

Report on an unannounced full follow-up
inspection of

HMP/YOI Littlehey

31 October – 4 November 2011

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
1 Healthy prison summary and progress on main recommendations	9
<hr/>	
2 Progress on other recommendations	
<hr/>	
1 Arrival in custody	23
2 Environment and relationships	27
3 Duty of care	33
4 Diversity	43
5 Health services	51
6 Activities	57
7 Good order	65
8 Services	73
9 Resettlement	77
3 Summary of recommendations	91
<hr/>	
4 Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	103
II Prison population profile	104
III Summary of adult prisoner questionnaires and interviews	107
IV Summary of young adult prisoner questionnaires and interviews	123

Introduction

HMP/YOI Littlehey contains two adjacent but distinct sites: an adult category C training prison opened in 1988 and a new young offender training establishment opened in 2010. It was clear that the new young offender side had had a very difficult start, but by the time of this inspection it was settling down and outcomes for prisoners across both sites were good or reasonably good against all of our healthy prison tests.

Prisoners told us they felt safer than at the time of the previous inspection and this was backed up by other evidence.

Escort, reception, first night and induction arrangements were generally sound (although, like many others, the prison was affected by national problems with the new escort contract). Most prisoners told us they felt safe during their first night in the prison.

Violence reduction measures were generally effective and the number of fights and assaults on the young adult side compared favourably with similar establishments. Prisoners' movement around the prison and association was well supervised by officers. The prison had taken a new approach to addressing bullying behaviour based on the incentives and earned privileges scheme, although this was not fully established on the adult site, and a new programme was in place to help staff and young adults avoid aggressive confrontations. The use of force had reduced by about a third over the previous six months. Fewer adults had been placed in segregation than at the time of the previous inspection but the number of segregated young adults was similar to the comparator.

Prisoners told us it was far less easy to get drugs in the prison than before and positive random mandatory drug testing rates were low – although tests were missed because of staff redeployment and record keeping needed improvement. Drug treatment services were excellent.

The quality of ACCT (suicide and self-harm prevention procedures) documentation was variable but vulnerable prisoners told us they felt well cared for and we saw generally supportive management of some young adults with challenging behaviour.

In the context of this improved and largely positive picture, some security measures – particularly on the young adult site – now appeared too restrictive and required review.

Young adults were only allowed out of their cells for evening association and meals on alternate weekdays. This was compounded by insufficient activity places for young adults. Too many young adult Muslim prisoners were banned from attending religious services without current intelligence to support the need to do so. Strip-searching was sometimes carried out without sufficient justification. The security department blocked access for up to half of otherwise eligible (enhanced) prisoners who applied to attend family day visits for reasons that were sometimes unconnected to visits.

The prison has a delicate balance to strike between achieving a safe and secure environment and one in which restrictions are proportionate and necessary. The balance will change over time and now that the young adult side is more stable, some security restriction should be reviewed.

Safety and security are not just a matter of locks, bars and rules. Safety at Littlehey is underpinned by generally good staff-prisoner relationships. Most prisoners, and more than at

comparable prisons, told us that staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. The prison made striking and imaginative use of prisoners in peer support roles – as Listeners, helping to put new arrivals at ease in reception, providing literacy support on the 'Toe by Toe' scheme, as diversity representatives, supporting work with veterans and assisting with a range of resettlement activities. This peer support work was generally more advanced on the adult and the young adult side but it reflected the appropriate and positive expectations most staff had of the prisoners held.

The accommodation and grounds were mainly clean and in good condition but the prison had a serious problem with vermin. Some cells designed for one held two prisoners and were unacceptably cramped.

Equality was generally well supported. Muslim and black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive about relationships than the prison population as a whole but were still broadly satisfied with the way they were treated. Support for prisoners with disabilities and older prisoners was good. Provision for gay and bisexual prisoners was better than in most establishments. However, the needs of foreign national prisoners were not adequately met.

Work on equality was hampered because equalities staff were frequently redeployed elsewhere. There were signs that staffing levels were stretched elsewhere too. Health services were good but too reliant on locum doctors. At times there was no medical cover at all. Mental health services were excellent.

Staffing shortages impacted most seriously on offender management. Offender supervisors had large caseloads and offender supervisor redeployments lengthened the backlog in the reviews necessary to address prisoners' offending behaviour. The large caseloads made it impossible for offender supervisors to have the necessary regular contact with the prisoners they supervised. Although public protection arrangements were generally sound, telephone monitoring of some prisoners who posed a risk to the public was not carried out. However, practical resettlement support was good.

HMP/YOI Littlehey is a training establishment. The prison had a strong commitment to learning and skills. The quality and range of education, training and work was good and achievements were high. Eighty prisoners were enrolled on Open University courses and new vocational workshops had been established. The prison expected high levels of attendance and absences were monitored and followed up.

Against this positive background it was therefore disappointing that there were simply too few activity places available for young adults. There were no activity places for a quarter of the young adult population and even with attendance of about 90%, it was not surprising that we found a third of the young adults locked in their cells with nothing to do during the working part of the day.

HMP/YOI Littlehey is now a very different prison from the one we last inspected in 2007. The opening of the young adult side in effect created a new prison, and after a difficult start the prison is now performing well. It is now a more stable and, in some areas, a very effective establishment; that enables it to review how it strikes the balance between its central training purpose and necessary security restrictions and ensure that progress continues.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

February 2012

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Littlehey is a category C and YOI training establishment.

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

Public

Region/Department

East of England

Number held

1,121

Certified normal accommodation

1,143

Operational capacity

1,220

Date of last full inspection

July 2007

Brief history

HMP Littlehey opened in 1988 on the site of Gaynes Hall Youth Custody Centre. In January 2010, the site was extended to accommodate a population of up to 480 young offenders, with the addition of four new accommodation blocks, an all-weather sports pitch, gym, adult learning and kitchen buildings.

Short description of residential units

The category C site has four wings (A–D), which hold 131 or 130 prisoners each. E wing is the induction wing and holds 99 prisoners. F wing is an enhanced wing which houses 36 prisoners. G wing is an enhanced wing which holds 40 prisoners. H wing provides accommodation for prisoners engaged in the drug rehabilitation programme and can hold 43 prisoners.

The YOI site has four wings (I–L). Each of these holds 120 prisoners; I wing is the induction wing.

Escort contractor

Serco and GEOAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: Cambridgeshire PCT

Provider: NHS Cambridgeshire

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

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, courts and customs custody.

HP2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the UN Optional Protocol to the 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 include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison 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 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 The Inspectorate conducts follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections may be announced or unannounced and are proportionate to risk. In full follow-up inspections sufficient inspector time is allocated to enable an assessment of progress and to conduct a new full inspection, including in-depth analysis of areas of serious concern identified in the previous inspection, or matters of concern subsequently drawn to the attention of the Chief Inspector. Inspectors use the findings of prisoner surveys (where available), prisoner focus groups, research analysis of prison data and observation. This enables a reassessment of previous healthy prison assessments held by the Inspectorate on all establishments, and published in reports from 2004 onwards.
- HP6 At the last inspection in 2007 we found that Littlehey was performing well against the healthy prison test of safety. We made 23 recommendations, of which eight had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, nine were not achieved and two were no longer relevant. We have made 20 further recommendations.
- HP7 In 2007 we found that Littlehey was performing reasonably well against the healthy prison test of respect. We made 57 recommendations, of which 17 had been achieved, 17 had been partially achieved and 23 were not achieved. We have made 42 further recommendations.
- HP8 In 2007 we found that HMP Littlehey was performing reasonably well against the healthy prison test of purposeful activity. We made 12 recommendations, of which six had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and four were not achieved. We have made 11 further recommendations.
- HP9 In 2007 we found that HMP Littlehey was performing reasonably well against the healthy prison test of resettlement. We made 29 recommendations, of which 13 had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, eight were not achieved and three were no longer relevant. We have made 16 further recommendations.

Safety

- HP10 The new escort contract had had some initial problems but prisoners were generally well treated on escort. Reception areas were appropriate and procedures sound. Prisoners felt safe on their first night. Induction was thorough and well delivered on both sites but lacked confidentiality on some personal issues. There was good coordination of violence reduction measures, and the sanctions-based approach worked effectively on the young adult site. Vulnerable prisoners and those at risk of self-harm were well supported. The Listener scheme was stronger on the adult than young adult site. The flow of security information was good, although it was not followed up reliably and some security measures were too restrictive. Use of force had reduced but there was inadequate scrutiny of incidents. Segregation conditions were acceptable but the regime was too limited for those staying a long time. The

level of illegal drug use was low but mandatory drug testing procedures were flawed. Clinical treatment for substance misuse needs was excellent. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners in this establishment were good against this healthy prison test.

- HP11 A new escort contract had recently begun. Relationships between escorts and reception staff were good but the new escort contractors did not regularly notify the prison of estimated times of arrival, and drivers had not mastered the routes. Vans were old but reasonably clean, and prisoners were given refreshments and comfort stops. Reception was closed at lunchtime. Late arrivals were issued with overnight packs when the full first night procedure could not be carried out. Most prisoner escort records were fully completed.
- HP12 Reception areas were clean and spacious, with information notices in waiting areas. The staff were welcoming and efficient, and were assisted by Listeners. Although most newly arrived prisoners were able to make a free telephone call and to get a shower on their first night, these were not reliably available to adult prisoners arriving on a Friday. Interviews with health services and first night staff took place in an appropriately confidential setting.
- HP13 First night accommodation was clean and fully equipped but in some cases marred by offensive graffiti. Prisoners arriving on the adult site were required to share accommodation, and staff took care over the pairings. In our survey, more young adults than at similar establishments, but fewer adults, reported feeling safe on their first night.¹
- HP14 Induction courses on both sides of the prison were comprehensive and sensibly paced, giving prisoners a good understanding of the regime. In our survey, almost all of the prisoners on both sites said that they had been on an induction course. Immediate resettlement needs were identified but some induction interviews were not conducted with sufficient confidentiality.
- HP15 The violence reduction strategy was comprehensive and provided practical guidance. The deputy safer custody coordinator was frequently assigned to other tasks. The monthly safer custody committee was well attended; a wide range of information was provided and analysis was thorough. Young adults and adults alike generally felt safe, but more adults than the average reported victimisation by other prisoners. The number of fights and assaults on the young adult sites compared favourably with that

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 Towel et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

at similar young adult establishments. A new approach to managing bullying behaviour, based on use of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, had been introduced. It was understood and operated better on the young adult site than on some adult wings. The LEAP programme had made a promising start in giving staff and young adults tools for avoiding aggressive confrontation.

- HP16 The level of self-harm and number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents opened was not unusually high but the quality of ACCT documents was variable. The main deficits were the level of interaction recorded, lack of multidisciplinary attendance at reviews and in some cases the standard of care planning. Training in ACCT procedures was too frequently cancelled, and not enough staff were trained. Nevertheless, vulnerable prisoners felt well cared for, and we saw supportive management of some young adults with challenging behaviour. Death in custody reports had been discussed at the safer custody committee and action plans implemented. There was a full Listener team on the adult site but shorter lengths of stay made it difficult to sustain adequate numbers on the young adult site. In place of a proper Listener suite, the adult site used the Listeners' cells, which needed to be remodelled.
- HP17 Well-attended monthly security meetings were supported by good intelligence reports, and there was a good flow of security information. Supervision was difficult on some of the adult wings owing to their design but free-flow movement and association were managed well. Some security practices were over-restrictive. Inconsistency in the staffing level of the security unit contributed to a reactive approach and to some tasks, such as suspicion mandatory drug tests, being missed.
- HP18 Both adjudications rooms were suitable for their purpose. The hearings were well managed and appropriate punishments were given. Senior managers did not check a sample of adjudications, and some records were of inadequate quality.
- HP19 Use of force had reduced by approximately 30% in the previous six months. No video recordings of planned use of force were available and there was no evidence that they were undertaken routinely or that any recordings were reviewed by a manager. A committee met quarterly to review data on the use of force but until recently there had been little quality assurance of completed paperwork. Handcuffs were used to escort every prisoner to the care and separation unit. Over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners in use of force had been noted at the equality meeting but there had been no proper investigation, beyond the commissioning of an equality impact assessment.
- HP20 Fewer adult prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection were segregated. A similar number of young adults to that at comparator establishments had spent time in the care and separation unit (CSU) in the previous six months. Both units were clean and appropriately equipped and run. The exercise yards were bare, and the one on the young adult site was used for single exercise only and was small. The regime in the CSUs was too limited, especially for the few who stayed there for a sustained period. Most prisoners were returned to the wings from the CSUs. The recording of formal reintegration planning was limited, and although reviews were timely, they did not set individualised and meaningful objectives. Daily history sheets had limited entries and did not reflect the extent of the constructive interactions with prisoners in the CSUs.

- HP21 While the positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was relatively low, record keeping was fragmented, with different sources publishing conflicting figures. The official MDT log book was not always completed correctly. The redeployment of MDT officers meant that targets for weekend and monthly random testing were not always met. The MDT suite on both sites was dirty.
- HP22 For the relatively small number of prisoners with acute drug problems, there was much better than average treatment, with individualised treatment, excellent care and good quality reviews. All those on opiate substitution were on reducing doses. Staff and prisoners told us that the trading of prescribed medications was a serious problem. The administration of opiate substitution medication was frequently delayed by the late arrival of a supervising discipline officer.

Respect

- HP23 The physical environment was generally clean and well maintained. Prisoners on both sites were positive about staff attitudes and interactions. The incentives and earned privileges scheme was well established but some young adults spent too long on the basic level, and views about the scheme were negative in a number of ways. The quality of catering was good. Equality was promoted well but some aspects of inequality did not receive sufficient attention. Foreign national prisoners were not adequately supported but there was greatly improved support for older prisoners and those with disabilities. Gay and bisexual prisoners were reasonably well supported. Applications and complaints were generally well managed. The chaplaincy team was effective. Good primary health care was being delivered, and mental health services were excellent. The reliance on a succession of locum doctors, and weaknesses in systems to manage medicines, increased the pressures on health services staff. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners in this establishment were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP24 The grounds were well maintained, although there was a serious problem with vermin. The accommodation was mainly clean and in good condition, and the young adult cells were good. A number of cells on the adult site designed for single occupancy were occupied by two prisoners, and were unacceptably cramped.
- HP25 There was a large amount of information on display but some was out of date and there was little in languages other than English. Prisoners complained about some delays in the issue of clean clothing. Clothing and bedding was laundered properly on the adult site but not on the young adult site, and there was insufficient opportunity for prisoners to wear their own clothes. There was good access to showers. Prisoners regularly experienced problems with sending and receiving mail.
- HP26 Prisoners on both sites had favourable perceptions of staff but young adults from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, and to some extent Muslims, were less positive. There was a good personal officer policy but it was not available to prisoners. Fewer young adult prisoners than in similar prisons found their personal officer helpful. Adults thought more highly of the personal officer scheme. Electronic records contained some good personal officer entries but others were superficial and infrequent.

