment):	good
Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:	good

Management of learning and skills and work

3.8 Senior managers had developed a clear direction for learning and skills, with a good focus on improving the quality of provision against a background of change. An effective needs analysis informed strategic planning well. The prison had a well-developed and comprehensive self-assessment process, and this was linked effectively to a good development plan which was reviewed and updated regularly. Learner views were used to inform the self-assessment process. The self-assessment report had identified most of the areas for improvement that we highlighted. The use and analysis of data to inform planning and performance management were very effective. The operational management of learning and skills on the category C site was good. Internal links were good, providing productive working relationships with the Offender Learning and Skills Service provider, Prospects (the National Career Service) and the subcontracted provision by East Riding College. Opportunities for staff development were good and quality improvement measures had been successful at improving the overall quality of teaching training and learning. There was a high level of mutual respect between tutors, instructional officers and prisoners. Delays in securing funding had resulted in inadequate learning and skills provision on the category D site (see main recommendation HP55).

Provision of activities

3.9 There were sufficient activity places for the prison population. However, with over 25% of prisoners at any one time remaining on wings and not working, learning or training, too few prisoners attended or were fully engaged with prison activities.

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

- 3.10 There were around 263 full-time vocational training places. The Manchester College offered courses in graphic design, food manufacture and professional cookery, bakery, barbering, environmental technology, welding and metal fabrication, light vehicle maintenance, rail engineering track maintenance (sub-contracted to Trackwork), industrial cleaning and horticulture. East Riding College, through a subcontract with The Manchester College, offered courses in brickwork, plastering, painting and decoration, joinery and maintenance operations. In addition, health and safety and food safety qualifications supported vocational training courses. Most qualifications were offered at level 2, with some progression opportunities at level 3 in barbering and professional cookery. There were 216 work places available in textiles, the kitchen, the gardens, horticulture, DHL and beverage packing, and as essential workers in the bakery and in graphic design. An additional 164 employment places were available in wing work, and a further 27 prisoners were employed in orderly roles across the prison.
- 3.11 The Manchester College provided 362 full-time-equivalent education places. The range of English, mathematics, and personal and social development courses was satisfactory. The range of information and communications technology (ICT) courses was good. The average class attendance rate was recorded at 84%; however, inspectors found some classes to be poorly attended.
- 3.12 Both the allocation to activities and the pay structure were fair, and the waiting lists for chosen activities were well managed. Prisoners were allocated to activities promptly after induction but on some occasions were not always sufficiently well informed of why they had been allocated to a particular activity. The learning and skills induction was good and provided an appropriate initial assessment of English and mathematics. The Manchester College provided prisoners with a good level of information and advice. There were links with sentence planning. The National Careers Service provided guidance and reviewed action plans at appropriate times throughout a prisoner's sentence.

Recommendation

- 3.13 The attendance rate of prisoners at activities should be improved.

Housekeeping point

- 3.14 Prisoners should be fully informed of the reasons for their allocation to an activity.

Quality of provision

- 3.15 The overall quality of teaching, coaching, learning and assessment was good. In vocational training, learners were taught by well-qualified and industry-credible staff. They were encouraged to take ownership of their learning and managed their time productively, using any spare time in practical sessions to complete supporting theory work.
- 3.16 Tutors used a wide range of extension activities to provide challenging tasks for the most able learners and helped them to extend their practical skills beyond the boundaries of the qualification. This greatly enhanced learners' employability opportunities on release and engaged them effectively in improving their skills and knowledge. Learners were highly motivated and behaviour was mainly very good. They were supported well in developing their English and mathematics but provision to develop these skills for prisoners in workshops was not sufficiently well planned or focused.

- 3.17 The variety and range of education courses were good. Teachers had a good understanding of the needs and abilities of prisoners, used this to plan and deliver good individual coaching and support, and provided verbal feedback on prisoners' work. In the better sessions, they clearly linked learning to future employability. In a few sessions, the late arrival of prisoners caused some disruption to the planned activities, and tutors and trainers did not sufficiently challenge lateness.
- 3.18 Individual learning plans were routinely used to record completion of qualification units; however, many were insufficiently detailed and did not record all areas for development, including punctuality and communication skills. Improvement targets were too often focused solely on completion of the tasks or entire qualifications rather than on the intended learning.
- 3.19 The range of vocational training courses was excellent. The facilities were mostly good, and outstanding in construction crafts and the bakery. However, the resources in barbering, although adequate, were shabby and in need of refurbishment to bring them to the high standard of the rest of the provision. In industrial cleaning, insufficient materials and equipment were available to facilitate effective training.
- 3.20 The monitoring of learners' progress was good and learners knew what they had achieved and what they had to do next. However, in light vehicle maintenance, the time between learners completing theory and practical tasks and taking the knowledge test based on this was sometimes too great to enable them to consolidate their knowledge effectively.
- 3.21 At work, most prisoners displayed a satisfactory work ethic, even when the work was mundane – for example, in beverage packing. Full-time wing cleaning work, although popular with prisoners, did not keep them occupied for more than a few hours a day. No accredited training in work was available, except in DHL.
- 3.22 On the category D unit, funding was not yet in place to provide adequate provision or accommodation for learning or training. There were no vocational training facilities and classrooms lay abandoned and unused (see Appendix IV). Prison work, which was mainly domestic work and cleaning, was of poor quality, insufficiently challenging, usually took only a few hours a day and did not provide opportunities to develop a good work ethic (see main recommendation HP55).

Recommendations

- 3.23 The planning of support for English and mathematics in workshops should be sufficiently focused.
- 3.24 The punctuality of prisoners at activities should be improved and lateness challenged by tutors.
- 3.25 Resources and facilities should be improved in barbering and industrial cleaning.

Housekeeping point

- 3.26 Target setting should focus on learning outcomes.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.27 The overall achievements of accredited qualification were outstanding, and learners were enthusiastic about their learning.
- 3.28 In vocational training, learners developed very effective practical skills and worked well in sessions. They displayed high levels of competence in their work and most made good progress. In barbering, prisoners worked professionally and demonstrated high levels of technical skill and client care. In the bakery, they worked effectively in teams and delivered high-quality goods to a production deadline. In catering, they developed good practical and customer service skills.
- 3.29 In education classes, prisoners made good progress and demonstrated a range of practical skills such as fault finding and making repairs in computer maintenance courses. Those on English courses demonstrated their improved understanding of punctuation and letter writing. Learners improved their confidence and self-esteem, with good improvements in communication skills.
- 3.30 In jobs where prisoners developed good employability skills (such as good punctuality, showing initiative and effective team working), these skills were not sufficiently well recognised or recorded.

Recommendation

- 3.31 The employability skills that prisoners develop at work should be recognised and recorded.

Library

- 3.32 The libraries on both sites were well managed. The library on the category C site was of modest size but well laid out and offered a good environment in which to read, study or undertake academic research. The range of stock was appropriate for the population and included a good selection of books to support vocational training. There was good access to computers.
- 3.33 Access to the main category C library and the three wing-based library rooms had improved and both were open for some evening sessions. The library was used by just over half of the prisoners. However, the main library was still not open at weekends, and shortfalls in prison officer staff resulted in some planned sessions being cancelled.
- 3.34 A range of activities was organised to promote literacy. A recent event which had involved the writing group giving a public reading of their own poetry had been particularly successful. The provision of small library rooms on three wings helped to promote reading. Toe by Toe (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read) was well established and around 24 prisoners were participating at the time of the inspection.
- 3.35 The library on the category D site was small and welcoming, but had no area for private study and no access to computers. Access was limited to two afternoons and one evening a week.

Recommendations

- 3.36 Access to the library on both the category C and category D sites should be improved.
- 3.37 The library on the category D site should provide areas for private study and access to computers.

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.

- 3.38 The PE provision was well run on the category C site, with a wide range of well-planned accredited courses. Achievements of accredited qualifications were outstanding. Facilities were good but the outside area was often unusable because of waterlogging. Facilities on the category D site were limited and had no free weights area. Health and fitness was well promoted, with good links to the health care department.
- 3.39 The PE department was well managed. Facilities were open every weekday, in the early evening and at weekends, on both sites. There was a well-planned and varied range of recreational activities. There was a wide range of indoor facilities on the category C site, and all equipment was well maintained and in good order. An outside grassed football pitch was often unusable because of waterlogging. Prisoners could use the gym up to three times a week.
- 3.40 On the category D site, a small gym was open during the day without supervision, and for four weekday evenings staffed by two PE officers. An additional free weights facility on this site was closed because the roof was leaking and was waiting to be repaired.
- 3.41 Health and fitness were well promoted to all groups of prisoners, and, in response to GP referrals, specific sessions were run for cardiac rehabilitation, improving mental health and well-being, walking to fitness and for the over-50s.
- 3.42 Use of the gym by different groups of prisoners was monitored and at the time of the inspection no groups were underrepresented. In the previous year, around 66% of the population had used the facilities.
- 3.43 On the category C site, the range of accredited PE training was very good and success rates were outstanding. Courses were well planned and PE staff also delivered a team-building session to support the 'beyond the gate' programme. There were no courses available on the category D site (see main recommendation HP55).

Housekeeping point

- 3.44 The drainage of the outdoor grassed football pitch should be improved, to allow more outside sports activities to take place.

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 A new reducing reoffending strategy and action plan had been developed. The action plan was still in an early stage of development and a comprehensive needs analysis had not yet been carried out. Release on temporary licence was used on both sites but was poorly coordinated with local transport services.
- 4.2 A new reducing reoffending strategy and action plan had been developed. The strategy aimed to draw together resettlement and public protection under reducing reoffending and to promote the role of the offender management unit (OMU). The action plan was still in an early stage of development but had begun to shape some of the work needed over the coming months. However, the needs analysis was inadequate and a more comprehensive one had not yet been carried out. A spreadsheet of identified needs provided a useful way of capturing the resources that were needed but it had not directly informed the reducing reoffending strategy. Other ways of analysing need (for example, prisoner surveys) had not been completed. The specific needs of the diverse population (for example, the category D prisoners) had not been analysed.
- 4.3 A new reducing reoffending committee had replaced the previous resettlement committee to drive forward the new action plan and monitor progress. However, there was little evidence of evaluation of services, and prisoner feedback was not used to identify ongoing gaps.
- 4.4 The range of resettlement services within the prison was limited. For example, there was little debt advice (see section on resettlement pathways), even though this had been identified as an offending-related need in almost a third of the population. Just over 250 prisoners had a sentence plan objective concerning victim awareness but no such provision was available at the establishment, with prisoners having to transfer to HMP Moorland to access it; even there, it was extremely unlikely that such a large number of prisoners would get a place on this course before their release (see recommendation 4.63).
- 4.5 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used on both sites to support ties (see section on children, families and contact with the outside world) but the use of ROTL on the category D site to provide meaningful work preparation before release was poor. Some practical obstacles on the category D site significantly limited prisoners' time out on day release. For example, they were released late in the morning, which meant that they missed the early bus into Doncaster and had to wait another two hours for the next one. They had similar problems on their return, and for some this made a day at work or a town visit impossible. Assessments for ROTL were adequate and approved by a senior manager.