- HP27 The incentives and earned privileges scheme was well understood by staff and prisoners but there was little difference between standard and enhanced levels. The facilities list had not been updated since May 2011. Fewer black and minority ethnic, foreign national and Muslim prisoners felt that they were being treated fairly under the scheme. Reviews took place as required but the setting of targets was weak and on the young adult site comprised a standard list applied to all. Recording of warnings and progress was inconsistent. Young adults spent a minimum of 14 days on basic, which was too long.
- HP28 More adults and young adults than at comparator prisons, but fewer adult black and minority ethnic, foreign national and Muslim prisoners than their white, British and non-Muslim counterparts, said that the food was good or very good. Some meals were served too early, and breakfast packs were issued at lunchtime on the day before consumption.
- HP29 There was no overarching equality strategy, but a good older prisoners policy, and all aspects of diversity were promoted well. There was uneven attendance from staff at the quarterly equality meeting. The equality team was sufficiently resourced but staff redeployment had a detrimental effect on their ability to develop provision. There were trained prisoner representatives, and their meetings with equality staff covered most diversity strands, but there were no open forums for any of the minority groups other than gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners.
- HP30 Issues raised by regular ethnic monitoring, including adjudications, release on temporary licence and use of force, took too long to address. The quality of discrimination incident report form investigations and responses was poor. Minority groups made few complaints about discrimination. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners generally felt well treated but provision for them was underdeveloped.
- HP31 Although equality staff were knowledgeable about some foreign national prisoners, individual needs were not always appropriately identified and contact was inconsistent. Some foreign national prisoners who spoke little or no English felt isolated and frustrated by the lack of staff engagement with them, and telephone interpreting was not used in all appropriate cases. At the time of the inspection, 17 prisoners were being held solely under immigration powers, one since May 2009. Late notification of intention to deport was still too common, and foreign national prisoners had no access to independent immigration advice.
- HP32 The disability liaison officer led on both disability and older prisoners and was achieving good progress. Developments for older prisoners included the older prisoner support scheme, work room, gym sessions and a separate garden. Lists of prisoners requiring assistance in an emergency were not up to date on all wings and not all staff were aware of evacuation plans.
- HP33 Provision for gay and bisexual prisoners was better developed than in many other establishments. Gay and bisexual prisoners generally did not feel discriminated against and said that any abuse from other prisoners was dealt with robustly by staff. There was a well-attended prisoner-led meeting for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners but it afforded insufficient privacy. Two prisoners identifying themselves as transgender did not feel adequately supported.
- HP34 The applications process worked well. Complaint forms were freely available on adult wings but on some young adult wings they had to be requested from the wing office.

In the previous three months, approximately 10% of complaint responses (across both sites) had been late. Quality checking was rigorous and analysis by the senior management team had led to improvements in the regime.

- HP35 Provision for legal visits was good but there were no trained legal services staff, and support was reactive. There was no referral process for prisoners requesting legal advice on induction.
- HP36 The chaplaincy team was well resourced and integrated into the prison, and faith provision was good. The faith and multi-cultural facilities were welcoming and well used. Provision on the young adult site was less well developed than among the adults. All major religious festivals were celebrated, and community engagement was reasonable. Access to religion was good for most but too many prisoners, especially Muslims, were inappropriately banned from attendance at worship.
- HP37 Clinical governance arrangements in the health care department were good, as were staff training and the sharing of information across the prison. Interactions between nursing staff and prisoners were good, although some staff were sometimes abrupt. There was a wide range of clinics, and smoking cessation clinics for the young adults were particularly effective. The inadequate pharmacy arrangements placed additional pressure on nurses. Prisoners did not always receive medication on time and there was no access to a pharmacist. Mental health services were excellent, with good access to a wide range of primary and secondary services.
- HP38 The medical provider agency used a high number of locum doctors, leading to inconsistency in prescribing and decision-making. At times there was no medical cover at all. There were long waits for the optician and podiatrist, and for the dentist on the adult site. Cleaning arrangements in health care rooms were inadequate.

Purposeful activity

- HP39 Available time out of cell was reasonable but had been curtailed for young adults in response to earlier issues of order and control. Too many on both sites were locked up during the working day. The management of learning and skills, and levels of achievement in education and training were good on both sites. There had been improvements in the range and quality of vocational training, especially on the adult site. There were sufficient work places for adults but not for young adults. Attendance at education classes and the standard of teaching were good. Library provision was appropriate but access was restricted for most prisoners. Recreational use of the gym was good on the adult site but access was less satisfactory for young adults. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners in this establishment were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP40 The weekday average of available time out of cell was reasonable for adult prisoners but more restrictive for young adults, who could achieve just over seven hours. In spot checks, too many prisoners, on both sites, were locked up during the working day. Young adults had evening association only on alternate weekdays and were able to dine in association at alternate mealtimes. These restrictions had been brought in as part of a set of measures to improve order and control by reducing the numbers mixing in relatively small open areas on the wings. Adults were able to exercise in a

pleasant landscaped area and the yards for young adults were clean and well equipped.

- HP41 The prison showed a strong commitment to learning and skills, with good resources. Education and vocational training were well managed. Achievement across both sites and most programmes was high but waiting lists were too long. The use of data was good and attendance on education programmes on the young adult site had improved. Some quality assurance processes had yet to be fully embedded and sharing of best practice was underdeveloped.
- HP42 There were sufficient activity places for the adult population, and they were well used. On the young adult site, there were not sufficient purposeful activity places to meet the needs of the population.
- HP43 Attendance and punctuality were generally good. Most workshops provided a good basis for skills development, and many prisoners were engaged in peer support. The vocational training provision and workshops had improved considerably. A wide range of appropriate accredited vocational training opportunities were provided. The vocational training opportunities were particularly good for adults. The standard of learners' work was good and there was much good coaching and training.
- HP44 Education provision was well managed and responsive to prisoners' needs across both sites. The need for English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) was being met but in general there was insufficient learning support for young adults. Attendance, teaching and learning in education classes were also good. Support for Toe by Toe literacy programmes was well embedded on the adult site but less well established on the young adult site. A large number of prisoners were engaged in Open University and distance learning programmes.
- HP45 The libraries provided a good resource, with bright and welcoming areas and a wide range of material. However, access to the facilities was poor on both sites and there had been too many cancellations in the evening and at weekends.
- HP46 The PE provision to adults was well developed and there was a high take-up. No accredited PE programmes were available to adults but some were provided to young adults. There was insufficient access to gym facilities for young adults.

Resettlement

- HP47 There was a strong strategic framework for resettlement work but the resettlement meeting were not sufficiently well used to drive progress. Offender management was inadequate. Offender supervisors had large caseloads, and there was a large backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) reviews. There was generally little contact between offender supervisors and prisoners. Categorisation processes were efficient. Public protection processes were generally sound, with the exception of telephone monitoring. Most resettlement pathway provision was good. Work to strengthen and support family ties was being carried out but was hindered by the unduly restrictive approach of the security department. Provision of offending behaviour programmes was suited to the needs of the population. On the basis of this full follow-up inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners in this establishment were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

- HP48 Resettlement provision was based on recent local and regional needs analyses. The comprehensive strategy document was well focused on pathway provision and was supported by a realistic action plan. Meetings were mainly well attended, although with no input from residential staff or managers, and minutes demonstrated good progress.
- HP49 Initial resettlement needs were identified during the induction process but the questionnaire sent to each prisoner before release was a poor substitute for resettlement boards. In our survey, young adults responded more negatively than adults over most issues relating to resettlement provision.
- HP50 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor on arrival, and initial interviews were usually held over the subsequent seven days, but there was not always a review of the appropriateness of sentence plans. Most offender supervisor caseloads were too large to be managed effectively or to support regular meaningful contact, and too many officer hours in the team were lost to redeployment. Prisoners out of scope of offender management were reliant on applications to initiate offender supervisor contact outside of formal reviews.
- HP51 Too many offender assessment system (OASys) reviews were late, and the quality was variable. Risk management plans were not comprehensive.
- HP52 Categorisation reviews were timely. There was limited use of release on temporary licence on the adult site, mainly for external gardens and for working in the staff mess, but none as yet for young adults.
- HP53 Support for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was limited.
- HP54 Systems for identifying and assessing the high number of prisoners presenting a risk of serious harm to others were effective. Regular risk management meetings screened all new arrivals, referring on to the inter-departmental risk management team as appropriate. Telephone monitoring was not being completed in a number of cases. Engagement with multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) processes was satisfactory, and use of the Violent and Sex Offender Register (VISOR) was developing gradually.
- HP55 Most prisoners were released to secure accommodation. Arrangements for early analysis of need (tenancy and debt issues) were effective and led to referrals to a wide range of national services. No benefits advice was available at the time of the inspection. However, access to advice and help on banking was good, and was supported by a short account management course. Good work was being done to support veterans.
- HP56 The prison had developed a good vocational training programme which was focused on prisoners' resettlement needs. Tribal provided a good service, identifying prisoners at exit interviews for access to a recently introduced pre-release course. Links between the prison, Tribal and Nacro were good, although insufficient information about prisoners' offences was provided by offender supervisors. The virtual campus was working well on the young adult site, providing prisoners with opportunities to search for jobs online.
- HP57 The health care planning approach was used for all appropriate cases. There were good links with community services, and prison health services staff maintained

contact with prisoners after release. Mental health discharge planning was effective. The standard of palliative care was improving.

- HP58 There had been difficulty in building relationships with drug intervention programmes but this was improving with the use of video-conferencing. The Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) course achieved a high standard of delivery, and interventions to address alcohol issues were delivered on both sites.
- HP59 The visitors centre was an excellent facility and well supported by the family liaison officer, who undertook some constructive work with the families of prisoners. Visits did not always start on time and there were sometimes delays in processing visitors.
- HP60 The visits hall was bright and clean but the play area was inconsistently supervised. Refreshments were available but young adults and their visitors could not purchase hot drinks. In our survey, adult prisoners were more positive than the comparator about treatment by visits staff.
- HP61 A total of 12 family days, of different types, were facilitated each year and all were generally oversubscribed; however, they were accessible only to enhanced prisoners. A relatively high proportion of applicants were ruled out by the security department. There was some provision of parenting classes on both sites and Relate attended weekly to deliver generic relationship counselling. Storybook Dads was well used with adult prisoners but less so with the young adults.
- HP62 Offender behaviour programme provision was appropriate for the population and adequately resourced across the prison as part of the regional delivery strategy, including core and rolling sex offender treatment programmes for the adult site and the thinking skills programme on both sites.
- HP63 The Trailblazers charity had introduced an effective mentoring scheme for young adults, incorporating post-release support.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP64 Concern: The regime on the young adult wings had been restricted in response to order and control issues, so that only 30 prisoners were on association together at any time and they often had only two weekday evening association periods in a week.

Recommendation: Managers should review association times for young adult prisoners, to allow at least an hour each day for all prisoners.

- HP65 Concern: On the young adult site, there were sufficient activity places for only about 75% of the population and, although 88% of the places were filled, this meant that only around 67% of this population was occupied, and during the inspection too many (32%) were locked up

Recommendation: The prison should increase the number of purposeful activity places in order to reduce to a minimum the number locked in their cells during the working day.

- HP66 Concern: Security measures were in some respects restrictive and not based on the assessment of individual risk. There was over-use of strip-searching, too many

prisoners excluded from family days for unclear security reasons and young adults were being banned from attendance at religious worship for inadequate reasons.

Recommendation: Young adults should be subjected to restrictive security measures such as strip-searching and banning from attendance at religious worship only on the basis of current individual risk assessment.

HP67 Concern: Offender supervisor caseloads of 100 and more made it impossible for regular, meaningful contact to take place, and many prisoners did not know whom to go to for resettlement support. A large number of OASys reviews were also overdue.

Recommendation: All prisoners should have regular face-to-face contact with a member of the offender management team, leading to practical resettlement support and timely review of OASys assessments where applicable.

Progress on main recommendations since the previous report

(The paragraph numbers at the end of each main recommendation refer to its location in the previous inspection report)

Main recommendations

MR1 Attendance at the REAT meetings should be increased to include representatives from all main areas of the prison. If REAT members are unable to attend, a deputy should be sent in their place. (HP50)

Not achieved. This meeting, now named the equality meeting, was consistently chaired by the governor but continued to have poor attendance from key departments across the prison, and deputies rarely attended (see diversity section).

MR2 Steps should be taken to understand and address the more negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners and ways found to promote good relations between prisoners of different racial groups. (HP51)

Partially achieved. Focus groups had been held with black and minority ethnic prisoners and some changes had been made, including the introduction of race equality representatives, a comprehensive equality action plan, regular consultative meetings, inclusion of prisoner representatives at equality management meetings and identification of areas of concern using the ethnic monitoring tool. However, progress to address concerns around the use of force, adjudications, release on temporary licence (ROTL) and other areas of the regime had been too slow (see sections on diversity and discipline).

MR3 A foreign national policy should be drawn up in consultation with foreign national prisoners and based on local needs. (HP52)

Not achieved. There had been no local needs analysis for foreign national prisoners. There was neither a distinct foreign national policy nor an overarching diversity strategy in which the needs of foreign national prisoners were identified (see also further recommendation 4.2).
We repeat the recommendation

MR4 A comprehensive resettlement strategy document should be developed, pulling together all elements and departments contributing to the resettlement function. This should address all categories of prisoners held, be based on an up-to-date needs analysis and contain strategic direction for the function. (HP53)

Achieved. A comprehensive resettlement policy, including an appropriate action plan, was in place. It was based on both local and regional analysis of data from offender assessment system (OASys) assessments. It also considered the change in the prison's population since the addition of young adult prisoners. It was not clear from the policy how initial screening and end-of-sentence processes would be completed.

MR5 A strategy should be drawn up in conjunction with prison drug workers and health services staff about how to manage issues arising from misuse of prescribed medication. (HP54)

Partially achieved. A strategy had been developed but there was evidence that locum GPs

were prescribing painkillers and other abusable medication rather than challenging drug-seeking behaviour (see paragraph 3.67 and further recommendation 3.71).