- 4.6 Offender supervisors were adequately trained to fulfil their role but some case administrators had not received sufficient support or training to take on their new generic workload in the OMU.

Recommendations

- 4.7 A regular and comprehensive needs analysis of the diverse population should be used to develop the reducing reoffending strategy and action plan.
- 4.8 There should be an evaluation of reducing reoffending service delivery and effectiveness which includes prisoners' views.
- 4.9 Release on temporary licence day release hours should support a full day's work or home/family visit, and practical obstacles to taking day release should be minimised.

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.

4.10 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments were up to date but offender supervisors had large caseloads which limited their contact with prisoners. The quality of assessment, planning and recording was inadequate. Sentence planning on the category D site was poor. Home detention curfew arrangements were good. Public protection arrangements were reasonable but there were some delays. Recategorisation decisions did not involve the prisoner sufficiently, and transfer requests were not coordinated with offender managers. There were few services for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners, and those on the category D site were inadequately prepared for release.

4.11 The previous backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments had been dealt with and completion was largely up to date. However, too many prisoners arrived at the establishment from local prisons without an initial assessment and plan. This meant that not only did offender supervisors have to catch up on this work (with about 16 new assessments needed each month), but also that prisoners were not allocated to the establishment on the basis of their offending-related needs.

4.12 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor. Offender supervisors were clear and enthusiastic about their responsibilities but caseloads were high, with about 80 cases each. Expectations about levels of contact were not well defined, based on the risk of harm or prioritised. There was little contact between offender supervisors and prisoners beyond the initial assessment, resulting in a reactive service only. The services of offender supervisors were deployed only for events in the prisoner's sentence such as ROTL assessment, parole hearings and recategorisation reviews. The ongoing management of the risk of harm to others had assumed a lower priority. There was also insufficient management oversight of high risk of harm cases.

- 4.13 The risk of harm analysis was adequate in only six of the 20 cases we inspected, with shortfalls including poor timeliness and a lack of sufficient information or analysis of information. The risk management plan was adequate in only half the cases.
- 4.14 Recording in the OMU was poor, with little use of P-Nomis (electronic case notes); in some cases hand-written notes were the only source of evidence. Information exchange between other departments and the OMU was significantly underdeveloped.
- 4.15 In our survey, far fewer prisoners on the category D site (59%) than at other open prisons (74%) said they had a sentence plan. Sentence plan objectives had been partly achieved in only nine of the 20 cases we inspected and not achieved in the remaining 11 cases. Only 28% of category C prisoners and 26% of category D prisoners, against the 35% and 47% comparators, respectively, said that their offender supervisor was working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets.
- 4.16 The number of successful applications for home detention curfew (HDC) was in line with that seen elsewhere. The timeliness of releases was good, even when a prisoner arrived at the establishment after the HDC assessment process should have started. However, the timeliness of release was not routinely monitored. The appeals process worked well and we saw evidence of refusals being overturned.

Recommendations

- 4.17 Prisoners arriving at the establishment should have an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and sentence plan.
- 4.18 The quality of the risk of harm analysis and management plans should be improved.
- 4.19 Prisoners should be supported in achieving their sentence plan targets, including meaningful contacts with their offender supervisor which are focused on offending behaviour and the management of the risk of harm.

Housekeeping points

- 4.20 Contact with the offender management unit (OMU) and other relevant information should be recorded in electronic case notes.
- 4.21 Information exchange between other departments and the OMU should be improved.
- 4.22 The timeliness of release on home detention curfew should be monitored and action taken to improve the number of successful candidates being released on their eligibility date.

Public protection

- 4.23 Public protection concerns were clearly identified when prisoners arrived at the prison, and reports to the interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) were prepared. However, these were sometimes slightly delayed, which meant that decisions about ongoing monitoring were sometimes held up. The IRMT met each week and considered new prisoners, as well as reviewing those who had been on mail and telephone monitoring for three months. These meetings were not always well attended and offender supervisors did not participate.

- 4.24 Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were adequate, with written reports being submitted to level 2 meetings. Information about new receptions was entered into the violent and sexual offenders register (ViSOR), which was used to request partnership with other agencies but was not actively used to support the management of the prisoner.

Housekeeping point

- 4.25 Offender supervisors should attend the interdepartmental risk management team meeting.

Categorisation

- 4.26 The previous backlog of recategorisation reviews had been dealt with and they were now mainly on time, although this was not routinely monitored. Some of the reports by offender supervisors lacked detail or an analysis of the information which suggested an increase or decrease in risks. Other reports (for example, from the personal officer) were also uninformative and basic. The prisoner could submit a written report but was not able to attend the review, and was only informed about the outcome in writing.
- 4.27 Only a few reviews due in January 2013 were still to be completed; these had been delayed because offender manager reports had not yet been received from the Probation Trust. Prisoners could appeal through the complaints system, and an appeals board was held which included the prisoner.
- 4.28 Prisoner requests for transfer were not always informed by the offender supervisor or sentence plan. Prisoners re-categorised from C to D did not have to wait too long to transfer to open conditions. Those waiting for a progressive move in line with their sentence plan were also moved fairly quickly.

Recommendation

- 4.29 Prisoner transfer requests should always be informed by the views of the offender supervisor.

Housekeeping point

- 4.30 The timeliness of recategorisation reviews should be routinely monitored to identify issues causing delays.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.31 At the time of the inspection, there were 59 life-sentenced prisoners on the category C site and 27 on the category D site. There were also 69 prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP) on the category C site and 26 on the category D site. There was little provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) on either site. ISP family days were not delivered regularly enough. Although offender supervisors were trained in the management of ISPs, they did not provide enough support to them and there was a significant lack of offence-focused work.

- 4.32 Most of the prisoners on the category D site were ISPs. They were poorly prepared for their eventual release and resettlement. They did not have regular access to resettlement services and those we spoke to were very angry and frustrated about the lack of provision.
- 4.33 Parole reports were on time and good use was made of the video conference facilities for hearings.

Recommendation

- 4.34 Support for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners, particularly those on the category D site, should be improved.

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.

- 4.35 Offender supervisors made referrals for reintegration services but provision of these was limited. A Shelter worker provided an adequate range of support on the category C site but this was not available on the category D site. Employment and training advice was available for category C prisoners but working-out opportunities for those on the category D site were poor. Health and substance misuse pre-release arrangements were good. Finance provision was extremely limited across both sites. Family support was poor. Visits arrangements were adequate but there had been no visitor consultation. There were delays to the start of visits, especially at weekends. Facilities for visiting children were poor. There was no provision of offending behaviour programme work at the establishment and prisoners were transferred when required to undertake a course.
- 4.36 Offender supervisors made referrals to resettlement services, as needed, for all prisoners on arrival. However, in only nine cases out of the 20 we inspected had the prisoner had their needs assessed within 10 days of arrival. Pre-release assessment and planning were not well developed and too few prisoners were assessed before release.
- 4.37 Resettlement services were very limited. In our survey, fewer prisoners on both sites than the respective comparators said that they had been helped to prepare for release. Far fewer prisoners on the category D site than at comparator establishments said that they knew whom to turn to for help with the resettlement pathways. Far fewer prisoners on the category D site than at comparator establishments said that they had been helped to prepare for open conditions, and that they had been given greater responsibility than when they had been at a category C prison. Only 4% of these prisoners, against the 19% comparator, said they had been on a preparation for release course. Prisoners on the category C site had access to the 'beyond the gate' course to help them to prepare for employment but received little other support in preparation for release (see main recommendation HP56).

Accommodation

- 4.38 A Shelter worker was based on the category C site during the week and provided an adequate range of help, support and advice, including the preservation of tenancies. Although few prisoners declared themselves homeless on release, the effectiveness of accommodation support was not routinely monitored beyond measuring performance against the key performance target. Far too many prisoners on the category C site failed to attend their appointments, which meant that the Shelter workers lost almost half of their interviewing time each week. Those on the category D site did not have routine access to accommodation advice, although one surgery had recently been held (see main recommendation HP56).

Housekeeping point

- 4.39 Attendance at Shelter appointments should be improved.

Education, training and employment

- 4.40 The education department provided an effective 'beyond the gate' course for category C prisoners before release. This helped prisoners with CV development, job applications, job search and interview skills. The National Careers Service also provided help with CV building and job search. Advice and guidance workers had a well-informed understanding of the labour markets where prisoners were to be released and had developed links with colleges and education providers to enable prisoners to access further training on release. Vocational courses available in the prison reflected employer needs but there were too few links with employers to help prisoners to gain employment on release.
- 4.41 The category D site had made some links within the community to enable prisoners to gain outside work experience using ROTL (see also section on strategic management of resettlement). Most of these places were in unpaid work and the variety of activities was limited. Although around half the population was allocated to outside work, in reality only about 25% of prisoners were working out on ROTL at any one time. There was no systematic planning of how these prisoners could access information, advice and guidance or get help with CVs, job applications or job search (see main recommendation HP56).

Recommendations

- 4.42 Better links with employers should be developed to provide improved employment opportunities for prisoners on release.
- 4.43 The amount of release on temporary licence and the variety of work, especially paid work, should be increased on the category D site.
- 4.44 Information, advice and guidance should be introduced and support provided for prisoners with CV building and job search on the category D site.

Health care

- 4.45 There were satisfactory discharge arrangements for prisoners with mental and physical health problems. Staff met prisoners as part of a discharge clinic. One week of medications was supplied if necessary, and also information about local GP services.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.46 There were good links with local and regional drug intervention programme (DIP) teams, with ongoing work by the substance use team aimed at encouraging more prison visits by DIP workers and gate pick-ups for newly released prisoners with substance use problems. Prisoners received good overdose and relapse prevention information before release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.47 Other than access to the free telephone debt advice line, finance provision was extremely limited across both sites and few prisoners knew where to go for finance advice. Shelter staff provided some debt advice on the category C site but they were not routinely available on the category D site. Jobcentre Plus staff provided benefits advice on the category C site but prisoners on the category D site did not have access to this. Limited budgeting advice was available only to those doing the 'beyond the gate' course on the category C site (see main recommendation HP56).
- 4.48 Basic savings accounts were available through the Credit Union and over 200 had been opened in the previous year.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.49 This pathway was underdeveloped and largely limited to the provision of Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children). However, this was not routinely available to category D prisoners and only 51 prisoners on the category C site had taken part over the previous six months. There was no parenting skills course, and family days had been sporadic over the previous year.
- 4.50 In our survey, only 41% of prisoners on the category D site, against the 54% comparator, said that staff had supported them in maintaining contact with their family and friends while at the prison. A large number of prisoners on this site were able to take periods of home leave or town visits (where prisoners travel to local towns to spend time with their family) but some significant practical obstacles had a considerable impact on this provision (see section on strategic management of resettlement).
- 4.51 The visitors centre was large and bright. There was little information on display but visitors we spoke to said that they had been sent everything they needed to know before their first visit. The availability of two telephone lines for booking visits was insufficient to meet demand and visitors told us that it was difficult to get through; however, they said that they could generally book visits for the days they wanted.
- 4.52 Visitors to the category C site were booked in efficiently and respectfully at the centre but they did not start moving over to the main gate and search area until after the advertised visits start

time, which sometimes meant that they started their visit 30 minutes late. We were told that the delay could be far longer at weekends, when more visitors had to be searched.

- 4.53 Visitors arriving late were still allowed into the visits hall. Prisoners were called over to the hall once their visitors had arrived, avoiding unnecessary waits in the hall. They had to wear a high-visibility vest in addition to prison-issue clothing.
- 4.54 The visits halls on both sites were large but bare. On the category C site, seating was fixed to the floor, but comfortable. A limited range of drinks and snacks could be bought from vending machines but hot food was not available.
- 4.55 The children's play area on the both sites contained few toys and did not have a crèche facility.
- 4.56 Visitors' surveys were not routinely undertaken, so potential issues remained unidentified.

Recommendations

- 4.57 **Support for prisoners on both sites to maintain contact with their families and friends should be prioritised and better family pathway provision developed, including regular family days.**
- 4.58 **Regular surveys of the views visitors should be completed and improvements made as necessary.**
- 4.59 **Prisoners should not have to wear prison clothes and a high-visibility vest during visits.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.60 The children's play areas should be improved and supervised.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.61 There were no accredited offending behaviour programmes or structured ways of addressing offending behaviour at either of the sites. Prisoners had to relocate to HMP Moorland to undertake programmes. The thinking skills (TSP), building skills for recovery (BSR), controlling anger and learning to manage it (CALM) and victim awareness programmes were available but demand vastly exceeded supply.
- 4.62 There was little evidence of transfers to HMP Moorland and many prisoners we spoke to were reluctant to move there because they could not be guaranteed a return to their current employment or accommodation. This perception had not been examined or addressed, even though it contributed to the refusal by half of those assessed as suitable for the TSP to relocate to undertake it.

Recommendation

- 4.63 **Access to structured offending behaviour work, including accredited programmes, should be improved.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.64 Prisoners' reluctance to transfer to HMP Moorland to complete an offending behaviour programme should be explored and addressed.

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 Prisoners on the category D site should be consulted about their feelings of safety, and all data relating to safety should be collated and analysed and action taken to make the prison safer. (HP52)
 - 5.2 Vulnerable prisoners and victims of bullying should not be routinely segregated on normal location. They should have a support plan and access to association and activities, and their underlying safety issues should be addressed. (HP53)
 - 5.3 Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners with protected characteristics are identified, assessed and met and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (HP54)
 - 5.4 Suitable planned on-site health and learning and skills services which meet the needs of the population should be provided on the category D site. (HP55)
 - 5.5 Specialist resettlement support should be made available and the services available should be monitored to establish how many prisoners are helped. (HP56)

Recommendation

To NOMS

Offender management and planning

- 5.6 Prisoners arriving at the establishment should have an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and sentence plan. (4.17)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.7 Prisoners should be disembarked promptly from the escort van. (1.4)

Early days in custody

- 5.8 Newly arrived prisoners should be offered access to a Listener. (1.12)

- 5.9 On both sites, first night procedures should include a private interview with a member of staff which addresses feelings of safety, and night staff should make themselves known to new arrivals. (1.13)
- 5.10 Prisoners should be provided with up-to-date written information about the prison on their first night. (1.14)
- 5.11 All new prisoners on the category D site should be given a full reception, welcome and briefing about the site on their first night and they should receive a thorough induction. (1.15)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.12 The safer custody meeting should analyse the data provided, to identify patterns and trends and set strategic objectives across both sites. (1.25)
- 5.13 There should be plans for victims of assaults and bullying which identify how they can be supported and kept safe. (1.26)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.14 There should be a local safer custody strategy which makes reference to the specific needs of the population held. (1.36)
- 5.15 All staff should have up-to-date training in self-harm and suicide prevention. (1.37)
- 5.16 The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) assessment, planning and care should be improved and this should be reflected in the quality of case records. (1.38)
- 5.17 There should be adequate provision of Listener services on the category D site. (1.39)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.18 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. (1.45)

Security

- 5.19 Closed visits should be imposed only for visits-related activity. (1.55)
- 5.20 Security conditions for prisoners on the open site should be in line with those at other open sites and proportionate to the risks posed. (1.56)
- 5.21 Security arrangements at night time on the older category C site wings should be amended so that prompt assistance and intervention can be provided in an emergency. (1.57)
- 5.22 Drug testing figures should be collated by type and separated by wing and site to provide effective management information. (1.58)

Discipline

- 5.23 The use of force committee should formally review all uses of force and examine data to identify trends and emerging issues. (1.71)
- 5.24 All use of force dossiers should include a fully completed F213 (injury to prisoner) form. (1.72)
- 5.25 All planned interventions should be video-recorded for evidential and training purposes. (1.73)
- 5.26 All incidents of use of special accommodation should be properly authorised, monitored, formally recorded and reviewed. (1.74)
- 5.27 The smoking ban in the segregation unit should be reviewed and the consequences for prisoners in crisis considered. (1.79)
- 5.28 All prisoners in the segregation unit should have daily access to showers and telephone calls. (1.80)
- 5.29 Opportunities for associated activity (including exercise) should be introduced, subject to appropriate risk assessment. (1.81)
- 5.30 A formal reintegration and care planning process for segregated prisoners should be introduced. (1.82)

Substance misuse

- 5.31 An in-depth substance use needs analysis should be conducted to update the drug and alcohol strategy and develop substance use interventions of sufficient intensity and ease of access to meet the needs of the prison's population. (1.92)
- 5.32 Peer supporters and self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous should be put in place. (1.93)
- 5.33 The prison should ensure an integrated approach to tackling both drug supply and demand reduction. (1.94)

Residential units

- 5.34 The shower rooms on the category D site should be refurbished and regularly cleaned and maintained. (2.10)
- 5.35 Replies to applications should be logged and monitored for timeliness. (2.11)
- 5.36 Prisoners should be able to access their stored property within 14 days. (2.12)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.37 Regular, meaningful prisoner consultation meetings should be introduced. (2.21)

- 5.38 Staff case note entries should be regular and meaningful and a system of regular quality checks should be introduced. (2.22)

Equality and diversity

- 5.39 Foreign national prisoners should have access to written information in their own language, and professional interpreting services should be used when required. (2.36)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.40 Regular corporate worship and adequate faith facilities should be provided for all faiths on both sites. (2.40)

Legal rights

- 5.41 Legal services officers should have up-to-date training and be accessible by those on the category D site. (2.46)

Health services

- 5.42 There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment that includes the needs of category D prisoners. (2.52)
- 5.43 All staff should know where the emergency equipment is kept and all first-aid equipment should contain a standardised range of products that are checked regularly. Sufficient officers should be trained in first aid and resuscitation skills. (2.53)
- 5.44 Feedback from prisoners should be used to develop health services. (2.54)
- 5.45 A full range of health promotion literature should be available for prisoners who do not speak English or who have difficulty in reading. (2.61)
- 5.46 The pharmacist and pharmacy technician should be supported to develop pharmacy services such as pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews. (2.71)
- 5.47 The larger wings should have a discipline officer managing the medicine queues. (2.72)
- 5.48 A range of patient group directions should be introduced, to enable the supply of more potent medications and avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.73)
- 5.49 Category D prisoners should be consulted about their views of the dental services and access to the dentist for category D prisoners should be monitored. (2.79)
- 5.50 The dental equipment and environment should comply with infection control requirements, including the availability of a separate decontamination area. (2.80)
- 5.51 Officers should receive training in mental health awareness. (2.84)
- 5.52 The length of time that prisoners wait for assessment and transfer to secure mental health services should be reduced. (2.85)

- 5.53 A full range of mental health services should be provided, including for personality disorders and learning disabilities. (2.86)

Catering

- 5.54 Serveries and trolleys should be left clean overnight, and servery workers should wear appropriate protective clothing. (2.92)
- 5.55 Prisoners should be regularly consulted about the food. (2.93)

Purchases

- 5.56 Prisoners should be able to place catalogue orders more frequently and should not be charged an administration fee for orders. (2.99)

Time out of cell

- 5.57 Evening association periods should be extended. (3.4)
- 5.58 Prisoners who are unemployed (through no fault of their own), older or have disabilities should be unlocked during the core day, with regime activities provided. (3.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.59 The attendance rate of prisoners at activities should be improved. (3.13)
- 5.60 The planning of support for English and mathematics in workshops should be sufficiently focused. (3.23)
- 5.61 The punctuality of prisoners at activities should be improved and lateness challenged by tutors. (3.24)
- 5.62 Resources and facilities should be improved in barbering and industrial cleaning. (3.25)
- 5.63 The employability skills that prisoners develop at work should be recognised and recorded. (3.31)
- 5.64 Access to the library on both the category C and category D sites should be improved. (3.36)
- 5.65 The library on the category D site should provide areas for private study and access to computers. (3.37)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.66 A regular and comprehensive needs analysis of the diverse population should be used to develop the reducing reoffending strategy and action plan. (4.7)
- 5.67 There should be an evaluation of reducing reoffending service delivery and effectiveness which includes prisoners' views. (4.8)

- 5.68 Release on temporary licence day release hours should support a full day's work or home/family visit, and practical obstacles to taking day release should be minimised. (4.9)

Offender management and planning

- 5.69 The quality of the risk of harm analysis and management plans should be improved. (4.18)
- 5.70 Prisoners should be supported in achieving their sentence plan targets, including meaningful contacts with their offender supervisor which are focused on offending behaviour and the management of the risk of harm. (4.19)
- 5.71 Prisoner transfer requests should always be informed by the views of the offender supervisor. (4.29)
- 5.72 Support for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners, particularly those on the category D site, should be improved. (4.34)