Progress on recommendations since the last report

Section 1: Arrival in custody

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Reception should stay open during the lunchtime period so that prisoners arriving during this time can be admitted without delay. (1.5)

Not achieved. Reception in both parts of the prison was closed during the staff lunch period. Escort vans arriving during this time were not admitted to the establishment, and prisoners remained on the van until staff returned from their break. We observed this with young adults, whose van had to wait 45 minutes before admission. Prisoners arriving shortly before lunch were disembarked and held in a waiting room until reception reopened after lunch.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 1.2 There had recently been a change of escort provider. Although some vans were fairly old, they were all clean and prisoners were given refreshments. We were told by young adult prisoners arriving after a long journey that they had had a comfort stop at a magistrates' court and staff said that this was standard procedure for journeys of more than two and a half hours.
- 1.3 While escort staff and reception officers cooperated well, drivers had had difficulty in finding the establishment and had not told reception staff when prisoners would be arriving. The contractors' control room was not always able to tell reception staff the planned itinerary for their vans. Escort staff agreed that these problems had occurred and that they had not been provided with satellite navigation equipment to help to locate establishments but said that the problems were reducing as they became more familiar with their role.
- 1.4 In our survey, the responses of adult prisoners were more positive than the comparators for a range of indicators about escort arrangements, while the responses of young adults were in line with the comparators.
- 1.5 The prisoner escort records we saw in both reception areas had been completed appropriately, with the exception of one for an adult prisoner transferring into the prison which did not have sufficient detail about a recently closed assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) document, and there was no copy in the accompanying file.

Further recommendations

- 1.6 Prisoner escorts should be provided with the support and equipment to enable them to deliver prisoners efficiently and safely.
- 1.7 Prisons should provide all relevant information with transferred prisoners.

First days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

Reception

- 1.8 Reception staff should have access to a small supply of smoking packs for prisoners who arrive after the prison shop has closed. (1.15)

Achieved. In the young adult site reception there was a supply of smoker's and non-smoker's packs which could be provided to new arrivals. The reception packs for adult prisoners were obtained from the prison shop; the orderly officer had a key to the shop, so that packs could be obtained even when it was closed.

- 1.9 Prisoners should be escorted to E wing as soon as reception procedures have been completed and not left waiting unoccupied in reception for long periods of time. (1.16)

Not achieved. In both receptions, newly arrived prisoners were kept together and were not taken individually to the first night wing until procedures had been completed for everyone in the group. Staff told us that this procedure ensured that prisoners had sufficient time in reception to meet staff and prisoner supporters and were not isolated.

Additional information

- 1.10 Both reception areas were large and kept clean by prisoner orderlies. There was abundant information about the prison on posters in general areas and in waiting rooms, most of which was in English only (see recommendation 4.38). Staff were welcoming to new prisoners and, particularly on the young adult site, put them at their ease. Prisoners were offered a drink in reception, and food was provided if prisoners were there at mealtimes.
- 1.11 There was a Listener, supported by a buddy, in the adult reception and a prisoner mentor in the young adult reception, to welcome new prisoners. All new arrivals had an interview in private with a first night officer, and a health care assessment in private with a nurse. Prisoners on both sides were given a free telephone call and PIN credit, if needed, to allow them to make further calls.
- 1.12 In our survey, adult prisoners responded positively about their experience in reception, with 79% (against the 69% comparator) saying that they were treated well and 86% (versus 78%)

that they were searched respectfully. The responses of young adults were less positive, with only 55% (against the 60% comparator) saying that they were treated well in reception.

First night

- 1.13 Prisoners should be offered a shower on their first night, regardless of what day and time they arrive at the establishment. (1.17)

Not achieved. Young adults had showers in their cells, so they had access at all times. Adult prisoners arriving on Friday afternoons did not have time to participate in association, when they would have been able to get a shower or make a telephone call. They were not offered use of the shower facilities in the reception areas.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 1.14 A first night officer should be available on a Wednesday (or any day when prisoners have arrived and the first night wing is shut down early), so that newly arrived prisoners can be appropriately supported. (1.18)

Partially achieved. The evening staffing of the first night wings had been supplemented with a first night officer for late arrivals, who conducted in-depth interviews with them. The wing was not shut down early on any day, but late arrivals on a Friday were issued with overnight packs and had their interview on the following day.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 1.15 On the adult site, newly arrived prisoners were located in shared cells on E wing. Reception and first night staff liaised to match prisoners as best they could, according to age, background and whether they smoked. High-risk prisoners were accommodated singly. Young adults had single cells on I wing.
- 1.16 In our survey, 85% of young adults, better than the 78% comparator, said that they had felt safe on their first night. On the adult site, 80% said that they had felt safe on their first night, which was worse than the 83% comparator; many had previously been separated in vulnerable prisoner units and were experiencing an integrated regime for the first time.
- 1.17 Accommodation for new prisoners was cleaned and checked to ensure that all equipment was in place. However, we found offensive graffiti in some cells.
- 1.18 Night patrol staff knew the location of new prisoners and checked them during the night.

Housekeeping point

- 1.19 Graffiti in first night cells should be removed promptly.

Induction

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 1.20 Induction on the adult site was spread over five days, and included an assessment of resettlement needs. Prisoners told us that it was informative and well paced. No printed information was given to new prisoners but a comprehensive booklet had been designed and funding was being sought to have it produced.
- 1.21 Induction for young adults was undertaken over two days and started with a session with a Listener, followed by interviews in a shared room with counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT), Nacro and psychology staff, which did not afford sufficient privacy. There was also a presentation by the induction officer about the rules of the prison, and a visit by one of the chaplaincy team. To consolidate their learning, prisoners completed the LEAF computer program, which covered information about the prison.
- 1.22 In our survey, 97% of adult prisoner respondents (better than the 93% comparator) and 94% of young adult prisoners (better than the 88% comparator) said that they had been on an induction course; 74% of adult prisoners (better than the 65% comparator) and 61% of young adult prisoners (in line with the comparator) said that it had covered everything they needed to know about the prison.

Further recommendation

- 1.23 Induction assessment interviews should be conducted in private.

Section 2: Environment and relationships

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

Accommodation and facilities

2.1 Cells designed for one prisoner should not be used for two. (2.11)

Not achieved. At the time of the previous inspection, seven cells on A wing and 12 cells on each of B, C and D wings had double occupancy. These were exactly the same size as the single cells and were cramped for two prisoners. These cells on the adult side of the prison continued to be shared by two prisoners, despite being designed for one. There was now no double occupancy on the young adult side of the prison.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.2 Information to prisoners should be provided in a range of appropriate languages. (2.12)

Not achieved. There was limited information available in languages other than English (see recommendation 4.38).

2.3 A prison-wide record should be kept of prisoners who may need assistance in the event of an evacuation. (2.16)

Not achieved. Lists of prisoners who required assistance in an emergency were not always available on residential units, and staff were not always aware of those who required assistance (see section on diversity).

2.4 Prisoners' outgoing mail should be posted within 24 hours (48 when received on a Saturday). (3.70)

Not achieved. Many prisoners reported problems with sending or receiving mail and some staff confirmed that there were delays in distributing mail to prisoners and collecting it from accommodation areas, particularly on Fridays. The mail room was regularly understaffed.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.5 The telephone calls of prisoners who have been identified as high priority for public protection should be monitored regularly. (3.71)

Not achieved. Telephone monitoring arrangements were appropriately in place for 35 prisoners. However, in five of these cases monitoring had not taken place and two of the prisoners involved had made a large number of calls (77 and 163, respectively) over a period of several weeks.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 2.6 Since the previous inspection, the prison had expanded considerably. Four new residential blocks had been added, each providing accommodation for up to 120 young adult prisoners (I, J, K and L wings). These cells were of a good quality. An all-weather sports pitch, gym, learning centre, kitchen and reception had also been built, creating a self-contained young adult prison within the boundaries of the original category C prison. Although some services were shared, adult and young adult prisoners did not mix. The prison grounds were clean, litter free and well maintained but there was a serious problem with rats. Attractive planting, especially on the adult site, enhanced the appearance of the prison.
- 2.7 The cells were adequately furnished, clean and in good order, with a lockable cupboard, curtains and appropriately screened toilets. H wing provided accommodation for prisoners engaged in the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) programme. However, the association room there also doubled as a meeting room for the regular mandatory evening forums which formed part of the regime each weekday and on weekend mornings. This restricted access to those prisoners not involved in these forums, curtailing association activity for them.
- 2.8 Facilities on most of the adult wings were good; floor space on the ground floor of E wing was limited but prisoners could play table tennis, pool or snooker. Many had an information room, which was maintained by a wing orderly. The information on display was relevant but some of it was out of date and there was little in languages other than English (see recommendation 4.38).
- 2.9 Space for association on the young adult wings was limited, with most activities (pool, table tennis and board games) taking place on the ground floor. Table football was usually found on the upper landing but some prisoners told us that they felt isolated there, preferring to be on the ground floor. In the first year there had been several serious incidents which had prompted managers to restrict the number of young adults on association together to a single landing of 30 prisoners. These restrictions were mitigated to some extent by allowing prisoners locked up during association periods to access the gym, but places were limited to 20, so that most of those locked up could not attend (see main recommendation HP64).
- 2.10 Guidance on safeguarding children measures was displayed in the mail room and the staff we spoke to were familiar with procedures. There was good information sharing with offender management staff. A total of 33 prisoners were subject to mail monitoring for public protection purposes and such mail was treated appropriately. A log was maintained of the letters checked for enclosures, and no more than 5% of mail was checked.
- 2.11 Across both sites, prisoners reported fewer problems in accessing telephones than at comparator prisons. However, our expectation of at least one telephone for every 20 prisoners was not met on all the adult wings. Provision on the young adult site met or exceeded our expectations, and I wing had an extra telephone away from the association areas specifically for first night receptions.

Further recommendations

- 2.12 An alternative venue should be found for H wing meetings, to allow prisoners to maximise their association times and use the room provided.

2.13 Prisoners' incoming mail should be delivered to them, and outgoing mail posted out, within 24 hours.

2.14 There should be at least one telephone per 20 prisoners on the adult wings.

Clothing and possessions

2.15 The range of items of personal clothing and bedding, including duvets and covers, allowed in-possession should be increased. (2.13)

Not achieved. Only enhanced prisoners could purchase T-shirts (which were limited to four), duvets and covers. Prisoners on F and G wings could purchase slightly more items of personal clothing but the range and quantity were limited.

We repeat the recommendation.

2.16 Wing based laundry facilities should be installed. (2.14)

Not achieved. On the adult side of the prison only G wing had suitable laundry facilities. Other prisoners on the adult site could send prison-issue items to the clothing exchange store to be laundered weekly but there were delays. Each of the wings on the young adult side of the prison had a laundrette, which catered for prisoners' own clothing weekly, by rota.

Further recommendation

2.17 Laundry facilities should be available on all adult wings.

Additional information

2.18 Young adults said that the issue of clean kit was unreliable and often delayed. In two bedding packs in the young adult reception we found items that were soiled, stained or torn. Adults were not content with the quality and cleanliness of bedding. Kit issued to adult prisoners on arrival was in good order, and there was appropriate quality control in the adult clothing exchange store.

Further recommendation

2.19 Quality control measures in the young adult clothing exchange store should be improved, to sift out unacceptable clothing and bedding items.

Hygiene

2.20 Showers should be fitted with screening to allow prisoners to shower in private. (2.15)

Achieved. All showers were suitably screened by a partition and stable door, providing some degree of privacy.

Additional information

- 2.21 In our survey, more prisoners, on both sites, than at comparator prisons reported positively about accessing a shower daily. Showers, toilets and bathrooms were clean; however, the tiling on the adult site was in a poor state of repair.
- 2.22 All prisoners had access to personal cleaning items, and considerably more young adults than at comparator prisons said that they could normally get cell cleaning materials each week. The figure for adult prisoners was similar to the comparator.

Further recommendation

- 2.23 Recesses, bathrooms and shower rooms in the adult accommodation should be refurbished.

Staff–prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.24 In all correspondence to or about prisoners, and also over the tannoy, prisoners should be addressed as ‘Mr...’ or by their preferred name. (2.21)

Partially achieved. Staff interactions with, and comments about, prisoners on the adult side of the prison were respectful. However, on several occasions on the young adult site we observed staff referring to and calling prisoners by their surname only. Two transgender prisoners were rarely called by their preferred name.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 2.25 In our survey, more adult prisoners than at comparator establishments said that staff treated them with respect; on the young adult site, this figure was similar to the comparator but young adults from black and minority ethnic, and to some extent Muslim, backgrounds had less favourable perceptions of staff. We observed limited interaction between staff and prisoners during association, particularly on the young adult site.
- 2.26 There was a range of staff–prisoner forums and good use of peer support workers across both sites.

Personal officers

Expected outcomes:

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

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 2.27 There was a good personal officer policy but it was not made available to prisoners.
- 2.28 In our survey, 72% of young adults, in line with the comparator, said that they had a personal officer but fewer than at comparator prisons (50% versus 60%) found them helpful. More adult prisoners than at comparator prisons said that they had a personal officer and more found them helpful.
- 2.29 Many staff used the P-Nomis-based case notes system to record both positive and negative comments about prisoners. However, entries by personal officers varied: some were good but others were superficial and infrequent. The personal officer monthly report template had been completed on only five occasions, for only two prisoners, and management checks were sporadic.

Further recommendation

- 2.30 Managers should ensure that personal officers make regular, informative entries in case records.

Section 3: Duty of care

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1 The safer prison strategy should be up to date and reflect Prison Service violence reduction instructions. (3.7)

Achieved. Violence management and suicide prevention documents had been updated recently. They were in line with the relevant Prison Service Instructions on the management of violence and the reduction of self-harm.

- 3.2 Violence reduction management information should be broken down by ethnic origin. The information should be presented in a format that enables monthly analysis of trends to be easily identified and monitored. (3.8)

Not achieved. The deputy safer custody coordinator prepared a report for the monthly safer custody meeting which provided information on the types of violent incident and their location but did not analyse them by ethnic origin. Some information showed the trend over the year to date but this was not done for the location of incidents.
We repeat the recommendation.

- 3.3 Violence reduction management information should be published prominently to staff and prisoners, along with any action taken to address problem areas. (3.9)

Not achieved. Information presented to the safer custody meeting was shared with prisoner representatives at the meeting but minutes were not circulated to them and information was not published or displayed in residential areas.
We repeat the recommendation.

- 3.4 All staff in direct prisoner contact roles should undertake anti-bullying refresher training. (3.10)

Not achieved. There was no anti-bullying refresher training.
We repeat the recommendation.