Reintegration planning

- 5.73 Better links with employers should be developed to provide improved employment opportunities for prisoners on release. (4.42)
- 5.74 The amount of release on temporary licence and the variety of work, especially paid work, should be increased on the category D site. (4.43)
- 5.75 Information, advice and guidance should be introduced and support provided for prisoners with CV building and job search on the category D site. (4.44)
- 5.76 Support for prisoners on both sites to maintain contact with their families and friends should be prioritised and better family pathway provision developed, including regular family days. (4.57)
- 5.77 Regular surveys of the views visitors should be completed and improvements made as necessary. (4.58)
- 5.78 Prisoners should not have to wear prison clothes and a high-visibility vest during visits. (4.59)
- 5.79 Access to structured offending behaviour work, including accredited programmes, should be improved. (4.63)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.80 The prisoner information representatives should meet all new prisoners to check if they require any information. (1.16)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.81 Targets in anti-bullying plans should be personalised to the behaviour of the prisoner concerned. (1.27)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.82 The use of safer cells and constant observation for prisoners at risk should be logged and monitored. (1.40)
- 5.83 The Listener suite should be used for meetings between Listeners and prisoners. (1.41)

Security

- 5.84 Mandatory drug testing facilities should be kept clean, tidy and free from graffiti, to create a respectful and uncontaminated testing and waiting environment. (1.59)
- 5.85 Strip-searching should be conducted on mats that are adequate for the purpose. (1.60)
- 5.86 Monthly security objectives should be regularly disseminated to all staff in the prison. (1.61)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.87 The incentives and earned privileges system should be applied consistently across the prison. (1.65)
- 5.88 The application of sanctions and subsequent monitoring of all prisoners subject to the basic regime should be applied as prescribed in the policy document. (1.66)

Discipline

- 5.89 Toilets should be deep-cleaned and maintained in an acceptable condition. (1.83)
- 5.90 Daily prisoner records should be fully completed. (1.84)

Residential units

- 5.91 Wing laundry equipment should be maintained in good order. (2.13)
- 5.92 The offensive display policy should be updated and enforced. (2.14)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.93 The process for admitting prisoners back onto the wings outside of main movement should be reviewed. (2.23)

Health services

- 5.94 The range of health services and clinics available should be more widely publicised. (2.62)
- 5.95 The system of relying on faxed prescriptions should be subject to audit. (2.74)
- 5.96 Patients should sign to indicate that they have received all medicines supplied as in-possession. The in-possession policy should be updated. (2.75)

- 5.97 The controlled drugs register in the pharmacy should be compliant with the national regulations. (2.76)

Catering

- 5.98 Serveries should be adequately screened. (2.94)
- 5.99 Meals should be served at the scheduled times and the evening meal should be served later. (2.95)

Purchases

- 5.100 Consultation with prisoners should take place regularly. (2.100)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.101 Prisoners should be fully informed of the reasons for their allocation to an activity. (3.14)
- 5.102 Target setting should focus on learning outcomes. (3.26)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.103 The drainage of the outdoor grassed football pitched should be improved, to allow more outside sports activities to take place. (3.44)

Offender management and planning

- 5.104 Contact with the offender management unit (OMU) and other relevant information should be recorded in electronic case notes. (4.20)
- 5.105 Information exchange between other departments and the OMU should be improved. (4.21)
- 5.106 The timeliness of release on home detention curfew should be monitored and action taken to improve the number of successful candidates being released on their eligibility date. (4.22)
- 5.107 Offender supervisors should attend the interdepartmental risk management team meeting. (4.25)
- 5.108 The timeliness of recategorisation reviews should be routinely monitored to identify issues causing delays. (4.30)

Reintegration planning

- 5.109 Attendance at Shelter appointments should be improved. (4.39)
- 5.110 The children's play areas should be improved and supervised. (4.60)
- 5.111 Prisoners' reluctance to transfer to HMP Moorland to complete an offending behaviour programme should be explored and addressed. (4.64)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Annie Crowley	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Helen Carter	Health services inspector
Paddy Doyle	Offender management inspector
Krystyna Findlay	Offender management inspector
Mike Lane	Offender management inspector
Gary Smallman	Offender management inspector
Stephen Miller	Ofsted inspector
Gerard McGarth	Ofsted inspector
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
Ian Mather	Care Quality Commission

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced		861	90.9
Recall		83	8.8
Convicted unsentenced		0	0
Remand		0	0
Civil prisoners		2	0.2
Detainees		1	0.1
Total		947	100

Sentence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		3	0.3
Less than 6 months		2	0.2
6 months to less than 12 months		16	1.7
12 months to less than 2 years		99	10.5
2 years to less than 4 years		109	11.5
4 years to less than 10 years		122	12.9
10 years and over (not life)		354	37.4
ISPP		59	6.2
Life		183	19.3
Total		947	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
<i>Please state minimum age</i>	<i>21</i>	
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	424	44.8
30 years to 39 years	319	33.7
40 years to 49 years	129	13.6
50 years to 59 years	57	6
60 years to 69 years	12	1.3
70 plus years	6	0.6
<i>Please state maximum age</i>	<i>80</i>	
Total	947	100

Nationality	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British		909	96
Foreign nationals		33	3.5
Not stated		5	0.5
Total		947	100

Security category	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced		1	0.1
Category A			
Category B			
Category C		831	87.8
Category D		112	11.8

Other		3	0.3
Total		947	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
<i>White</i>		657	69.4
British		637	67.3
Irish		8	0.8
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		1	0.1
Other White		11	1.2
<i>Mixed</i>		44	4.6
White and black Caribbean		31	3.3
White and black African		1	0.1
White and Asian		6	0.6
Other mixed		6	0.6
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		124	13.1
Indian		19	2.0
Pakistani		83	8.8
Bangladeshi		3	0.3
Chinese		0	0
Other Asian		19	2.0
<i>Black or black British</i>			
Caribbean		40	4.2
African		10	1.1
Other black		16	1.7
<i>Other ethnic group</i>		0	0
Arab			
Other ethnic group			
Not stated		56	5.9
Total		947	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		0	0
Church of England		250	26.45
Roman Catholic		169	17.8
Other Christian denominations		64	6.8
Muslim		188	19.9
Sikh		5	0.5
Hindu		1	0.1
Buddhist		17	1.8
Jewish		0	0
Other		3	0.3
No religion		240	25.3
Not stated		10	1.1
Total		947	100

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			147	15.5
1 month to 3 months			223	23.5
3 months to 6 months			220	23.2
6 months to 1 year			199	21
1 year to 2 years			98	10.3
2 years to 4 years			45	4.8
4 years or more			12	1.3
Total			944	99.7

Sentenced prisoners only

	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry		3	0.3
Public protection cases			
Total		3	0.3

Main offence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person			
Sexual offences			
Burglary			
Robbery			
Theft and handling			
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences			
Other offences			
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
Total			

Appendix IIIa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology: HMP Lindholme (closed)

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 4 February 2013, the prisoner population at HMP Lindholme was 840. The sample size was 210. Overall, this represented 25% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

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

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Six 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;
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

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

Response rates

In total, 183 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 22% of the prison population. The response rate was 87%. In addition to the six respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 17 questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2013 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in category C trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 40 category C trainer prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses in 2013 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Lindholme in 2007.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Survey summary

Section 1: About you

Q1.2 How old are you?

<i>Under 21</i>	0 (0%)
<i>21 - 29</i>	80 (44%)
<i>30 - 39</i>	59 (33%)
<i>40 - 49</i>	23 (13%)
<i>50 - 59</i>	15 (8%)
<i>60 - 69</i>	3 (2%)
<i>70 and over</i>	1 (1%)

Q1.3 Are you sentenced?

<i>Yes</i>	162 (90%)
<i>Yes - on recall</i>	19 (10%)
<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)
<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)

Q1.4 How long is your sentence?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Less than 6 months</i>	2 (1%)
<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	6 (3%)
<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	15 (8%)
<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	44 (25%)
<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	67 (38%)
<i>10 years or more</i>	18 (10%)
<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	11 (6%)
<i>Life</i>	15 (8%)

Q1.5 Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)

<i>Yes</i>	11 (6%)
<i>No</i>	170 (94%)

Q1.6 Do you understand spoken English?

<i>Yes</i>	180 (99%)
<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

Q1.7 Do you understand written English?

<i>Yes</i>	180 (99%)
<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

Q1.8 What is your ethnic origin?

<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)....</i>	117 (65%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese.</i>	0 (0%)
<i>White - Irish</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	3 (2%)
<i>White - other</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	12 (7%)
<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	9 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Black or black British - African</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0 (0%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	23 (13%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)		

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

Yes.....	5 (3%)
No.....	168 (97%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	53 (30%)	<i>Hindu</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Church of England</i>	53 (30%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	27 (15%)	<i>Muslim</i>	33 (18%)
<i>Protestant</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Other</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	2 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	174 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	2 (1%)

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

Yes.....	27 (15%)
No.....	153 (85%)

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

Yes.....	10 (6%)
No.....	169 (94%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	46 (26%)
No.....	133 (74%)

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

Yes.....	99 (55%)
No.....	80 (45%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	126 (69%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	47 (26%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (5%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	126 (70%)
Yes.....	42 (23%)
No.....	13 (7%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	126 (70%)
---	-----------

Yes	5 (3%)
No.....	48 (27%)
Don't remember	2 (1%)

Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?

Yes	123 (69%)
No.....	47 (26%)
Don't remember	9 (5%)

Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?

Yes	151 (84%)
No.....	25 (14%)
Don't remember	4 (2%)

Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?

Very well.....	44 (24%)
Well.....	76 (42%)
Neither.....	48 (27%)
Badly.....	4 (2%)
Very badly	6 (3%)
Don't remember	2 (1%)

Q2.7 Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Yes, someone told me	114 (63%)
Yes, I received written information.....	35 (19%)
No, I was not told anything.....	34 (19%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?

Yes	160 (88%)
No.....	22 (12%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?

Less than 2 hours	85 (47%)
2 hours or longer.....	86 (48%)
Don't remember	9 (5%)

Q3.2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?

Yes	153 (85%)
No	23 (13%)
Don't remember	4 (2%)

Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?