- 3.5 Accurate records of prisoners undergoing mediation on C wing should be kept. (3.11)

No longer relevant. No mediation programme was provided on C wing at the time of the inspection. We were told that any interventions by buddies to resolve conflict between prisoners were not planned or structured as mediation.

Additional information

- 3.6 The monthly safer custody meetings considered violence reduction and self-harm and suicide prevention. Buddy and Listener representatives from each side of the prison attended alternate meetings. The meeting was chaired by the deputy governor and was well attended. A continuous improvement plan was produced from each meeting.
- 3.7 Prisoners generally felt safe. In our survey, the proportion of adult prisoners reporting that they had ever felt unsafe in the prison (31%) was in line with that at comparator establishments but only 8% said that they currently felt unsafe, which was better than the 14% comparator. More adult prisoners than at comparator establishments said that they had been victimised or intimidated by another prisoner (24% versus 18%).
- 3.8 In our survey of young adult prisoners, only 31%, against the 37% comparator, said that they had ever felt unsafe at the prison. However, their responses regarding racial and religious victimisation by staff were worse than for comparator establishments.
- 3.9 The prison had recently completed a prisoner safety survey and drawn action points from it. There were also plans to develop a more sophisticated analysis of safety trends through the Promoting Risk Intervention by Situational Management (PRISM) tool.
- 3.10 There had been only four assaults and four fights on the adult side of the prison in the six months before the inspection. The number of assaults and fights in the same period was higher among young adult offenders, with 54 fights and 25 assaults, but this compared favourably with comparable young adult establishments. There had been some incidents of gang-related violence on the young adult site, which had been well controlled and actively monitored.
- 3.11 The newly introduced violence reduction process was based on a local response using the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. When a prisoner was suspected of bullying, local observation and investigation were conducted and logged in the wing records. Prisoners found to have been involved in bullying were placed on a restrictive compact at the basic level of the IEP scheme, the details of which reflected the nature of the bullying behaviour. The prisoner's behaviour was reviewed after seven days, with a view to relaxing or removing the restrictions. At the time of the inspection, 10 prisoners were subject to violence reduction compacts, all located on the young adult site.
- 3.12 The policy stated that when a prisoner's behaviour did not improve, a system of case management was introduced which involved the appointment of a case manager and a multidisciplinary review. However, on the adult wings we could not find any staff who had operated this second stage, and on the young adult site staff told us of meetings to review 'more serious cases' but there was no evidence of a structured casework approach. A critical few prisoners who were violent and/or vulnerable were reviewed weekly by a multidisciplinary group, including the safer custody coordinator and members of the psychology department.
- 3.13 Staff's understanding of the new approach to managing bullying behaviour was variable. The system was used more often on the young adult site and was better understood by staff there, and some senior staff on the adult site were not familiar with it.
- 3.14 The research we undertook on the young adult site showed that 85% of prisoners felt that, although staff took reports of victimisation seriously, some did not act swiftly enough. On both sides of the prison, a zero tolerance approach to violence was widely publicised and there was

a confidential telephone line to report bullying which was accessible from both inside and outside the prison.

- 3.15 A cognitive skills-based intervention from the LEAP Confronting Conflict charity had recently been introduced for young adult prisoners involved in violence.

Further recommendation

- 3.16 The violence reduction process should be reviewed and each step implemented as described in the strategy.

Good practice

- 3.17 *The LEAP intervention provided instruction in the development of cognitive skills to deal with conflict in a non-violent way.*

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.18 A deputy safer custody coordinator should be appointed and trained. (3.20)

Partially achieved. A full-time officer had been appointed to the safer custody team as deputy safer custody coordinator in August 2011 and took responsibility for the coordination of violence reduction. At the time of the inspection, she was receiving training in the management of violence reduction and facilitating interventions. She had been frequently redeployed to other duties, which had left her insufficient time to develop her role and deliver an effective service. In the six months before the inspection, safer custody staff had lost 75% of their allocated time.

Further recommendation

- 3.19 The deputy safer custody coordinator should be given sufficient time to carry out her duties.

- 3.20 More specialist counselling services should be provided, and in particular support for prisoners who have been sexually abused. (3.21)

Achieved. Specialist counselling services were provided by the mental health team, the psychology department and a trained psychotherapist through the Improving Access to Psychological Services project. This covered a range of issues, including sexual abuse.

- 3.21 All staff in prisoner contact roles should be ACCT trained, and a programme of refresher training instigated. (3.22)

Partially achieved. There was a programme of refresher training but since May 2010 the monthly scheduled session had been cancelled on seven occasions. Not all staff were up to date in their assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) training.
We repeat the recommendation.

- 3.22 **The next Listener on the daily rota should always be deployed when required, unless there are exceptional circumstances and only with the agreement of the unit manager or night orderly officer. (3.23)**

Achieved. Control room staff identified from a rota which Listener should be used on each occasion. The Listener coordinator assured us that the rota was adhered to, except on rare occasions.

- 3.23 **The arrangements for the management of prisoners at risk of self-harm held in the safer cell located in the CSU should adhere to the relevant Prison Service Order. (3.24)**

Achieved. The constant observation cell in the adult care and separation unit (CSU) was no longer used but the use of those located on I, K, and E wings was in line with the relevant Prison Service Order. Initial reviews of cases we examined had taken place within four hours and constant observation had been properly authorised, with reviews at appropriate intervals.

Additional information

- 3.24 Self-harm prevention was managed by the safer custody coordinator. She checked ACCT documents weekly and monitored the incidence of self-harming behaviour.
- 3.25 At the time of the inspection, there was a team of 19 Listeners on the adult site but only four on the young adult site, as there had been difficulties with the recruitment and retention of suitable prisoners. Listeners were well trained and met Samaritan representatives weekly. This was reflected in our survey, where more adult prisoners than at comparator prisons (82% versus 59%) said that they were able to speak to a Listener at any time; the figure for young adults (44%) was in line with the comparator. Dedicated rooms on I and L wings on the young adult side of the prison were used as Listener suites. On the adult site, on A and B wings, there were two adjoining cells with a connecting door occupied by Listeners, which were used as Listener suites. This was disruptive to the resident Listeners and a proposal had been developed to remodel the accommodation to create stand-alone Listener suites.
- 3.26 In the six months before the inspection, 85 ACCT documents had been opened on the adult side of the prison and 59 on the young adult site, which were comparable with the numbers at other establishments. In the sample of ACCT documents we examined, while assessments and plans were, with a few exceptions, reasonable, the level of interaction with prisoners was not adequate. Case reviews were held on time but there was rarely a consistency of case manager from one review to the next and there was insufficient representation of prison departments, other than the mental health team.
- 3.27 Prisoners we spoke to on both sides of the prison who were subject to ACCT supervision felt well cared for. On the young adult site we found some prisoners with high levels of need and staff were aware of their vulnerability. One was being cared for in a constant observation cell on I wing and was successfully being managed to participate in work on the wing; during the inspection he was moved back to normal accommodation.

- 3.28 Following an episode of self-harm, one young adult had been removed to the CSU and his clothing had been removed. This action had been taken because he had assaulted a member of staff and used his clothing to attempt suicide, behaviour he had displayed previously. His clothing had been returned to him after he had calmed down and he had been returned to normal accommodation, and we were satisfied that this was not the usual response to incidents of self-harm.
- 3.29 Since the previous inspection there had been eight deaths in custody, two of which had been self-inflicted. Reports received from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman had been shared with the safer custody meeting and action plans developed and completed. Reports had not been received on the two deaths, one self-inflicted, which had occurred in 2011.
- 3.30 A system of reviewing serious self-harm incidents which could have resulted in a fatality had been developed and one report, with an action plan, had been made to the safer custody meeting.

Further recommendations

- 3.31 A dedicated Listener suite should be available on the adult side of the prison.
- 3.32 Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) supervision should be improved by ensuring a consistency of care manager, increased interaction with prisoners and wider representation of departments at reviews.

Applications and complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.33 Prisoners' applications, whether formal or informal, should be tracked by staff to ensure that prisoners receive a timely and adequate response to their queries. (3.87)

Partially achieved. A well-designed system had been introduced to promote timely responses. The prisoner was given a dated copy of his application, and the member of staff who replied retained a copy of that. In our survey, 58% of young adult and adult prisoners said that applications were dealt with promptly, which was better than the comparators of 46% and 52%, respectively. Applications were logged in the wing office but we saw incomplete recording of replies received.

Housekeeping point

- 3.34 Responses to applications should be logged consistently by wing staff.
- 3.35 Replies to complaints should not be delayed unnecessarily due to staff absences. (3.88)

Not achieved. Although the proportion of prisoners reporting that complaints were answered promptly was in line with similar populations elsewhere, the adult response to this survey

question was considerably more negative than at the time of the previous inspection (39% versus 54%). In the three months before the inspection, 11% of complaints on the adult site and 9% of those on the young adult site had not received a response within the required timescale. The complaints clerk issued reminders and had been informed that delays were mostly due to staff absence.

We repeat the recommendation.

3.36 Only authorised personnel should have access to complaints boxes. (3.89)

Achieved. Complaints were collected in person by the night orderly officer, who had sole possession of the key to complaints boxes and passed them directly to the complaints clerk.

Further recommendation

3.37 Complaints should be collected from the wings by the complaints clerk, to ensure confidentiality.

3.38 Statistical information should include a breakdown of complaints by ethnicity and be routinely considered by the REAT. (3.90)

Achieved. Complaints were monitored by ethnicity and the data were considered at each meeting of the equality management team. In the six months before the inspection, complaints from black and minority ethnic prisoners were within the expected range for each month except one.

3.39 Responses to prisoner complaints should be improved so that they are legible, clearly identify the respondent, fully address the issues raised and are respectful of the prisoner's right to use the complaint system. (3.91)

Achieved. Responses to complaints that we saw were generally respectful and provided a full and reasonable answer. They were legible and identified the respondent. The deputy governor reviewed a minimum of 10% of complaints every month and fed back her findings to functional heads, and directly to staff when required. In our survey, prisoners' satisfaction with responses to complaints on both sides of the prison was in line with that at comparator establishments.

Additional information

3.40 Application forms were freely available on both sides of the prison, and more young adults and adult prisoners than at comparator establishments reported that responses were fair.

3.41 Complaint forms were freely available on adult wings but on some young adult wings prisoners had to request them from staff. In our survey, the proportion of prisoners on both sides of the prison reporting that they had made a complaint was in line with that at similar establishments. Information about making a complaint was given at induction and there were prisoner representatives on the wings to assist those who needed it.

3.42 Complaints were recorded by location and category. This was reported monthly to the senior management team and functional heads were required to account for trends in their areas and to make improvements when required.

Further recommendation

3.43 Complaint forms should be freely available on all wings.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

3.44 A legal services officer with adequate facility time should be appointed. (3.96)

Not achieved. There were two legal services officers. Neither was provided with facility time to fulfil the legal services role.

We repeat the recommendation.

3.45 Legal services officers should be suitably trained, but in the absence of an accredited training course, they should be monitored by the legal services principal officer. (3.97)

Not achieved. Neither of the legal services officers had been trained, as there was no course available nationally. We did not see evidence of monitoring of their work.

3.46 The waiting times for a legal visit should be reduced and the use of private rooms maximised. (3.98)

Achieved. Access to legal visits was good for both adult and young adult prisoners. Sessions could be up to two hours in length each morning and afternoon during the week. Since the previous inspection, a legal visits suite had been developed, comprising five well-equipped private rooms and a video-conferencing facility. The protocol for this had yet to be agreed.

Additional information

3.47 The provision of legal services was not proactive. The induction passport included six questions to determine prisoners' need for legal services, with space for the induction officer to comment on any action taken. However, we spoke to two prisoners who had recently arrived at the prison, both of whom had indicated some need during induction but neither of whom had been referred. Both would have welcomed the opportunity to have spoken to a legal services officer.

3.48 Information identifying legal services staff was published in some areas of the prison but this was out of date and available only in English (see recommendation 4.38). The governor responsible for legal services had made this information available in several other languages but it had not been displayed.

Housekeeping point

3.49 Information displayed about legal services should be up to date and in languages other than English.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.50 The advice and support of the Prison Service Muslim advisers should be sought to expedite the appointment of a Muslim chaplain. (5.42)

Achieved. A full-time Muslim chaplain had been appointed and was supported by two sessional Muslim chaplains.

- 3.51 The multi-faith room should be redecorated so that it is suitably welcoming and equipped. (5.43)

Achieved. The multi-faith room on the adult site offered a well-equipped and welcoming environment and was well used for a variety of staff and prisoner activities. A multi-faith room was part of the young adult learning centre and was clean, bright and well used for a range of activities, including Muslim prayers. A purpose-built ablutions area had been added to the young adult facility.

Additional information

- 3.52 In our survey, 11% of adults and 24% of young adults identified themselves as Muslim. There were concerns that a number of prisoners, mostly Muslims, and particularly on the young adult site, appeared to be unnecessarily and punitively banned from attendance at corporate worship (see section on security). Prisoners from a range of faiths told us that they believed the levels of staff supervision at Muslim prayers on both sites were disproportionate when compared with those at other services and, while there had been some issues of disorder at Muslim prayers, we were not assured that this was a proportionate response.
- 3.53 Prisoners were positive about chaplaincy services, and there was good provision for all faiths. Fewer adult and young adult prisoners than at comparator establishments said that they had seen a chaplain within their first 24 hours at Littlehey but our observations satisfied us that all new arrivals were seen, although not necessarily by a minister of their own faith.
- 3.54 The well-resourced chaplaincy team worked cooperatively to meet the needs of prisoners and was well integrated with the life of the prison. The chapel on the adult site was welcoming and sufficiently large to meet the needs of the population.
- 3.55 In addition to pastoral care and the provision of corporate worship services, the chaplaincy team was involved in the delivery of the Sycamore Tree victim awareness course, study classes, faith-based courses and concerts. However, they acknowledged that provision on the young adult site was far less developed than for adult prisoners, partly due to what was described as a 'prohibitive regime'.
- 3.56 The team had some links with outside faith groups, to support prisoners both in custody and on their release.

Further recommendations

- 3.57 Prisoners should be banned from attendance at corporate worship services, and particularly Muslim prayers, only when there is relevant and sufficient evidence in the individual case.
- 3.58 Levels of staff supervision at Muslim prayers should be reviewed, to ensure proportionality.
- 3.59 The provision of faith and religious activities should be developed for young adult prisoners.