Very well.....	34 (19%)
Well.....	100 (55%)
Neither.....	32 (18%)
Badly.....	7 (4%)
Very badly	8 (4%)
Don't remember	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>	30 (17%)	<i>Physical health</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Housing problems</i>	24 (13%)	<i>Mental health</i>	19 (11%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Contacting family</i>	36 (20%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>	51 (28%)
<i>Childcare</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Money worries</i>	16 (9%)	Did not have any problems	68 (38%)
<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	19 (11%)		

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

<i>Yes</i>	30 (17%)
<i>No</i>	80 (45%)
Did not have any problems	68 (38%)

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

<i>Tobacco</i>	153 (84%)
<i>A shower</i>	53 (29%)
<i>A free telephone call</i>	41 (23%)
<i>Something to eat</i>	86 (47%)
<i>PIN phone credit</i>	137 (75%)
<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>	68 (37%)
Did not receive anything	6 (3%)

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

<i>Chaplain</i>	79 (44%)
<i>Someone from health services</i>	115 (64%)
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	34 (19%)
<i>Prison shop/canteen</i>	29 (16%)
Did not have access to any of these	38 (21%)

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>	73 (42%)
<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	44 (25%)
<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	54 (31%)
<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	59 (34%)
<i>Health services</i>	77 (45%)
<i>Chaplaincy</i>	66 (38%)
Not offered any information	56 (32%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	161 (88%)
<i>No</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)

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

Have not been on an induction course	18 (10%)
<i>Within the first week</i>	141 (77%)
<i>More than a week</i>	16 (9%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (4%)

Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	18 (10%)
	Yes.....	88 (48%)
	No.....	62 (34%)
	Don't remember	15 (8%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	32 (18%)
	Within the first week.....	54 (30%)
	More than a week.....	74 (41%)
	Don't remember	19 (11%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:						
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	31 (17%)	59 (33%)	25 (14%)	27 (15%)	19 (11%)	18 (10%)
	Attend legal visits?	31 (19%)	56 (34%)	24 (14%)	11 (7%)	8 (5%)	36 (22%)
	Get bail information?	7 (4%)	20 (13%)	25 (16%)	14 (9%)	11 (7%)	82 (52%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	<i>Not had any letters</i>						33 (18%)
	Yes.....						84 (46%)
	No.....						66 (36%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	Yes.....						75 (41%)
	No.....						10 (5%)
	Don't know						98 (54%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		Yes	No	Don't know			
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	107 (59%)	71 (39%)	2 (1%)			
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	173 (95%)	10 (5%)	0 (0%)			
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	125 (69%)	52 (29%)	5 (3%)			
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	118 (65%)	60 (33%)	3 (2%)			
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	59 (33%)	100 (56%)	21 (12%)			
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	127 (71%)	51 (28%)	1 (1%)			

If you need to, can you normally get your stored property? 29 (16%) 93 (51%) 61 (33%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?			
	Very good.....	4	(2%)	
	Good.....	18	(10%)	
	Neither.....	41	(23%)	
	Bad.....	48	(27%)	
	Very bad.....	70	(39%)	
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?			
	Have not bought anything yet/don't know	8	(4%)	
	Yes.....	75	(41%)	
	No.....	98	(54%)	
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?			
	Yes.....	74	(40%)	
	No.....	20	(11%)	
	Don't know.....	89	(49%)	
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?			
	Yes.....	89	(50%)	
	No.....	25	(14%)	
	Don't know/N/A.....	65	(36%)	
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?			
	Yes.....	96	(53%)	
	No.....	11	(6%)	
	Don't know/N/A.....	74	(41%)	
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?			
	I don't want to attend	39	(22%)	
	Very easy.....	42	(23%)	
	Easy.....	48	(27%)	
	Neither.....	10	(6%)	
	Difficult.....	8	(4%)	
	Very difficult.....	1	(1%)	
	Don't know.....	33	(18%)	

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	138	(77%)	
	No.....	33	(18%)	
	Don't know.....	8	(4%)	
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	22 (13%)	84 (50%)	63 (37%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	22 (13%)	52 (32%)	89 (55%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....	107	(59%)	

No 34 (19%)
 Don't know 40 (22%)

Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints:

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	68 (39%)	27 (15%)	81 (46%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	68 (40%)	24 (14%)	80 (47%)

Q5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?

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

Q5.6 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?

Don't know who they are 62 (35%)
 Very easy 12 (7%)
 Easy 20 (11%)
 Neither 38 (21%)
 Difficult 29 (16%)
 Very difficult 17 (10%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)

Don't know what the IEP scheme is 6 (3%)
 Yes 98 (54%)
 No 64 (35%)
 Don't know 13 (7%)

Q6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)

Don't know what the IEP scheme is 6 (3%)
 Yes 89 (50%)
 No 69 (39%)
 Don't know 14 (8%)

Q6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?

Yes 14 (8%)
 No 168 (92%)

Q6.4 If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?

I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months 137 (77%)
 Very well 3 (2%)
 Well 14 (8%)
 Neither 11 (6%)
 Badly 10 (6%)
 Very badly 2 (1%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	135 (75%)
	No	45 (25%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	123 (71%)
	No	51 (29%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	40 (22%)
	No	140 (78%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Never</i>	56 (31%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	49 (27%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	42 (23%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	15 (8%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	13 (7%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	69 (38%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	58 (32%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	21 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	33 (18%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i>	69 (40%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	33 (19%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	38 (22%)
	<i>Neither</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	7 (4%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	56 (31%)
	No	126 (69%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	28 (16%)
	No	152 (84%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	126 (72%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	29 (17%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>At health services</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	12 (7%)

<i>In an exercise yard</i>	14 (8%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	16 (9%)
<i>At work</i>	11 (6%)	<i>In your cell</i>	13 (7%)
<i>During movement</i>	15 (9%)	<i>At religious services</i>	4 (2%)
<i>At education</i>	8 (5%)		

Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?

Yes	38 (21%)
No.....	142 (79%)

Q8.5 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>	15 (8%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	32 (18%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Medication</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Debt</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Drugs</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	6 (3%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	64 (36%)
No.....	114 (64%)

Q8.7 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>	16 (9%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	27 (15%)
<i>Medication</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Debt</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Drugs</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	4 (2%)

Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	105 (63%)
	Yes	23 (14%)
	No	38 (23%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	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	30 (17%)	9 (5%)	36 (20%)	23 (13%)	46 (25%)	37 (20%)
	The nurse	18 (10%)	34 (19%)	82 (46%)	17 (10%)	14 (8%)	13 (7%)
	The dentist	32 (18%)	5 (3%)	19 (11%)	15 (9%)	45 (26%)	59 (34%)

Q9.2	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	40 (23%)	12 (7%)	44 (25%)	28 (16%)	25 (14%)	26 (15%)
	The nurse	28 (16%)	25 (14%)	64 (36%)	35 (20%)	11 (6%)	16 (9%)
	The dentist	56 (32%)	15 (9%)	40 (23%)	22 (13%)	15 (9%)	28 (16%)

Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>Not been</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>Very good</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Good</i>	44 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i>	38 (21%)
	<i>Bad</i>	36 (20%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	24 (14%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	91 (50%)
	No	91 (50%)

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	91 (50%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	59 (33%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	17 (9%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (8%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	47 (26%)
	No	133 (74%)

Q9.7	Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	133 (74%)
	Yes	26 (15%)
	No	20 (11%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	50 (28%)
	No	129 (72%)

Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	29 (16%)
	No.....	151 (84%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	48 (27%)
	Easy.....	28 (16%)
	Neither.....	14 (8%)
	Difficult.....	6 (3%)
	Very difficult.....	5 (3%)
	Don't know	77 (43%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	27 (15%)
	Easy.....	27 (15%)
	Neither.....	23 (13%)
	Difficult.....	13 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (3%)
	Don't know	82 (46%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	11 (6%)
	No.....	169 (94%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	14 (8%)
	No.....	163 (92%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	120 (68%)
	Yes.....	38 (22%)
	No.....	18 (10%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	151 (84%)
	Yes.....	16 (9%)
	No.....	12 (7%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	115 (71%)
	Yes.....	31 (19%)
	No.....	16 (10%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		<i>Don't know</i>	Very Easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult
						Very difficult
	Prison job	19 (11%)	21 (12%)	57 (32%)	21 (12%)	34 (19%)
						25 (14%)

Vocational or skills training	31 (18%)	21 (12%)	53 (30%)	32 (18%)	22 (13%)	15 (9%)
Education (including basic skills)	20 (11%)	33 (19%)	71 (41%)	24 (14%)	16 (9%)	11 (6%)
Offending behaviour programmes	47 (27%)	9 (5%)	24 (14%)	25 (14%)	34 (20%)	35 (20%)

Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Not involved in any of these	46 (26%)
Prison job	83 (47%)
Vocational or skills training.....	31 (18%)
Education (including basic skills).....	38 (22%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	12 (7%)

Q11.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	32 (24%)	43 (32%)	47 (35%)	14 (10%)
Vocational or skills training	39 (30%)	56 (44%)	20 (16%)	13 (10%)
Education (including basic skills)	29 (21%)	61 (44%)	32 (23%)	16 (12%)
Offending behaviour programmes	41 (30%)	43 (32%)	35 (26%)	16 (12%)

Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?

Don't want to go	19 (11%)
Never	40 (23%)
Less than once a week.....	47 (27%)
About once a week.....	52 (30%)
More than once a week.....	17 (10%)

Q11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

Don't use it	51 (29%)
Yes.....	79 (45%)
No.....	46 (26%)

Q11.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

Don't want to go	31 (17%)
0.....	32 (18%)
1 to 2.....	31 (17%)
3 to 5.....	72 (40%)
More than 5.....	12 (7%)

Q11.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

Don't want to go	13 (7%)
0.....	14 (8%)
1 to 2.....	42 (23%)
3 to 5.....	39 (22%)
More than 5.....	72 (40%)

Q11.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?

Don't want to go	4 (2%)
0.....	6 (3%)
1 to 2.....	1 (1%)
3 to 5.....	15 (8%)
More than 5.....	151 (85%)

Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	44 (25%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	37 (21%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	37 (21%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (6%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	61 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	114 (65%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	84 (47%)
	<i>No</i>	94 (53%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	55 (31%)
	<i>No</i>	125 (69%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Easy</i>	39 (22%)
	<i>Neither</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	45 (25%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	36 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (5%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	147 (84%)
	<i>No</i>	29 (16%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/N/A</i>	29 (16%)
	<i>No contact</i>	52 (29%)
	<i>Letter</i>	65 (36%)
	<i>Phone</i>	33 (18%)
	<i>Visit</i>	40 (22%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	117 (68%)
	<i>No</i>	56 (32%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		0 (0%)	
	Yes		135 (75%)	
	No.....		44 (25%)	
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>		44 (25%)	
	<i>Very involved</i>		28 (16%)	
	<i>Involved</i>		43 (24%)	
	<i>Neither</i>		13 (7%)	
	<i>Not very involved</i>		27 (15%)	
	<i>Not at all involved</i>		21 (12%)	
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>		44 (25%)	
	<i>Nobody</i>		78 (45%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>		36 (21%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i>		24 (14%)	
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>		3 (2%)	
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>		9 (5%)	
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>		44 (25%)	
	Yes		71 (40%)	
	No.....		34 (19%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		27 (15%)	
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>		44 (25%)	
	Yes		38 (21%)	
	No.....		60 (34%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		35 (20%)	
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>		44 (25%)	
	Yes		35 (20%)	
	No.....		50 (28%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		48 (27%)	
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes		11 (6%)	
	No.....		84 (48%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		81 (46%)	
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes		17 (10%)	
	No.....		155 (90%)	
Q13.12	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	28 (17%)	50 (30%)	91 (54%)

Accommodation	37 (22%)	53 (32%)	75 (45%)
Benefits	28 (17%)	56 (34%)	82 (49%)
Finances	36 (23%)	31 (19%)	93 (58%)
Education	40 (24%)	45 (27%)	79 (48%)
Drugs and alcohol	49 (32%)	53 (34%)	53 (34%)

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

Not sentenced	0 (0%)
Yes	92 (52%)
No.....	84 (48%)

Appendix IIIb: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology: HMP Lindholme (open)

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 4 February 2013, the prisoner population at HMP Lindholme (I wing) was 90. Questionnaires were offered to all prisoners.

Selecting the sample

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Nine 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;
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

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

Response rates

In total, 51 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 57% of the wing population. The response rate was 57%. In addition to the nine respondents who

refused to complete a questionnaire, 26 questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2013 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since April 2008.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Survey summary

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	12	(24%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	17	(33%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	13	(25%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	6	(12%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	1	(2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	2	(4%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?		
	<i>Yes</i>	4	(8%)
	<i>No</i>	45	(92%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	7	(14%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	10	(20%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	4	(8%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	12	(24%)
	<i>Life</i>	18	(35%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>	1	(2%)
	<i>No</i>	50	(98%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	51	(100%)
	<i>No</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	51	(100%)
	<i>No</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish).....</i>	32 (65%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> .. 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	1 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	3 (6%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	11 (22%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)	

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?		
	Yes	2	(4%)
	No.....	47	(96%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	<i>None</i>	13	(26%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	13	(26%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	3	(6%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	2	(4%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	5	(10%)
	<i>Hindu</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Jewish</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Muslim</i>	14	(28%)
	<i>Sikh</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Other</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	47	(94%)
	<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	2	(4%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>	1	(2%)
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	5	(10%)
	No.....	45	(90%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	Yes	5	(10%)
	No.....	45	(90%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes	26	(52%)
	No.....	24	(48%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes	25	(50%)
	No.....	25	(50%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	25	(49%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	24	(47%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2	(4%)
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	25	(50%)
	Yes	19	(38%)
	No.....	5	(10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1	(2%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	25	(49%)
	Yes	4	(8%)
	No.....	22	(43%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0	(0%)

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	33 (65%)
	No.....	18 (35%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	37 (73%)
	No.....	14 (27%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	18 (35%)
	Well.....	18 (35%)
	Neither.....	12 (24%)
	Badly.....	3 (6%)
	Very badly	0 (0%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	41 (80%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	1 (2%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	7 (14%)
	Don't remember	2 (4%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	46 (90%)
	No.....	5 (10%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	30 (60%)
	2 hours or longer.....	19 (38%)
	Don't remember	1 (2%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	35 (73%)
	No	10 (21%)
	Don't remember	3 (6%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	10 (20%)
	Well.....	22 (44%)
	Neither.....	12 (24%)
	Badly.....	5 (10%)
	Very badly.....	1 (2%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of property	6 (13%)
	Housing problems.....	3 (6%)
	Physical health	7 (15%)
	Mental health.....	1 (2%)

Contacting employers	4 (9%)	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	0 (0%)
Contacting family	6 (13%)	Getting phone numbers	10 (21%)
Childcare	0 (0%)	Other.....	3 (6%)
Money worries.....	3 (6%)	Did not have any problems	24 (51%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	3 (6%)		

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

Yes	6 (12%)
No.....	20 (40%)
Did not have any problems	24 (48%)

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

Tobacco.....	24 (49%)
A shower	12 (24%)
A free telephone call.....	4 (8%)
Something to eat.....	15 (31%)
PIN phone credit.....	25 (51%)
Toiletries/basic items.....	7 (14%)
Did not receive anything	15 (31%)

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

Chaplain	9 (19%)
Someone from health services.....	30 (63%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	2 (4%)
Prison shop/canteen.....	5 (10%)
Did not have access to any of these	13 (27%)

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

What was going to happen to you.....	7 (15%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	4 (8%)
How to make routine requests (applications).....	7 (15%)
Your entitlement to visits.....	7 (15%)
Health services	11 (23%)
Chaplaincy	6 (13%)
Not offered any information	30 (63%)

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

Yes	33 (66%)
No.....	15 (30%)
Don't remember	2 (4%)

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

Have not been on an induction course	22 (44%)
Within the first week	9 (18%)
More than a week	17 (34%)
Don't remember	2 (4%)

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

Have not been on an induction course	22 (45%)
Yes	7 (14%)

No..... 17 (35%)
 Don't remember 3 (6%)

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

Did not receive an assessment..... 32 (65%)
 Within the first week 3 (6%)
 More than a week 12 (24%)
 Don't remember 2 (4%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	6 (12%)	23 (45%)	6 (12%)	11 (22%)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)
Attend legal visits?	4 (9%)	15 (35%)	5 (12%)	8 (19%)	5 (12%)	6 (14%)

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..... 4 (8%)
 Yes 28 (55%)
 No 19 (37%)

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

Yes 12 (24%)
 No 10 (20%)
 Don't know 28 (56%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	49 (96%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	17 (34%)	29 (58%)	4 (8%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	28 (56%)	22 (44%)	0 (0%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	22 (45%)	27 (55%)	0 (0%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	31 (62%)	11 (22%)	8 (16%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good..... 0 (0%)
 Good 6 (12%)
 Neither 13 (27%)
 Bad 11 (22%)
 Very bad 19 (39%)

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

Have not bought anything yet/don't know..... 0 (0%)
 Yes 18 (35%)
 No 33 (65%)

Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	
	Yes.....	6 (12%)
	No.....	21 (41%)
	Don't know.....	24 (47%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	12 (24%)
	No.....	22 (43%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	17 (33%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	17 (33%)
	No.....	9 (18%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	25 (49%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	13 (27%)
	Very easy.....	3 (6%)
	Easy.....	8 (16%)
	Neither.....	2 (4%)
	Difficult.....	6 (12%)
	Very difficult.....	9 (18%)
	Don't know.....	8 (16%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes.....	38 (75%)
	No.....	9 (18%)
	Don't know.....	4 (8%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:	
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>	
		Not made one
		Yes
		No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	6 (12%) 19 (38%) 25 (50%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	6 (12%) 14 (27%) 31 (61%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	28 (55%)
	No.....	14 (27%)
	Don't know.....	9 (18%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints:	
	<i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>	
		Not made one
		Yes
		No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	14 (29%) 7 (14%) 28 (57%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	14 (29%) 5 (10%) 29 (60%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes.....	19 (40%)
	No.....	29 (60%)

Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	12 (24%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	2 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i>	7 (14%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (16%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	11 (22%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	10 (20%)

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	29 (58%)
	<i>No</i>	21 (42%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	30 (60%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (40%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	42 (82%)
Q6.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	2 (4%)
	<i>Never</i>	18 (35%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	16 (31%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	8 (16%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	4 (8%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	3 (6%)
Q6.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	12 (24%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	14 (28%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	23 (46%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (2%)
Q6.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i>	12 (24%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	8 (16%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	13 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i>	5 (10%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	5 (10%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	7 (14%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (38%)
	<i>No</i>	30 (63%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (28%)
	<i>No</i>	34 (72%)

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

<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	30 (64%)	<i>At meal times</i>	3 (6%)
<i>Everywhere</i>	10 (21%)	<i>At health services</i>	2 (4%)
<i>Association areas</i>	2 (4%)	<i>Visits area</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Reception area</i>	1 (2%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	3 (6%)
<i>At the gym</i>	3 (6%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i>	0 (0%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	3 (6%)
<i>At work</i>	0 (0%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	4 (9%)
<i>During movement</i>	1 (2%)	<i>In your cell</i>	3 (6%)
<i>At education</i>	0 (0%)	<i>At religious services</i>	0 (0%)

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

Yes	17 (33%)
No.....	34 (67%)

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>	10 (20%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	9 (18%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	2 (4%)
<i>Medication</i>	3 (6%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	1 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (8%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	5 (10%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (6%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	4 (8%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (2%)
<i>Your age</i>	3 (6%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	1 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	5 (10%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (2%)

Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	24 (47%)
No.....	27 (53%)

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 (18%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	14 (28%)
<i>Medication</i>	4 (8%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (10%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (16%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (8%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (6%)

You are from a traveller community	0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation	0 (0%)
Your age.....	1 (2%)
You have a disability	2 (4%)
You were new here.....	1 (2%)
Your offence/crime	6 (12%)
Gang related issues	1 (2%)

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

Not been victimised	21 (45%)
Yes	6 (13%)
No.....	20 (43%)

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	6 (12%)	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	19 (38%)	18 (36%)
The nurse	2 (4%)	10 (21%)	21 (44%)	6 (13%)	4 (8%)	5 (10%)
The dentist	5 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	4 (8%)	11 (22%)	28 (56%)

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	9 (18%)	0 (0%)	8 (16%)	7 (14%)	16 (31%)	11 (22%)
The nurse	3 (6%)	6 (12%)	16 (32%)	8 (16%)	10 (20%)	7 (14%)
The dentist	15 (31%)	1 (2%)	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	8 (16%)	9 (18%)

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

Not been	3 (6%)
<i>Very good</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Good</i>	8 (17%)
<i>Neither</i>	9 (19%)
<i>Bad</i>	15 (31%)
<i>Very bad</i>	13 (27%)

Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	29 (57%)
No.....	22 (43%)

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

Not taking medication	22 (43%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	23 (45%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	4 (8%)
No.....	2 (4%)

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

Yes	4 (8%)
No.....	46 (92%)