Substance use

Expected outcomes:

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

Clinical management

- 3.60 The PCT and the prison should develop appropriate detoxification protocols and ensure that prisoners consistently receive psychosocial support during detoxification. (3.106)

Achieved. Detoxification protocols had been introduced, and under the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) prisoners undergoing treatment were supported by counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) workers. Twenty-eight-day psychosocial group-work modules were delivered as needed, as part of the IDTS.

Drug testing

- 3.61 The prison should ensure that weekend MDT targets are met. (3.107)

Not achieved. Neither weekend nor monthly random mandatory drug testing (MDT) targets were being met and suspicion tests frequently fell out of the required 72-hour time frame, largely due to the redeployment of MDT officers.

Further recommendation

- 3.62 Mandatory drug testing (MDT) should be appropriately staffed, to ensure that all testing and record-keeping duties are carried out appropriately, within identified timescales and without gaps in provision.

- 3.63 The MDT suite should be refurbished. (3.108)

Not achieved. No work had been done on the suite on the adult side of the prison. It was found to be dirty and in a state of further dilapidation. The MDT suite on the young adults site was also dirty.

Further recommendation

- 3.64 The MDT suite on the adult side of the prison should be refurbished, and both suites should be kept clean and tidy.

Additional information

- 3.65 For the relatively small number of prisoners with acute drug problems, treatment was much better than average. We found excellent care, with individualised treatment and good quality clinical reviews. All those on opiate substitution were on reducing doses, which was in line with National Treatment Agency guidance. Nevertheless, the prescribing regime was flexible and maintenance was available if the clinical need arose. Prisoners had good relationships with nursing staff, and those we spoke to were satisfied with their treatment.
- 3.66 However, the daily administration of opiate substitution medication was frequently delayed by the late arrival of a supervising discipline officer. During the inspection, a prisoner was caught on closed-circuit television attempting to divert Subutex at a time when the officer was late arriving for the medication round.
- 3.67 Staff and prisoners alike told us that the trading of prescribed medications diverted from the general health care medication rounds was a serious problem. Since the most commonly diverted medications, such as tramadol and gabapentin, could not be detected by existing mandatory drug tests, it was difficult to assess the extent of the problem. Some prisoners also told us about bullying that had resulted in medication being taken away from those who would otherwise have taken it correctly. In our survey, 11% of young adult prisoners (against the 19% comparator) and 13% of adults (against the 32% comparator) said that it was easy to get drugs in the prison.
- 3.68 Although the random MDT positive rate appeared to be relatively low, at 2.96% for the six months from April to September 2011, the MDT record keeping was fragmented, with conflicting figures being published by different sources. Furthermore, the official MDT log book was not always completed correctly (see further recommendation 3.62).

Further recommendations

- 3.69 A discipline officer should always be made available as a matter of priority to supervise the administration of opiate substitution medication and the general health care medication rounds, to minimise the risk of medication diversion.
- 3.70 The range of drugs covered by MDT should be widened to include the most commonly diverted medications, including tramadol and gabapentin.
- 3.71 The prison should work closely with the GP providers to ensure a consistent approach to the delivery of the strategy on misuse of medication.

Section 4: Diversity

Expected outcomes:

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

Diversity

- 4.1 A long-term diversity strategy should address the needs of the population and specifically of prisoners with disabilities or special needs. This should include issues such as access to healthcare and the chapel, provision of services for older prisoners and accommodation adjustments. (3.31)

Not achieved. There was no overarching diversity strategy to identify and address the range of needs of the population. There was a comprehensive policy specific to prisoners with disabilities and a more concise policy for older prisoners but they worked in isolation. The lack of a cohesive strategy was a serious gap, as many staff and prisoners were unsure of the provision for diverse groups. In spite of this, there was evidence of effective leadership and a broadly supportive environment for prisoners across all the strands of diversity.

Further recommendation

- 4.2 There should be an overarching strategy, based on an assessment of local need, which covers all strands of diversity.

- 4.3 The DLO should be given additional support to assist in the development of this role. (3.32)

Achieved. The role of the disability liaison officer (DLO) had developed considerably and included responsibility for providing both for older prisoners and those with disabilities but, although the post was full time, it was subject to considerable cross-deployment (see additional information and further recommendation 4.12). Nevertheless, the DLO was energetic and passionate and had implemented many changes that had had a positive impact on the lives of older prisoners and those with disabilities. The developments had been mainly on the adult site and mostly affected prisoners over 65. They included a work room specifically for older prisoners, a separate garden with good and regular access, specific gym sessions, and unlocking prisoners during the core day if they were not involved in another activity. Older prisoners and those with disabilities across both sites that we spoke to were positive about the services and facilities available to them.

Additional information

- 4.4 Work on diversity was undertaken and promoted by two full-time and one part-time equality officers, one of whom was responsible for the provision for older prisoners and those with disabilities. However, all of the equality officers were subject to considerable redeployment, which had a detrimental effect on their ability to develop provision. Mechanisms to identify prisoners with diverse needs were generally effective.

- 4.5 The new-style quarterly equality meeting (see also recommendation MR1) discussed most strands of diversity, with the exclusion of religion. There was no strategic approach to developing some of these strands. The meeting was chaired by the governor but attendance from some key departments was poor. Ethnic monitoring data were discussed at the equality meeting but there was no monitoring under any of the other strands. Prisoner representatives from the adult and young adult sites attended alternate meetings but the introduction of quarterly meetings meant that they attended only once every six months.
- 4.6 On the adult site, there were around 18 trained prisoner representatives and orderlies across all the diversity strands, including two from a Gypsy/Roma/Traveller background and two from Real Voices, the local support group for gay/bisexual/transgender prisoners. Work with young adults was less well developed but was still afforded a high priority and at the time of the inspection there were eight prisoner representatives, mostly undertaking work under the race equality and foreign national strands.
- 4.7 Meetings between equality staff and prisoner representatives across most of the diversity strands were reasonably regular, although some were cancelled at short notice owing to redeployment of the staff. Issues raised at these meetings were communicated effectively to the equality meeting. Other than prisoner representative meetings and a prisoner-led meeting for gay/bisexual/transgender prisoners, there were no forums or support groups for members of the wider population who were from a minority group.
- 4.8 In the three years before the inspection, a large number of staff (93%) had received 'Challenge It, Change It' diversity training. However, many staff we spoke to were not appropriately sighted on the distinct needs or provision for each minority group and, rather than dealing with needs, often referred prisoners to the equality staff when issues were identified. There were no staff equality representatives.
- 4.9 A timetable for the completion of equality impact assessments had been set following a priority-setting exercise but at the time of the inspection none had been completed.
- 4.10 Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had replaced racist incident report forms (RIRFs) in June 2011. Until June 2011, investigations into complaints had been completed to a high standard by equality staff. However, DIRF investigations were completed by wing managers and the quality and timeliness of investigations were poor. There were few consequences for those about whom complaints were upheld and support for victims of discrimination was poor. Responses lacked any empathy for the complainant (see also recommendation 4.23).
- 4.11 The prison had produced an award-winning DVD, called 'In the same boat', which promoted diversity and was shown during induction. A further diversity-related DVD, called 'Further up the creek', had been recorded and showed opportunities at the establishment. Both were shown on televisions in all cells on the prisoner information channel.

Further recommendations

- 4.12 Equality staff should be given sufficient time to undertake their roles effectively.
- 4.13 The equality management team meeting should cover all aspects of diversity and should manage the strategic development of provision across all strands.
- 4.14 All main areas of the prison should be consistently represented at the equality meeting, and all prisoner representatives should be able to attend each meeting.

- 4.15 There should be regular support groups/forums for all prisoners from a minority group.
- 4.16 Equality impact assessments should be completed as soon as possible.
- 4.17 Investigations resulting from discrimination incident report forms should be thorough and timely, and there should be consequences when discrimination is proved and support for victims of discrimination.

Good practice

- 4.18 *The prison had produced an award winning DVD, which promoted diversity and was shown during induction.*

Race equality

- 4.19 **Nominated REAT staff with sufficient authority from all relevant parts of the prison should attend monthly meetings with the prisoner representatives, and offer advice and guidance as appropriate. Issues which cannot be resolved directly with prisoner representatives should be taken to the next REAT meeting for resolution. (3.41)**

Partially achieved. Equality staff on both the adult and young adult sites met prisoner race equality and foreign national representatives, including representatives from Gypsy/Roma/ Traveller backgrounds, reasonably regularly. There was some evidence that issues raised were addressed and that they were taken forward to the equality management meetings (see also further recommendation 4.22).

- 4.20 **The REO should be given sufficient time to carry out his duties effectively in accordance with Prison Service guidelines. (3.42)**

Not achieved. The equality staff were subject to consistent redeployment and estimated that approximately 60% of their time was spent on duties other than diversity/equality work. Some aspects of work with prisoners suffered as a result (see further recommendation 4.12).

- 4.21 **Prisoner representatives should be consulted and a plan drawn up through the REAT meetings about how to improve the promotion of race and diversity issues throughout the prison. (3.43)**

Partially achieved. There was extensive use of trained prisoner representatives across both sites (see section on diversity). They told us that, while they felt listened to and engaged with the process, there was little work undertaken to address issues that had consistently been highlighted by both them and SMART monitoring around areas of potential discrimination, such as inequality of access to release on temporary licence, overuse of adjudications and use of force. There was a comprehensive equality action plan which was regularly updated, but after initial identification some actions had made little progress and some had remained on the action plan as 'ongoing' for too long (see further recommendation 4.13).

Further recommendation

- 4.22 Concerns highlighted by ethnic monitoring data should be explored and addressed promptly.

- 4.23 **Racist incidents which relate to relations between individual staff and prisoners should be addressed through face-to-face discussion or mediation. (3.44)**

Partially achieved. Incident reports that had been investigated and responded to by equality staff before the introduction of a new system in June 2011 showed some evidence of mediation being recommended and used to address issues between staff and prisoners. However, the investigation of DIRFs by wing managers showed no evidence of mediation or face-to-face discussions being used to address such issues.

- 4.24 **Contact with external organisations such as the local race equality council should be vigorously pursued and they should be invited to attend monthly management meetings. (3.45)**

Not achieved. External organisations had not been represented at equality meetings for a considerable time.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 4.25 **A sample of RIRFs should be quality checked by an appropriate external body. Any findings should be reported to the REAT. (3.46)**

Not achieved. RIRFs had not been externally validated since at least August 2010 and there had been no such checks of DIRFs since their introduction (see paragraph 4.10). Some quality assurance had been undertaken by residential managers, and as a result some issues had been highlighted at the equality meeting. We were not convinced that the quality assurance of DIRF investigations was effective.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 4.26 At the time of the inspection, 24% of adults and 40% of young adults were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. In our survey, approximately 4% of adults and 2% of young adults identified themselves as Gypsy/Roma/Traveller but identification of, and support for, this group was underdeveloped.
- 4.27 In our survey, the responses from black and minority ethnic prisoners were less favourable than those of their white counterparts in a number of areas, including: ever having felt unsafe, currently feeling unsafe and having been threatened or intimidated by a member of staff. However, most prisoners from this group, including Gypsy/Roma/Traveller prisoners, told us that they were broadly satisfied with the service they received at the establishment and that they did not feel discriminated against.
- 4.28 Details of prisoners currently or previously convicted of a racially aggravated offence, or those found to have engaged in racist behaviour while in custody, were not identified and no list for staff information was maintained. There were no formal interventions to challenge prisoners who engaged in racist behaviour.

Further recommendation

- 4.29 There should be formal interventions to challenge prisoners who engage in racist behaviour.

Housekeeping point

- 4.30 A list of prisoners currently or previously convicted of a racially aggravated offence and those having engaged in racist behaviour in custody should be maintained.

Religion

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 4.31 In our survey, 59% of adult prisoners said that their religious beliefs were respected, which was better than the 55% comparator; on the young adult site this figure was 52%, which was in line with the comparator.
- 4.32 The coordinating chaplain was a member of the equality team. Religion was not a standing agenda item at the meeting.
- 4.33 The religious affiliation of prisoners was recorded but there was no formal monitoring of equality of treatment, such as access to services and activities.

Foreign nationals

- 4.34 **The foreign nationals meeting/committee should be given specific terms of reference, be multidisciplinary and include prisoner representatives. (3.52)**

Not achieved. There was no separate foreign national prisoner committee/meeting. Foreign national prisoners were a standing agenda item on the DREAT/equality meeting and prisoner representatives were invited to this meeting.

- 4.35 **A foreign nationals coordinator should be appointed who has sufficient time to fulfil their role in accordance with Prison Service guidelines. (3.53)**

Not achieved. There was no foreign nationals coordinator. The equality staff undertook this role as part of their wider remit. We were not assured that the needs of foreign national prisoners were always identified and addressed. Equality staff were knowledgeable about some foreign national prisoners but contact with many of them was inconsistent and not always recorded. Some foreign national prisoners who spoke little English told us that they felt isolated and frustrated by the lack of staff engagement with them.

Further recommendation

- 4.36 The needs of all foreign national prisoners should be formally assessed and recorded.

- 4.37 **Information for foreign nationals about PIN telephone credit, legal advice and translation services should be displayed in a range of languages on notice boards in residential areas. (3.54)**

Partially achieved. Information about a range of subjects was included on equality noticeboards across the prison but was available only in English. Appropriate information was

held in the prisoner information rooms on residential units but, again, had not been translated.
We repeat the recommendation.

4.38 Foreign national prisoners should be provided with information about immigration status and procedures in different languages. (3.55)

Not achieved. Staff from the UK Border Agency (UKBA) attended the prison every four to six weeks and saw prisoners from both the adult and young adult sites. There were a limited number of appointments available and surgeries were consistently oversubscribed, which meant that not all prisoners could see UKBA staff when they wanted to, although appointments were prioritised appropriately. Interpreters were used appropriately by UKBA staff during their visits but all other written communication was available only in English.
We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 4.39** At the time of the inspection, 16% of adults and 13% of young adult prisoners were identified as foreign nationals. In our survey, only 11% of adult foreign national prisoners said that staff normally spoke to them during association and only 61% that most staff treated them with respect, both of which were worse than the responses of their British national counterparts.
- 4.40** There were foreign national prisoner representatives on each site; regular meetings were held with them on the adult site but less so for young adults. Other than a selection of telephone numbers, foreign national prisoners had no access to independent immigration advice. No wider focus/support groups were facilitated with foreign national prisoners (see further recommendation 4.15).
- 4.41** Foreign national prisoner representatives had folders containing all relevant information, and those on the adult site also had access to a laptop computer with which they could use internet translation services for the small number of prisoners with a limited or no understanding of English. Use of professional interpreting services was low and was not monitored, and staff appeared to be too reliant on using other prisoners as interpreters, or devolved responsibility to prisoner representatives or equality staff.
- 4.42** At the time of the inspection, 17 prisoners were being detained solely under immigration powers, one since May 2009. Many of these prisoners had been informed far too close to their release date that they were to be detained. Owing to the nature of their offences, some detainees did not meet the criteria for transfer to immigration removal centres (IRCs). Eight of the 17 had elected to remain at Littlehey but others wished to move either to an IRC or to another prison and, despite efforts by the prison, this was proving difficult in some cases.

Further recommendations

- 4.43** The UK Border Agency should ensure that decisions to deport and maintain detention after sentence expiry are made and communicated to prisoners well before the end of sentence.
- 4.44** Prisoners should have regular access to independent immigration advice.

Disability and older prisoners

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 4.45 Work on the disability and older prisoners strands was well developed and there had been considerable progress since the previous inspection.
- 4.46 At the time of the inspection, the DLO had a backlog of approximately 35 prisoners who were older and/or had declared a disability whom he had not yet seen because of his regular redeployment (see recommendation 4.20); however, he tried to prioritise those with the greatest need, and there were many examples of practical support which he had organised. The older prisoner support scheme had been developed to support prisoners over the age of 65 and included a pre-release assessment of need. Most prisoners who had received help were reasonably content with the service, support and adjustments they had been offered, although one older prisoner told us that he had not taken a shower for over three weeks because of an issue with the buddy who had been allocated to him, and staff appeared to be unaware of this. There were no multidisciplinary care plans, even for those with identified high support needs.
- 4.47 Older prisoners and those with disabilities were able to access all parts of the regime and efforts were made to make the prison accessible to all, including grab rails, stair lifts, shower chairs and wheelchair ramps.
- 4.48 Twenty-three prisoners had personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) but few staff were aware of PEEPs (see also recommendation 2.3). Prisoners were assigned as buddies to assist in the evacuation of prisoners needing help in an emergency but lists of the latter prisoners were not always up to date on the wings
- 4.49 There were regular meetings between the DLO and the representatives for older prisoners and those with disabilities on the adult site but the wider forum to allow other older prisoners to meet had not taken place since about April 2011 because of redeployment of the DLO.

Further recommendation

- 4.50 Older prisoners and/or those with disabilities should have a multidisciplinary care plan, where appropriate.

Gender and sexual orientation

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 4.51 In our survey, 11% of adult and 1% of young adult prisoners identified themselves as gay or bisexual. In our survey, adult gay/bisexual prisoners had mainly similar perceptions to others but were more likely to feel unsafe and to have been victimised by another prisoner.
- 4.52 During the inspection, the gay/bisexual prisoners we spoke to told us that the prison was generally inclusive and supportive of them and that any issues or abuse were dealt with robustly by staff. This diversity strand was well developed for adult prisoners and there was evidence of engagement with external support agencies. Young adults appeared less likely to disclose that they were gay or bisexual, and support services for them were less developed.

- 4.53 Real Voices (see paragraph 4.6) met monthly and was well attended. However, this meeting was held in an area that was accessible by other prisoners and afforded insufficient privacy.
- 4.54 During the inspection, two prisoners identified themselves as transgender and were at different stages in the gender reassignment process. There were some complicated and challenging issues with one of the prisoners but both felt that the prison was unsupportive of their individual circumstances.

Further recommendations

- 4.55 Support services for young adult prisoners who are gay/bisexual should be improved.
- 4.56 Positive support should be given to transgender prisoners.

Housekeeping point

- 4.57 The Real Voices support meeting should be held in a more appropriate venue.

Section 5: Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

General

- 5.1 The Governor should ensure that the arrangements between the prison and the new PCT are robust and adhere to Department of Health quality regulatory frameworks. (4.45)

Achieved. There was good partnership working, supported by the strategic prison health partnership board, risk management steering group and medicines management meetings.

Additional information

- 5.2 There was one health care orderly per site, who undertook cleaning in the department. His role was hampered as he was not able to gain access to clinical areas every day. The decoration of areas in the adult prison was unsuitable and some administration and clinical areas were dirty. Clinical staff frequently undertook cleaning duties, which was a poor use of their time.

Further recommendation

- 5.3 Clinical and administrative areas on both sites should be cleaned every day, and clinical areas on the adult site should be deep-cleaned.

Clinical governance

- 5.4 There should be a prison clinical governance committee, linking into the clinical governance structure of the PCT. (4.46)

Achieved. There was a risk management steering group, where clinical governance issues were discussed.

- 5.5 All staff should attend clinical supervision. (4.47)

Achieved Clinical supervision was available for all staff and was well attended. The mental health team had robust supervisory arrangements.

- 5.6 Complaints relating specifically to healthcare should be managed under the PCT complaints system, as they commission the service provided. (4.48)

Achieved. Written complaints were managed through the health care department and confidentiality was maintained. There was good use of the Patient Advice and Liaison Services and Independent Complaints Advocacy Service, representatives of which attended the prison every six to eight weeks; this had contributed to a reduction in written complaints.

Additional information

- 5.7 Clinical governance arrangements were effective for primary care and mental health services. Training arrangements were robust and there was good sharing of information across the prison. We observed good interactions between nursing staff and prisoners, although we were told that some staff could be abrupt when they were busy.

Primary care

- 5.8 **Barrier protection should be freely available to prisoners. (4.49)**

Partially achieved. There was good access to barrier protection for adults and younger adults, particularly on release; however, prisoners had to request condoms from health services staff. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 5.9 **Action should be taken to reduce the waiting time for access to the optometrist. (4.50)**

Partially achieved. Action had been taken to increase the number of sessions for the optometrist but this had not embedded in practice, and we noted a waiting time of approximately 18 weeks at the time of the inspection. In our survey, 11% of adult prisoners, which was worse than the 18% comparator, said that they found it easy or very easy to see the optician. The figure for young adults (16%) was in line with the comparator. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Additional information

- 5.10 In our survey, 35% of adult prisoners, which was worse than the 39% comparator, said that they found it easy or very easy to see a doctor, although the figure for young adults (47%) was better than the comparator (42%). Sixty-eight per cent of young adults identified the overall quality of health services as good or very good, which was better than the comparator of 53%. The medical provider, Medacs, used a high number of locum staff, which resulted in inconsistency in prescribing and decision-making, and we were told that sometimes there was no medical cover at all. Prisoners and nurses complained about general delays in the doctors' service, including the review of pathology reports. We also noted long waits for the dentist (see also recommendation 5.31) and podiatrist, which were not being monitored closely.
- 5.11 In our survey, 68% of young adults said that the overall quality of health services was good or very good, which was better than the 53% comparator. The figure for adults (43%) was in line with the comparator.
- 5.12 The health care department had received an award for smoking cessation for their success in encouraging young adults to give up the habit in a challenging environment.

Further recommendations

- 5.13 The Primary Care Trust should review arrangements for medical cover, to ensure consistent provision.
- 5.14 There should be robust monitoring arrangements for all appointments and action should be taken to reduce all waiting lists for primary care services.

Pharmacy

- 5.15 **The pre-packing of medications must stop and alternative small proprietary packs purchased for use. (4.51)**

Achieved. Correctly labelled medicines were provided by an appropriate supplier. These were stored in an emergency cupboard in the health care department. There had been a recent review of medicines available, and the record of medicines used was audited by the pharmacy technician.

- 5.16 **A review of the times when medications are given should be completed to ensure that patients on a 'see to take' basis receive their medication at an appropriate time. (4.52)**

Not achieved. Medicines in both parts of the prison were supplied twice a day; at 8am and 4pm. A number of the medicines administered at 4pm on the adult site were for night-time sedation. Some abusable medicines had been supplied daily in possession, which created opportunities for diversion (see recommendation MR5 and section on substance use). Although the administration we observed was generally well ordered, long queues often made prisoners late for work or education, and were exacerbated by those needing to order repeat medicines (see further recommendation 5.28) and to make appointments. There were no audits of the medicines in the treatment rooms. On the young adults site, we found medicines that should have been administered to patients and some that patients were no longer taking. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Further recommendation

- 5.17 Monthly in-possession medication should be administered as a preferred option, once prisoners have been appropriately risk assessed.

- 5.18 **Patient group directives should be introduced to enable the supply of more potent medications by the pharmacist and/or nurses to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (4.53)**

Not achieved. There were no patient group directions (PGDs) in place at the time of the inspection. The special sick policy only allowed the supply of paracetamol and ibuprofen. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 5.19 **A step-wise approach to pain management should be introduced, with appropriate allowance made for the prison environment. (4.54)**

Not achieved. With the lack of regular prescribers and no prescribing formulary in place (see also further recommendation 5.27), the approach to pain management was inconsistent. Nurses indicated that there was a lack of consistency between prescribers. **We repeat the recommendation.**

Additional information

- 5.20 In our survey, only 35% of adult prisoners said that it was easy or very easy to see a pharmacist, which was worse than the 54% comparator; 49% of young adults responded positively to this question, in line with the comparator. Since the previous inspection, the pharmacist had resigned and the pharmacy closed, and all medicines were currently supplied

by a local community pharmacy. Nurses were responsible for medicines management on a day-to-day basis and undertook the administration of medicines. Even though a part-time pharmacy technician was employed, the pharmacy service was essentially a supply-only model. It was not clear that the role undertaken by the pharmacy technician utilised her skills. Governance arrangements were limited and the range of policies and procedures was inadequate. There was a written policy for in-possession medication; the special sick policy was limited and there was no policy for out-of-hours provision. There was no specific prescribing formulary available.

- 5.21 Prisoners and nurses complained about delays in obtaining medicines, particularly repeat medicines. The delays seemed to lie in the ordering process in the prison, especially in regard to getting the prescriptions signed by the prescriber. There was no audit of the faxed prescriptions.
- 5.22 Decision-making in relation to prisoners having in-possession medication was also inconsistent and at times haphazard, with nurses and the pharmacy technician making decisions that were unclear. There was no straightforward way of checking that administration was taking place against a valid prescription.
- 5.23 There was robust checking of refrigerator temperatures on the young adult site but on the adult site there was no evidence that heat-sensitive products had been stored in appropriate conditions, and record sheets there were generally poor. There were no records on the adult site to confirm that the pump that supplied methadone was cleaned and calibrated.

Further recommendations

- 5.24 There should be access to a pharmacist, to provide counselling sessions, pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication review. The role of the pharmacy technician should be reviewed; and appropriate professional support introduced.
- 5.25 All medicines procedures and policies should be formally reviewed and adopted via the medicines and therapeutics committee. All staff should read, sign and implement the agreed adopted procedures.
- 5.26 The special sick policy should be reviewed, to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied; only medicines in that policy should be supplied as special sick.
- 5.27 A prescribing formulary should be agreed by the medicines and therapeutics committee, and implemented.
- 5.28 The system for patients requesting repeat medicines should be reviewed and prisoners should receive them in a timely manner.
- 5.29 The prescribing and administration of medicines should be audited.

Housekeeping point

- 5.30 Maximum and minimum temperatures should be recorded daily for the drug refrigerators in treatment rooms, to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2–8°C range. Corrective action should be taken where necessary and should be monitored by pharmacy staff.

Dentistry

5.31 A full range of NHS dental treatments should be available to prisoners. (4.55)

Achieved. A full range of treatments was available for adult and young adult prisoners, and also one-to-one health promotion, but there were long waiting lists on the adult site (see further recommendation 5.14).

5.32 Additional hand-pieces and appropriate endodontic equipment should be provided to allow for proper cross-infection control. (4.56)

Achieved. A full range of endodontic equipment was available.

Additional information

- 5.33** The role of the dental nurse was limited and her skills were inappropriately focused on cleaning the department, rather than on health promotion. In our survey, only 9% of adult prisoners said that it was easy or very easy to see a dentist, which was worse than the 15% comparator. However, 21% of young adults responded positively to this survey question, which was better than the 17% comparator.

Mental health

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 5.34** Mental health services were excellent, with good access to a wide range of primary and secondary services, including psychiatrists, a psychologist, a psychotherapist, Mind and Hunts Mind. The mental health team had received an award in recognition of their group work. In our survey, 50% of adult prisoners said that their mental health needs were being addressed by the mental health in-reach team, which was better than the 33% comparator. In addition, 22% of adult prisoners said that their mental health issues were being addressed by a counsellor, which was better than the 12% comparator. However, only 3% of younger adults said that their emotional needs were being addressed by a nurse or a doctor, which was worse than the comparators of 26% and 19%, respectively.

Section 6: Activities

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

6.1 Prisoners should spend at least 10 hours out of their cell on weekdays. (5.49)

Not achieved. The core day timetable allowed for a maximum of 9.4 hours unlocked for adults and seven hours for young adults. In our two checks of the proportion of prisoners locked in their cells during the working day, we found averages of 22% of adults and 36% of young adults, which indicated that a large number would not achieve the maximum available time unlocked.

We repeat the recommendation.

6.2 Time out of cell should be accurately recorded. (5.50)

Not achieved. An administration officer collected the returns of prisoners attending activities from the various prison departments and submitted these to a central hub for collation, and the average time unlocked was calculated. The prison recorded an average daily time unlocked of 9.2 hours. In the light of the findings from our spot checks of numbers unlocked during the working day (see recommendation 6.1), the average recorded by the prison did not appear to be accurate.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

6.3 On the adult site, prisoners had outside exercise for one hour every day and had evening association four days a week. These periods were reliable and well supervised.

6.4 The young adult time out of cell had been restricted in the interests of safety and maintaining good order. They had just 30 minutes a day of outside exercise, and evening association was alternated between landings, so that prisoners had only two sessions a week (see main recommendation HP64). In our survey, fewer young adults than at comparator establishments said that they went on association five times a week (19% versus 55%).

6.5 Exercise and association periods for young adults were well controlled and supervised, which we were told was an improvement on the situation when the wings had first opened and larger numbers had been unlocked. However, prisoners complained to us that they felt too restricted and that the morning 30-minute domestic time unlocked was not adequate compensation for the loss of daily evening association. Young adults were allowed to dine out for approximately 30 minutes in rotation, which, to some extent, mitigated the loss of association time.

6.6 Exercise on the adult site was taken in a pleasant area between residential blocks with planted gardens, lawns and seating. Young adult exercise areas were attached to each wing and were clean and modern, with fixed exercise equipment.