Q8.7 Are your being helped/supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	46 (92%)
Yes	2 (4%)
No.....	2 (4%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	6 (12%)
	No	45 (88%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	6 (12%)
	No	45 (88%)
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	22 (43%)
	Easy	4 (8%)
	Neither	0 (0%)
	Difficult	1 (2%)
	Very difficult	1 (2%)
	Don't know	23 (45%)
Q9.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	9 (18%)
	Easy	5 (10%)
	Neither	1 (2%)
	Difficult	4 (8%)
	Very difficult	2 (4%)
	Don't know	30 (59%)
Q9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	2 (4%)
	No	49 (96%)
Q9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	1 (2%)
	No	50 (98%)
Q9.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not/do not have a drug problem	44 (88%)
	Yes	2 (4%)
	No	4 (8%)
Q9.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not/do not have an alcohol problem	45 (90%)
	Yes	2 (4%)
	No	3 (6%)
Q9.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	Did not have a problem/did not receive help	47 (94%)
	Yes	1 (2%)
	No	2 (4%)

Section 10: Activities

Q10.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		Don't know	Very Easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult
						Very difficult
	Prison job	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	12 (24%)	7 (14%)	13 (25%)
	Vocational or skills training	7 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	3 (6%)	9 (19%)
	Education (including basic skills)	7 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	9 (19%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	11 (23%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	5 (10%)	6 (13%)
						25 (52%)
Q10.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)					
	Not involved in any of these					15 (31%)
	Prison job					33 (67%)
	Vocational or skills training.....					1 (2%)
	Education (including basic skills).....					0 (0%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....					0 (0%)
Q10.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?					
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know	
	Prison job	4 (9%)	14 (30%)	23 (49%)	6 (13%)	
	Vocational or skills training	10 (29%)	7 (20%)	16 (46%)	2 (6%)	
	Education (including basic skills)	11 (29%)	8 (21%)	17 (45%)	2 (5%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes	12 (34%)	8 (23%)	11 (31%)	4 (11%)	
Q10.4	How often do you usually go to the library?					
	Don't want to go					4 (8%)
	Never					8 (16%)
	Less than once a week					14 (27%)
	About once a week					17 (33%)
	More than once a week					8 (16%)
Q10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?					
	Don't use it					10 (20%)
	Yes					16 (32%)
	No					24 (48%)
Q10.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?					
	Don't want to go					7 (14%)
	0					7 (14%)
	1 to 2					6 (12%)
	3 to 5					9 (18%)
	More than 5					22 (43%)
Q10.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?					
	Don't want to go					1 (2%)
	0					1 (2%)
	1 to 2					3 (6%)
	3 to 5					14 (27%)

More than 5..... 32 (63%)

Q10.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?
Don't want to go..... 1 (2%)
 0..... 4 (8%)
 1 to 2 2 (4%)
 3 to 5 7 (14%)
 More than 5 37 (73%)

Q10.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)
 Less than 2 hours 2 (4%)
 2 to less than 4 hours..... 2 (4%)
 4 to less than 6 hours..... 2 (4%)
 6 to less than 8 hours..... 5 (10%)
 8 to less than 10 hours..... 6 (12%)
 10 hours or more..... 26 (52%)
 Don't know 7 (14%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?
 Yes..... 21 (41%)
 No..... 30 (59%)

Q11.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?
 Yes..... 26 (51%)
 No..... 25 (49%)

Q11.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?
 Yes..... 7 (14%)
 No..... 44 (86%)

Q11.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?
I don't get visits..... 5 (10%)
 Very easy 6 (12%)
 Easy..... 12 (24%)
 Neither..... 3 (6%)
 Difficult..... 5 (10%)
 Very difficult 18 (36%)
 Don't know 1 (2%)

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?
 Yes..... 46 (90%)
 No..... 5 (10%)

Q12.2 What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)
 Do not have an offender manager/N/A..... 5 (10%)
 No contact..... 11 (22%)

	Letter.....	19 (37%)
	Phone	27 (53%)
	Visit	12 (24%)
Q12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	47 (92%)
	No.....	4 (8%)
Q12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Yes	30 (59%)
	No.....	21 (41%)
Q12.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	21 (42%)
	Very involved.....	10 (20%)
	Involved.....	10 (20%)
	Neither.....	3 (6%)
	Not very involved	2 (4%)
	Not at all involved	4 (8%)
Q12.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Do not have a sentence plan	21 (41%)
	Nobody.....	15 (29%)
	Offender supervisor.....	8 (16%)
	Offender manager.....	11 (22%)
	Named/personal officer.....	2 (4%)
	Staff from other departments	2 (4%)
Q12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	21 (41%)
	Yes	12 (24%)
	No.....	11 (22%)
	Don't know	7 (14%)
Q12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	21 (42%)
	Yes	6 (12%)
	No.....	21 (42%)
	Don't know	2 (4%)
Q12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	Do not have a sentence plan	21 (41%)
	Yes	15 (29%)
	No.....	8 (16%)
	Don't know	7 (14%)
Q12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	7 (14%)
	No.....	24 (47%)
	Don't know	20 (39%)
Q12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes	6 (12%)
	No.....	44 (88%)

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	12 (24%)	4 (8%)	34 (68%)
Accommodation	12 (24%)	5 (10%)	34 (67%)
Benefits	11 (22%)	3 (6%)	36 (72%)
Finances	12 (24%)	2 (4%)	36 (72%)
Education	13 (26%)	3 (6%)	34 (68%)
Drugs and alcohol	14 (29%)	4 (8%)	30 (63%)

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

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	30 (60%)	20 (40%)
Resettlement overnight release	27 (54%)	23 (46%)

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

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	33 (65%)	18 (35%)
Resettlement overnight release	24 (47%)	27 (53%)
Special purpose leave	24 (49%)	25 (51%)

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	2 (4%)	49 (96%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc.)	6 (12%)	45 (88%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	26 (52%)	24 (48%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	2 (4%)	49 (96%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	25 (49%)	26 (51%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	19 (38%)	31 (62%)

Appendix IV: Photographs

A classroom on the category D unit.



Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMPLindholme (closed) 2013

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

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		183	6219	183	123
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	0%	3%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	11%	9%	11%	18%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%	5%	5%	11%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	10%	6%	5%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	11%	6%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	99%	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)?	28%	26%	28%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	4%	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	18%	12%	18%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	17%	15%	6%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	6%	6%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	26%	37%	26%	20%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	55%	51%	55%	56%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	26%	45%	26%	29%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	76%	70%	76%	76%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	9%	9%	9%
2.4	Was the van clean?	69%	67%	69%	69%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	84%	81%	84%	84%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	69%	67%	58%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	63%	61%	63%	63%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	19%	19%	19%	19%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	89%	88%	84%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	47%	53%	47%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	83%	85%	70%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	72%	74%	69%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	62%	61%	62%	52%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	17%	17%	17%	16%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	13%	15%	13%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	3%	2%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	20%	21%	20%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	3%	0%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	9%	14%	9%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	11%	13%	11%	7%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	10%	11%	10%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	11%	11%	11%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	4%	4%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	19%	28%	
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	27%	39%	27%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	84%	78%	84%	94%
3.6	A shower?	29%	32%	29%	39%
3.6	A free telephone call?	23%	44%	23%	36%
3.6	Something to eat?	47%	68%	47%	76%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	75%	54%	75%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	37%	45%	37%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	44%	54%	44%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	64%	72%	64%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	19%	34%	19%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	16%	18%	16%	9%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	42%	53%	42%	54%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	25%	46%	25%	37%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	31%	46%	31%	27%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	34%	47%	34%	37%
3.8	Health services?	45%	57%	45%	
3.8	The chaplaincy?	38%	51%	38%	
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%	83%	88%	89%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	93%	90%	97%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	53%	66%	53%	59%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	82%	85%	82%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	48%	50%	45%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	52%	52%	52%	54%
4.1	Get bail information?	17%	15%	17%	21%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	46%	41%	46%	48%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	41%	45%	41%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	59%	65%	59%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	92%	95%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	69%	81%	69%	77%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	65%	75%	65%	81%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	41%	33%	36%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	71%	71%	71%	70%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	16%	29%	16%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	29%	12%	18%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	45%	41%	53%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	41%	58%	41%	50%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	54%	50%	53%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	59%	53%	51%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	50%	53%	50%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	85%	77%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	57%	63%	57%	48%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	37%	52%	37%	37%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	63%	59%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	25%	34%	25%	26%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	23%	39%	23%	31%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	17%	20%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	31%	18%	36%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	54%	55%	54%	44%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	47%	50%	
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	5%	8%	4%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	42%	43%	42%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	78%	75%	64%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	71%	77%	71%	56%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	22%	30%	22%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	16%	20%	16%	19%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	62%	76%	62%	43%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	70%	64%	70%	71%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	31%	31%	27%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	13%	16%	15%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	21%	21%	21%	14%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	9%	8%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%	5%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	12%	18%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	2%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%	3%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	4%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	4%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	3%	3%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	36%	25%	36%	21%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	10%	10%	9%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	2%	4%	3%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	11%	17%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	2%	3%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	5%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	4%	6%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%	2%	
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	38%	38%	38%	32%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	35%	25%	
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	65%	58%	65%	
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	14%	14%	14%	
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	42%	50%	42%	39%
9.2	The nurse?	59%	62%	59%	43%
9.2	The dentist?	46%	43%	46%	34%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	36%	45%	36%	36%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	50%	46%	50%	37%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	85%	86%	85%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	26%	25%	26%	
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	56%	51%	56%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	28%	23%	28%	17%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	16%	17%	16%	6%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	43%	28%	43%	56%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	30%	18%	30%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	7%	6%	
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%	6%	8%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	68%	64%	68%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	57%	63%	57%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	66%	81%	66%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	44%	44%	44%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	43%	37%	43%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	59%	51%	59%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	19%	20%	19%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	47%	62%	47%	
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	18%	18%	18%	
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	22%	29%	22%	
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	14%	7%	
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	76%	84%	76%	
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	41%	44%	41%	
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	70%	75%	70%	
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	63%	61%	63%	
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	79%	81%	79%	
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	56%	64%	56%	
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	70%	73%	70%	
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?	46%	55%	46%	
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39%	49%	39%	33%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	45%	49%	45%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	47%	38%	47%	43%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	62%	45%	62%	72%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	85%	77%	85%	86%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	21%	14%	21%	19%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	35%	36%	35%	
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	47%	43%	47%	69%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	31%	25%	31%	24%
12.4 Is it easy/very easy for your friends and family to get here?	25%	26%	25%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	HMP Lindholme 2013	HMP Lindholme 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				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	84%	83%	84%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	35%	33%	35%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	43%	37%	43%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	22%	24%	22%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	27%	35%	27%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	68%	68%	68%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	75%	73%	75%	61%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	54%	56%	54%	67%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	60%	45%	60%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	28%	35%	28%	
13.6	Offender manager?	18%	27%	18%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	2%	14%	2%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	7%	17%	7%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	54%	67%	54%	77%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	29%	21%	29%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	26%	28%	26%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	7%	6%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	10%	18%	10%	12%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	36%	36%	36%	
13.12	Accommodation?	41%	40%	41%	
13.12	Benefits?	41%	41%	41%	
13.12	Finances?	25%	30%	25%	
13.12	Education?	36%	38%	36%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	50%	46%	50%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	52%	56%	52%	50%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Lindholme (closed) 2013