6.7 Warm outdoor clothing was issued, so that prisoners could exercise during bad weather.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

Leadership and management

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 6.8 Senior prison staff had maintained a strong commitment to learning and skills across the prison and provided a sound emphasis on providing employability skills and reducing reoffending.
- 6.9 The prison had used a needs analysis from HMP Rochester to influence the provision at Littlehey. The current provision of purposeful activities had been well developed and was managed effectively. Staff from the prison, Milton Keynes College and the Tribal careers information, advice and guidance service (CIAS) worked together in a cohesive and planned way to offer a flexible approach to education and training. Improvements had been made in workshop and vocational training programmes and were aimed at the employment needs of industry and commerce.
- 6.10 The CIAS provision was well established and all prisoners were seen at induction and followed up throughout their stay at the establishment. The service provided good support at activity allocation meetings. Referrals to Nacro and the recently established pre-release course were satisfactory. CIAS staff received insufficient information from offender supervisors about prisoners' sentence risks and restrictions at the point of referral to Nacro.
- 6.11 A large number of prisoners (about 80) were engaged in Open University and distance learning programmes, many of whom had been referred by prison staff, and achievement of higher-level qualifications was good. Representatives from the Open University often attended the prison to provide award ceremonies and present awards. However, there was insufficient support, particularly for young adults, to progress prisoners onto programmes, so waiting lists were too long.
- 6.12 Vocational training was well managed. New vocational trainers were supported effectively to improve their training and assessment practice.
- 6.13 The prison had re-established the quality improvement group. Staff engaged positively in quality assuring the education and training provision offered by Milton Keynes College, the offender learning and skills service (OLASS) provider. However, the arrangements for quality assuring the teaching and learning of the non-OLASS-funded provision were not as well developed. Self-assessment for learning and skills was effective. Insufficient work had been done to identify the differences between the adult and young adult sites. The sharing of best practice between staff and sites was also underdeveloped.

- 6.14 The core day for activities was too short. Afternoon sessions were particularly short, and during the inspection there were delays to the start of afternoon sessions, reducing the core day even further.

Further recommendations

- 6.15 An analysis should be completed to ensure that the provision of purposeful activities meets the needs of the population.
- 6.16 Sufficient support should be provided for prisoners on Open University and distance learning programmes.
- 6.17 The core day should be extended and delays to the start times of training reduced.

Housekeeping point

- 6.18 The self-assessment report should clearly differentiate between the two sites, to identify the strengths and areas for improvement for both.

Work

- 6.19 **The number of prisoners allocated to work but not attending should be monitored and reduced. (5.22)**

Achieved. A clear and effective process for monitoring attendance at purposeful activities had been introduced. Records of attendance at work were kept weekly for adults and daily for young adults and were frequently monitored by senior staff. Staff followed up non-attendance to determine the reasons for it, and this had resulted in an increase in the number of prisoners participating in purposeful activities, particularly young adults in education. Young adult attendance in education sessions had risen from 50–60% earlier in 2011 to 70–80% over recent months.

- 6.20 **Except for those who refuse to attend activities, all prisoners should receive a reasonable minimum wage. (5.23)**

Achieved. The wage policy had been reviewed and prisoners who wanted to take part in purposeful activities received a reasonable weekly wage of around £10. Some prisoners with extra responsibilities, such as orderlies, received a small increment in pay of around £1. The pay policy was applied across the prison and pay was equitable. Those attending education were not disadvantaged. Prisoners were able to work part time and attend education.

- 6.21 **The pay policy should not undermine other prison policies, such as safer custody, incentives and earned privileges, and resettlement. (5.24)**

Achieved. The published pay policy had been aligned with other policies, such as safer custody, incentives and earned privileges and resettlement, and did not undermine them.

Additional information

- 6.22 Sufficient purposeful activities were provided for the adult population and participation was high, at around 90%. However, during the inspection too many adult prisoners (22%) were

locked up. On the young adult site, there were sufficient places for only about 75% of the population and, although 88% of the places were filled, this meant that only around 67% of this population was occupied, and during the inspection too many (32%) were locked up (see main recommendation HP65).

- 6.23 There was an appropriate range of work activities, including welding, packing, kitchen, recycling and horticulture. Many prisoners, particularly on the adult site, were engaged in peer support roles. Prisoners in these roles were used well for Toe by Toe literacy programme coordination and delivery, and also as orderlies and Listeners.
- 6.24 The prison had removed most areas providing mundane, repetitive work, and in most work areas prisoners developed their employment skills well. The recently created welding and fabrication workshop on the adult site was well designed and provided good skills development opportunities in an industry-standard environment. There were plans to introduce qualifications in this area, and also the kitchen and recycling areas. Few prisoners were released on temporary licence and most of these were restricted to outside gardens and the staff mess.

Vocational training

- 6.25 **There should be more opportunities to recognise or accredit prisoners' learning and skills, particularly in the electronics workshop and for prisoners in positions of responsibility. (5.25)**

Achieved. Since April 2010, the prison had developed a strategy of accrediting many vocational training programmes offered, and was further developing progression routes to higher levels of qualification. A foundation-level electronics qualification had recently been introduced. Learning support assistants were able to gain an accredited award.

Additional information

- 6.26 Achievement rates in vocational training were satisfactory for adults and generally high for young adults. Information communication technology (ICT) achievement rates were high across both sites. Generally, training areas were well attended, although the removal of some prisoners to attend other courses or prison requirements had a negative impact on their progress. Sentence plans were not used sufficiently to plan training, and on some programmes waiting lists were too long. Punctuality at vocational training sessions was satisfactory, although young adults sometimes arrived late for afternoon sessions.
- 6.27 Most trainers offered prisoners good individual coaching, and learning was well planned. Many used their industrial experience well to motivate and encourage learners. Resources were good for vocational training, although less so on the young adult site, where some areas were cramped, which sometimes hampered training.
- 6.28 The range of vocational provision was good on both sites. Recently introduced provision on the adult site included welding and fabrication, music technology, motor body repair/vehicle spraying and fine cell work/sewing workshop; at the time of the inspection the motor vehicle repair shop was closed owing to staff sickness, although arrangements to introduce a replacement tutor were well advanced. Young adults had opportunities to develop catering, construction multi-skills and floor-laying skills.
- 6.29 The allocation of training and work places was fair. However, some prisoners were not always appropriately prepared for all aspects of the training. For example, some ICT learners did not

always have the necessary technical English skills to enable them to take examinations. The labour allocations board was not sufficiently aware of the training opportunities that were available. Individual learning plans were not used well to set clear personal or vocational targets or to monitor learners' progress (see further recommendation 6.42).

Further recommendations

- 6.30 Sentence plans should be organised so that prisoners are able to complete education and training programmes without being taken out for other activities.
- 6.31 Qualifications should be introduced into all vocational training areas, with appropriate progression routes that meet the needs of industry.

Education

- 6.32 **The effectiveness of the quality improvement group and its ability to respond appropriately to changes should be improved. (5.26)**

Achieved. The quality improvement group had been reformed over the previous 18 months and had been instrumental in bringing about changes to the education and training provision. Changes to the education programmes on the young adult site had been implemented – for example, providing a more flexible start to programmes for prisoners with short sentences.

- 6.33 **A formal system of observation of teaching and learning should be introduced for all programmes delivered by the prison. (5.27)**

Partially achieved. A member of staff had been appointed by Milton Keynes College to assist with the standardisation of assessment processes and support quality improvement in, for example, catering, to ensure that training and qualifications were appropriately delivered and met awarding body requirements. At the time of the inspection, formal observation of teaching and learning in areas delivered by the prison had not been fully implemented. There remained an over-reliance on the external verification process of accredited awards to maintain standards.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 6.34 Education provision on both sites was well managed and offered part-time sessions, with flexible starts and a wide range of subjects to meet the needs and interests of both adult and young adult prisoners. Attendance was good on both sites and the education provision was purposeful. Achievement of qualifications and standards of work on both sites were good. The English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) provision met the needs of the population on both sites. However, young adults could take only ESOL qualifications, and adult prisoners only literacy qualifications, and both qualifications were available only at entry level.
- 6.35 There was insufficient support on the young adult site for those with learning difficulties. The support for the Toe by Toe programme was well established on the adult site but less so on the young adult site. A large number of prisoners were engaged in Open University and distance learning programmes.

- 6.36 Teaching was generally good, although young adults exhibited poor behaviour. Education staff were knowledgeable and enthusiastic about their subjects and most communicated skilfully with prisoners with a wide range of abilities and previous learning and experience.
- 6.37 Learning resources were generally good, including interactive boards in some rooms. The range of media used in the creative techniques (art) was varied. However, a few rooms on both sites were cramped, restricting the range of learning activities that could take place. The recently installed music technology equipment was to commercial industry standards. Learning materials varied in quality, although good use was made of workbooks on both sites to support prisoners working at their own pace and ability. Innovative use was made of customised learning aids for employment training in the young adults' provision.
- 6.38 The planning of learning was satisfactory. However, preparation for new learners was hampered by incomplete individual learning plans in too many programmes, resulting in tutors being unaware of learners' literacy and numeracy abilities, any additional learning support needs and their long-term goals. In addition, individual learning plans did not systematically contain prisoners' related prior learning, achievements and experience to help staff to plan learning effectively. Learner diaries were generally well completed, with comments from learners and staff alike.
- 6.39 Quality improvement was evident on both sites and teachers were well supported by constructive comments following the observation of teaching and learning activities. Content was detailed and summaries generally reflected the key points and grades awarded; however, those in the adults' provision had more action points to support quality improvement and their teaching and learning grade profile was higher. The established process on the adult site was well linked to appraisals and staff development, which included prison as well as educational activities.
- 6.40 Internal verification activities were coordinated across both sites. However, to support quality improvement, good practice was insufficiently shared within the two education areas and across both sites.

Further recommendations

- 6.41 Appropriate English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) qualifications should be offered on both sites.
- 6.42 Individual learning plans should be used better to plan learning and support needs.
- 6.43 Best practice in education provision should be shared across both sites.

Library

- 6.44 **The library should introduce an open learning study area and the number of computers should be increased. (5.28)**

Not achieved. There was one computer for prisoners' use in the adults' library, which was used regularly by the Toe by Toe orderly for administration of the programme. Laptop computers bought following the previous inspection had not been used and were stored in a cupboard in the library staff area. Plans to use the adjacent education computer suite for evening private study had not been implemented and evening library access had been

curtailed. The adults' library had a 16-seater table area, where prisoners regularly read newspapers in their breaks from education classes, but an additional study area had not been created.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 6.45 The libraries on both sites were spacious and welcoming, with knowledgeable and enthusiastic library staff and orderlies. There was a wide range of stock, which was appropriately varied for the different sites, although financial restrictions had hampered recent purchasing of new stock to meet prisoners' interests.
- 6.46 Books were often returned late to both libraries as a result of frequent closures, which occurred because no officers were available to escort prisoners there. These closures primarily affected evening and weekend library access, and over 100 sessions had been cancelled in recent months. This impacted severely on prisoners on vocational training programmes or who worked off their wings, as they did not have any daytime library access.

Further recommendations

- 6.47 The library should not close owing to a shortage of staff to escort prisoners.
- 6.48 Prisoners who work off their wings and/or attend vocational training programmes should be provided with regular library sessions.

Physical education and health promotion

Expected outcomes:

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

- 6.49 The showers in the gymnasium should be refurbished and updated. (5.34)

Not achieved. Despite bids for improvements, the showers for adults had not been refurbished, although the female staff showers next to the prisoner showers had been. Many prisoners used wing showers as an alternative. The shower facilities for young adults were fit for use, although the floor in the shower room for young adult men was in a poor state of repair.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 6.50 Prisoners should have a clean PE kit each time they visit the gymnasium. (5.35)

Partially achieved. Laundry facilities on the wings had improved and prisoners were able to wear their own kit, including jogging bottoms (previously banned). However, the process for ensuring that all prisoners had clean kit every time they visited the gym was not clear. There were no storage facilities in the PE department, and laundry facilities there were limited.

- 6.51 The number of PE staff should be increased to the level required to provide a full recreational programme and accredited training opportunities. (5.36)

Partially achieved. The adult PE department offered a broad recreational programme and catered for most prisoners who wished to access the facilities. However, accredited training opportunities had ceased for adult prisoners, in part because it was considered that prisoners would not have opportunities to work in the leisure industry on release. Staffing arrangements had changed since the introduction of the young adult site, and PE staff managed both sites. However, the PE department on the adult site often experienced staff shortages, owing to redeployment of staff to the young adult site, to ensure safer working practices for staff and prisoners there.

Additional information

- 6.52 PE was appropriately promoted to prisoners at induction and on the wings, and prisoners were appropriately assessed for fitness. Access to PE was good for adults, with many prisoners able to take part in over two sessions a week. However, access for young adults was limited and on average prisoners had only one session a week.
- 6.53 Outdoor sports facilities were adequate, although, since the building of the young adult site, opportunities to play sports with outside organisations had been lost. The sports hall for young adults was being adapted to offer more places for weight-lifting and improved cardiovascular activities. PE staff ensured that activities were similar to those of the adult population. However, the range of recreational activities for young adults was too narrow.
- 6.54 A range of sports qualifications was available to young adults. Accidents were appropriately recorded and managed.

Further recommendation

- 6.55 The access of young adults to PE should be improved and the range of recreational activities increased.

Section 7: Good order

Security and rules

Expected outcomes:

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

- 7.1 Local rules should be translated into key foreign languages and displayed in all of the residential units. (6.10)

Partially achieved. Not all wings displayed the rules and we saw little in languages other than English. Rules were set out in the prison compact, which was explained during induction but was available in English only (see recommendation 4.38).

We repeat the recommendation

Additional information

- 7.2 Free-flow movement and association time were well supervised on both sites, and staff interacted with prisoners. Closed-circuit television had been installed in the young adult site, where the wings were more open, promoting staff surveillance and supervision. In our survey, far fewer adult and young adult prisoners than in comparator prisons said that it was easy to get illegal drugs at the establishment (13% versus 32% and 11% versus 19%, respectively).
- 7.3 Other aspects of security were disproportionate and over-restrictive. Strip-searching was always undertaken on adults entering the segregation unit, whereas for young adults it was based on a risk assessment. Strip-searching was carried out on 20% of prisoners leaving domestic visits, which was disproportionate. A policy of banning young adult prisoners from attending religious services following their involvement in a non-related violent incident had been introduced shortly after the young adult site opened, when intelligence suggested that some prisoners were using attendance as a way of getting into a fight. However, intelligence no longer supported the need for such a restrictive policy. Most (53) of those banned over the previous year had been young adult Muslim prisoners, even though the violent incident had occurred outside of Friday prayers and the prisoner involved was still able to participate in all other aspects of the regime (see main recommendation HP66).
- 7.4 The monthly security meeting was well attended and supported by thorough intelligence reports. Objectives were clear and reflected current intelligence.
- 7.5 The size of the security team had been reduced and considerable cross-deployment of the senior security officers made it difficult to complete all the necessary work. As a result, the work tended to be reactive. Some important work was not being undertaken; for example, suspicion mandatory drug tests were rarely completed (see further recommendation 3.62). Of 24 security information reports (SIRs) we examined that required a suspicion test, only two had been completed. Not all searching was carried out as intended, including reception searching and the ad hoc searching of legal visitors.
- 7.6 The number of SIRS on both sites in the year to date had increased from the same period in the previous year, from 1,737 to 2,064 on the adult site and 2,141 to 2,578 on the young adult

site. The most common reasons for SIRs were bullying and threats, possession of mobile telephones and diverted medication. A log was maintained of SIRs involving violence and bullying, and this informed the work of the violence reduction team. The nature of the SIRs was monitored monthly but not aggregated year on year to identify trends.