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		51	130	33	146
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	5%	6%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	99%	97%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	99%	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)?			94%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	4%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	62%	2%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	17%	12%	16%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	7%	0%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	30%	24%	27%	26%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	70%	64%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	45%	69%	45%	66%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	84%	88%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	77%	64%	75%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	63%	61%	76%	59%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	59%	68%	55%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	90%	76%	90%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	89%	91%	90%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	55%	48%	52%	50%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim 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				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	69%	56%	70%	57%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	96%	91%	96%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42%	30%	47%	30%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	10%	13%	9%	13%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	30%	47%	30%	45%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	39%	41%	36%	41%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	51%	48%	64%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	48%	82%	46%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70%	80%	63%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	59%	53%	60%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	56%	45%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	63%	46%	64%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	9%	3%	9%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	79%	61%	78%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	69%	74%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	18%	15%	19%	15%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	63%	61%	67%	60%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	30%	33%	30%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	20%	14%	21%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	22%	20%	22%	20%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	18%	17%	16%	17%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	1%	6%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	8%	2%	10%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	8%	1%	10%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim 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				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	45%	32%	40%	35%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	22%	15%	17%	17%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11%	1%	10%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	14%	1%	17%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	7%	2%	7%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	3%	4%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	27%	21%	26%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	57%	68%	61%	66%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	37%	55%	40%	52%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	16%	30%	12%	29%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	51%	40%	53%	42%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	42%	48%	35%	49%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	25%	15%	32%	14%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	27%	19%	32%	18%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	13%	5%	13%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39%	39%	31%	40%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	64%	41%	69%	42%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	66%	60%	72%	60%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	90%	84%	88%	85%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	20%	22%	19%	22%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	52%	45%	47%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	34%	30%	37%	29%

Diversity Analysis



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

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

Key to tables

		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 green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		27	153	19	162
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	6%	0%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	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)?	19%	30%	10%	30%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	3%	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	15%	19%	6%	20%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			32%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	6%	16%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	30%	25%	47%	23%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	69%	66%	79%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	56%	63%	68%	61%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	84%	89%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	72%	79%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	96%	55%	63%	62%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	74%	64%	74%	63%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	89%	90%	88%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	77%	92%	90%	90%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	46%	51%	59%	50%

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				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	69%	58%	68%	59%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	95%	94%	95%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	27%	34%	43%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	27%	10%	26%	11%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	37%	43%	47%	41%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	44%	39%	68%	38%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	47%	61%	48%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	53%	61%	52%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70%	79%	83%	76%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	60%	53%	59%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	52%	55%	68%	53%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	52%	55%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	7%	6%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	75%	94%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	64%	73%	89%	70%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	19%	15%	37%	13%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	70%	60%	90%	59%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	30%	21%	32%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	17%	6%	17%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	26%	19%	21%	21%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	26%	15%	21%	17%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	0%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	4%	1%	6%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	7%	1%	0%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	37%	35%	26%	37%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	17%	6%	18%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	4%	4%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	4%	5%	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	8%	2%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%	25%	58%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	77%	63%	84%	62%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	82%	45%	74%	47%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	58%	20%	17%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	44%	43%	37%	44%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	37%	49%	50%	46%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	15%	19%	11%	19%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	19%	21%	28%	21%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	11%	6%	0%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	44%	38%	63%	36%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	24%	51%	50%	47%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56%	63%	74%	61%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	70%	88%	83%	86%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	33%	19%	37%	19%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	56%	45%	37%	48%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	30%	31%	43%	30%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Lindholme (I Wing) 2013

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

Key to tables

		HMP Lindholme (I Wing)	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		51	1609
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%
1.3	Are you on recall?	8%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	7%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	23%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	2%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	33%	26%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	28%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	6%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	52%	51%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	50%	54%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	47%	45%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	75%	80%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	15%	13%
2.4	Was the van clean?	64%	70%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	72%	82%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	80%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	18%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	90%	94%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (Wing)	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	60%	69%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	73%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	78%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	49%	41%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	8%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	6%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	8%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	13%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	6%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	6%	6%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	15%	8%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	2%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	22%	8%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	24%	39%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	49%	72%
3.6	A shower?	24%	53%
3.6	A free telephone call?	8%	45%
3.6	Something to eat?	30%	67%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	51%	59%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	14%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (1 Wing)	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	19%	56%
3.7	Someone from health services?	62%	76%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	5%	37%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	11%	20%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	14%	63%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	8%	47%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	14%	56%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	14%	59%
3.8	Health services?	23%	66%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	13%	55%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	66%	92%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	56%	96%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	26%	74%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	35%	83%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:			
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	57%	65%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	44%	54%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	55%	25%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	24%	47%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:			
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	34%	87%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	56%	74%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	45%	80%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	63%	54%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	13%	42%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	36%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	12%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	23%	57%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	33%	64%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	22%	51%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (1 Wing)	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	74%	91%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	43%	79%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	31%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	55%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	20%	46%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	15%	53%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	39%	13%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	40%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff			
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	58%	76%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	60%	78%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	18%	26%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	18%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	76%	70%
	For those with a personal officer:		
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	55%	73%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (Wing)	Open prisons comparator
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 7: Safety		
7.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?	38%	16%
7.2 Do you feel unsafe now?	28%	5%
7.3 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	33%	9%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
7.5 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	4%
7.5 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%
7.5 Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7.5 Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	8%
7.5 Taken your canteen/property?	4%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because of medication?	6%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	10%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
7.5 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because of your age?	6%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%
7.5 Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	2%
7.5 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	2%
7.5 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (1 Wing)	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 7: Safety continued			
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	47%	16%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18%	6%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	28%	9%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	10%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	16%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	12%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	24%	27%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (1 Wing)	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Health services			
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	8%	59%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	65%	78%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	5%	30%
	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?	19%	73%
8.2	The nurse?	47%	78%
8.2	The dentist?	23%	56%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	18%	68%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	57%	43%
	For those currently taking medication:		
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	92%	99%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	8%	12%
	For those who have problems:		
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	50%	51%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol			
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	12%	10%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	8%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	51%	32%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	28%	25%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	3%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	2%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	36%	67%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	44%	77%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
9.9	Was the support helpful?	33%	86%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (1 Wing)	Open prisons comparator
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 10: Activities		
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
10.1 A prison job?	31%	80%
10.1 Vocational or skills training?	2%	55%
10.1 Education (including basic skills)?	2%	71%
10.1 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	2%	29%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
10.2 A prison job?	67%	74%
10.2 Vocational or skills training?	2%	22%
10.2 Education (including basic skills)?	0%	28%
10.2 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	8%
10.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	92%	93%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
10.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	33%	45%
10.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	71%	81%
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?	27%	67%
10.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	72%	85%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
10.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	30%	69%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	66%	70%
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?	35%	52%
10.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	49%	56%
10.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	32%	58%
10.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	61%	55%
10.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	90%	75%
10.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	72%	84%
10.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	52%	50%
SECTION 11: Friends and family		
11.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	41%	54%
11.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	51%	21%
11.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	14%	13%
11.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	36%	36%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lindholme (1 Wing)	Open prisons comparator	
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse			
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details			
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference			
SECTION 12: Preparation for release			
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	90%	90%
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:		
12.2	No contact?	24%	13%
12.2	Contact by letter?	41%	45%
12.2	Contact by phone?	59%	62%
12.2	Contact by visit?	26%	38%
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	92%	65%
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	59%	74%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	69%	71%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
12.6	Nobody?	50%	34%
12.6	Offender supervisor?	26%	47%
12.6	Offender manager?	37%	37%
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	8%	20%
12.6	Staff from other departments?	8%	21%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	40%	81%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	22%	10%
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	50%	50%
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	14%	5%
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	13%	33%
	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?	10%	50%
12.12	Accommodation?	13%	47%
12.12	Benefits?	7%	47%
12.12	Finances?	6%	40%
12.12	Education?	8%	52%
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	12%	56%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	60%	75%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	55%	75%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.14	Resettlement day release?	64%	66%
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	47%	60%
12.14	Special purpose leave?	49%	36%
	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?	4%	24%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	12%	28%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	52%	83%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	4%	19%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	49%	42%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	38%	59%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Lindholme (I Wing) 2013

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	33	14	36
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	0%	8%	0%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			100%	7%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	4%	0%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	86%	0%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	16%	0%	14%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	16%	0%	14%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	68%	43%	72%	44%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	79%	50%	81%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	81%	79%	81%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	56%	84%	57%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	50%	75%	50%	71%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	50%	48%	52%	48%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	54%	71%	52%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62%	71%	56%	71%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	75%	46%	72%	48%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	57%	60%	56%	59%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	86%	100%	84%	100%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	13%	17%	11%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	18%	43%	21%	41%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	7%	16%	8%	14%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	25%	24%	28%	22%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57%	21%	64%	19%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	68%	81%	72%	78%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	32%	69%	36%	64%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim 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 most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	43%	68%	36%	69%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	38%	71%	28%	71%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	0%	21%	0%	19%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	59%	88%	52%	86%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	44%	32%	43%	34%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	44%	16%	43%	20%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	43%	31%	44%	30%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	18%	19%	16%	19%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	18%	3%	21%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	25%	3%	28%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	14%	3%	16%	3%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	0%	3%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	57%	43%	64%	39%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	32%	28%	36%	25%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	25%	3%	28%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	38%	3%	44%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	18%	3%	21%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	7%	0%	6%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	14%	7%	8%	8%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	44%	79%	48%	73%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	50%	57%	50%	59%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	14%	7%	16%	7%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	32%	57%	28%	59%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim 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?	46%	79%	39%	80%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	4%	0%	3%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	0%	0%	0%	0%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	0%	0%	0%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	57%	21%	59%
10.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	62%	60%	64%	61%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	100%	85%	100%	86%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	72%	72%	75%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	19%	69%	17%	67%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	43%	55%	44%	56%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	14%	16%	16%	14%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	57%	63%	50%	66%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	43%	59%	44%	60%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	62%	64%	56%	67%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	38%	48%	36%	50%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	38%	55%	36%	54%
	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?	0%	7%	0%	6%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	7%	16%	8%	14%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	43%	59%	36%	60%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	7%	3%	8%	3%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	38%	55%	36%	56%