- 7.7 The use of closed visits was kept to a minimum. There were no banned visitors at the time of the inspection and only three had been banned since April 2011.

Further recommendation

- 7.8 Basic security tasks such as drug testing and searching should be completed fully and on time.

Housekeeping point

- 7.9 Security information reports should be monitored year on year to identify trends and changes.

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.

Disciplinary procedures

- 7.10 A senior member of staff should carry out quality checks on completed adjudications. (6.22)

Not achieved. Although the quarterly adjudications standardisation meeting included discussions about the number and type of adjudications, individual records were not quality assured. Some of the records we reviewed were of an inadequate quality, lacking detail about the hearing and the processes followed. Wing reports were also of limited value in too many cases.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 7.11 There had been 182 adjudications on the adult site and 490 on the young adult site in the six months before the inspection. The number of adjudications on both sites had decreased slightly since the previous year.
- 7.12 There was an adjudication room in the care and separation unit (CSU) on both sites. Both were large enough and well equipped, providing adequate privacy and a non-threatening environment.
- 7.13 The adjudications we observed were well managed. Prisoners were referred to by their first name and were actively involved in the proceedings. However, wing progress reports arrived late, delaying hearings, and prisoners were not asked if they wanted to call any witnesses. The appeals process was not verbally explained at the end of the hearing but was provided in

writing. Punishments were appropriate and different local tariffs had been developed for the young adult site and the adult site, to reflect the differing needs of the two populations.

- 7.14 The adjudication standardisation meeting analysed trends in adjudications but no analysis was undertaken year on year, to identify longer-term issues and trends. The meeting was well attended and included a representative of the Independent Monitoring Board.

The use of force

- 7.15 **In completing use of force forms, the supervising officer and certifying officer should not be the same person. (6.26)**

Not achieved. In too many cases the use of force had been certified by the same officer who had supervised it, providing inadequate oversight.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 7.16 A coordinator was in post and a quarterly meeting was held to oversee the use of force across both sites. A report, analysing use of force events, was presented at the meeting, which was well attended. Between May and September 2011, there had been 26 planned and 105 spontaneous events. We were not assured that planned events were reviewed or quality assured, as we were not provided with any video recordings during the inspection. However, individual incidents were discussed at the monthly security meeting.
- 7.17 The use of force had been high following the opening of the young adult site but had reduced steadily over the previous year. Between May and October 2010 there had been a total of 224 reported uses of force across both sites, with 154 over the same period in 2011, representing a reduction of about a third. Most of the incidents had been on the young adult site. In our survey, fewer adult prisoners (3%) than at comparator prisons (5%) said that they had been restrained in the previous six months, which was lower than at the time of the previous inspection (9%). However, more young adults (20%) than at comparator prisons (16%) said that they had been restrained.
- 7.18 Ratchet handcuffs were always used to escort a prisoner to the CSU, even if he was fully compliant. The special cell on the adult site had not been used over the previous year and the one on the young adult site had been used 11 times, for relatively short periods and with appropriate authority.
- 7.19 Quality assurance of completed use of force paperwork by the coordinator had been limited. Further checks by a senior manager had been introduced recently. There were gaps in the records: in few cases was the health assessment form attached to the completed paperwork and it was not always fully signed by the relevant staff. Descriptions of the incident sometimes lacked detail and did not always justify the use of force. Incidents involving the use of batons were reviewed by a senior manager, and since June 2011 a written report had been produced as a result of the review. Over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners in use of force had been noted by the equality meeting but there had been no investigation, beyond the commissioning of an equality impact assessment (see also section on diversity).

Further recommendations

- 7.20 The use of force on the young adult site should be monitored and reduced further.
- 7.21 All planned uses of force should be video-recorded and reviewed by a manager, in order to identify lessons learnt and make any necessary changes.
- 7.22 A risk assessment should be undertaken before the use of ratchet handcuffs when escorting compliant prisoners to the care and separation unit.
- 7.23 Quality assurance of completed use of force paperwork should be undertaken and issues addressed.
- 7.24 The over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the use of force should be investigated and appropriate action taken to reduce it.

Segregation unit

- 7.25 **Targets in prisoners' reviews should be based on getting out of segregation and not limited solely to behaviour. (6.23)**

Not achieved. Meaningful, individualised targets were rarely set. When targets had been included, they tended to be basic, focusing on compliance with the regime, rather than on specific behavioural changes to promote reintegration. The reviews we observed did not include a focus on the setting of new objectives.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 7.26 **The pool of CSU selected staff should be increased to ensure that there is normally one on duty in the CSU at all times. (6.24)**

Achieved. There was always at least one member of the segregation staff on duty in each CSU.

- 7.27 **The adjudicators' meeting should include CSU staff. (6.25)**

Achieved. The adjudication liaison officers did not attend the adjudications standardisation meeting but the CSU manager attended, and fully briefed staff about issues arising.

Additional information

- 7.28 The unit on the young adult site contained 11 cells and one special cell. We were told that the cells were not sufficiently robust and six of them had been damaged in the previous 18 months. This unit contained some graffiti. The CSU on the adult site was older but relatively clean, with the exception of the toilets.
- 7.29 Both exercise yards were bare and that on the young adults site was very small. Young adult prisoners always exercised alone, without risk assessment to allow exercise with others where possible.

- 7.30 The regime was limited for those staying for more than a few weeks. There was no care planning for those staying for long periods, and at the time of the inspection one prisoner had been in the young adult CSU for over two months.
- 7.31 There were no photographs of the staff (other than the senior managers) and there was no statement of purpose displayed in either CSU. Prisoners in both units had daily access to showers and telephones. The provision of books in both CSUs was limited but prisoners could apply to the library for more. There was no in-cell work in either CSU but access to in-cell education was adequate.
- 7.32 Staff working on the CSUs had been appropriately selected and trained. However, only one member of staff in the young adult CSU and none in the adult CSU had been first-aid trained. Most staff were enthusiastic about their role and worked hard to ensure that individual prisoners were well looked after.
- 7.33 The use of the CSUs had declined slightly since the previous year, with very few there for their own protection. In our survey, fewer adult prisoners (5%) than at comparator prisons (10%) and than at the time of the previous inspection (17%) said that they had been in the CSU in the previous six months. The proportion of young adults who said that they had been in the CSU in the previous six months (17%) was in line with that in comparator establishments.
- 7.34 The average length of stay on the unit was relatively short and most prisoners returned to one of the main wings. The number being transferred to another establishment was relatively low, with a third of adult prisoners and a quarter of young adults being transferred out, but some stayed in CSU for too long before transfer. There was a policy for phased return to normal location but we did not see this being put into action with any of the prisoners currently located in the CSU.
- 7.35 Reviews were well managed. Case files contained limited daily entries and did not focus on the nature of the interaction with the prisoner or on any assessment of his well-being or motivation. The records did not reflect the large number of interactions between staff and prisoners on the units.

Further recommendations

- 7.36 Regime opportunities should be extended for those spending more than two weeks on the care and separation units (CSUs).
- 7.37 In-cell work should be available in the CSUs.
- 7.38 A risk assessment should be undertaken to determine if young adult prisoners on the CSU can exercise with others.

Housekeeping points

- 7.39 Daily records should evidence the full extent of interactions between CSU staff and prisoners, and their outcome.
- 7.40 Sufficient staff working in the CSUs should be first-aid trained to provide cover for all shifts.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- 7.41 The facilities list should be rewritten with representative prisoner involvement, and access to items acquired at other establishments should be authorised. (6.33)

Partially achieved. Items bought at other establishments were allowed in possession if they were on the facilities list. The list was reviewed regularly, in consultation with prisoners, but a new list had not been published since May 2011.

Additional information

- 7.42 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was displayed on the wings, and most prisoners in our groups said that they understood it. However, half of the 20 young adults and some of the adult prisoners we interviewed said that staff were inconsistent in the way they applied the IEP scheme, with some young adults feeling that measures were over-punitive and others saying that staff did not tell them when they recorded a written warning. While the number of adult prisoners on the enhanced level of the scheme was higher than at the time of the previous inspection, it was lower than at comparator prisons. In total, 41% of prisoners across the sites were on the enhanced level of the scheme, with only 2% on the basic level.
- 7.43 In our survey, fewer adult prisoners than at comparator prisons said that they had been treated fairly under the IEP scheme. Far fewer prisoners from a black and minority ethnic background than their white counterparts said that they had been treated fairly under the IEP scheme (both young adults and adults). This was also the case for Muslim prisoners, with 22% of young adult and 35% of adult Muslim prisoners against 51% of non-Muslims on each site saying that they had been treated fairly under the scheme.
- 7.44 Fewer young adults (41%) than at comparator establishments (55%) said that the scheme had helped them to change their behaviour. Young adults placed on the basic regime had to remain there for too long – the local policy stated a minimum of 14 days instead of the usual seven.
- 7.45 Of the 40 wing files we examined, most included comments about the IEP scheme, and most made reference to both negative and positive behaviour; 10 recorded negative behaviour only and seven noted positive behaviour only. One prisoner, who had been at the establishment for six months, had received six positive entries, no negative entries and had only recently been recommended for enhanced status. The personal officer hardly ever attended an IEP review. The case files on both sites showed an inconsistent quality of recording and few management checks.
- 7.46 Prisoners retained their enhanced status on arrival at the establishment. They could apply for enhanced status after four weeks at the establishment. Objectives in reviews were basic and not individualised to the prisoner; for young adults, objectives were simply a standard set of regime rules. There was an appeals process and prisoners could also use the complaints system but there was no central log of appeals and their outcome.

- 7.47 The differences between the standard and enhanced levels were limited. The main benefits included an increased visits allowance and more private cash. The use of the enhanced wings provided additional advantages but waiting lists to get onto these units denied some prisoners the benefit.

Further recommendations

- 7.48 The negative views of young adult, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners about the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be investigated and action taken to address issues.
- 7.49 Objectives in IEP reviews should be individualised and specific to the behavioural changes needed.

Housekeeping point

- 7.50 Entries on case records should be of a good quality, including evidence of both positive and negative behaviour.

Section 8: Services

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 8.1 Prisoners should not be required to wait more than 15 hours between meals, or should be provided with an additional snack. (7.9)

Partially achieved. There had been no changes in mealtimes, although prisoners were given an additional small portion of fruit, which some felt to be inadequate.

- 8.2 There should be increased consultation with prisoners to identify and seek to address areas of dissatisfaction with the food. (7.10)

Partially achieved. There was now regular structured consultation, although this was less frequent on the young adult site. Food comments books were available on the wings and the catering staff maintained regular contact through wing visits. However, there had been no regular formal surveys from which data could be aggregated or analysed for specific groups of prisoners (see also additional information).

- 8.3 Catering staff should receive specialist guidance and support from others within the prison to ensure that they are appropriately addressing the full range of diversity issues. (7.11)

Partially achieved. Although some advice had been sought from the faith leaders in the prison, some prisoners still had negative views about the lack of diversity in the food provided. However, there had been positive responses to catering for specific religious events – for example, Ramadan and the Jewish New Year – and we saw examples of feedback to the catering manager to praise the efforts that the team had made.

- 8.4 There should be a delay of no more than 45 minutes between the preparation and serving of meals, particularly in the case of hot food. (7.12)

Not achieved. Food was sometimes loaded onto the heated trolleys almost an hour before collection. By the time the food was served, it would have been on the trolley for over an hour. However, the food temperatures were checked prior to serving and the food we tasted was of a reasonable quality.

We repeat the recommendation.

- 8.5 Opportunities for prisoners to dine in association should be expanded and encouraged. (7.13)

Partially achieved. Each wing had some provision for dining out, although it remained limited to a few tables and chairs. We saw prisoners dining out and others we spoke to said that they preferred to eat in their cell.

8.6 Prisoners should have the opportunity to cater for themselves. (7.14)

Partially achieved. On some of the enhanced wings there was limited provision for prisoners to cater for themselves; on other wings there was no such provision.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 8.7** More adult prisoners, and even more young adults, than at comparator establishments said that the food was good or very good (43% versus 29% and 49% versus 24%, respectively). While young adults across all strands of diversity were positive about the food, fewer adult black and minority ethnic and foreign national, and far fewer Muslim, prisoners than their white, British national and non-Muslim counterparts said that the food was good or very good.
- 8.8** The catering manager had consulted other young offender institutions to develop the menus on the young adult site with a focus on a more healthy diet. Salads and other healthy foods were provided as one of the daily options and this provision had recently increased in response to prisoners' comments.
- 8.9** Food was stored appropriately and equipment used in the kitchens was marked clearly and stored securely. However, we found some food left in the trolley overnight and some of the trolleys were dirty when returned to the kitchen.
- 8.10** On some wings, we observed the evening meal being served earlier than advertised. Lunch was served at 11.45am during the week and one hour earlier at the weekend, which was too early. Breakfast packs were issued at lunchtime on the day before consumption.

Further recommendation

- 8.11** The negative views of black and minority ethnic, foreign national and Muslim prisoners about the quality of the food should be addressed.

Housekeeping points

- 8.12** All food should be removed from the trolley after the meal has been served and the trolleys should be thoroughly cleaned before returning them to the kitchen.
- 8.13** The breakfast pack should be issued on the morning it is to be eaten.

Prison shop

Expected outcomes:

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

8.14 Prices in the prison shop should be comparable with those in local supermarkets (7.20)

Achieved. Selling prices were set quarterly under the national contract and were generally in line with the manufacturers' recommended retail prices. The 24 popular items listed in the

NOMS survey for October 2011 showed that the prices charged in prison shops were comparable with those of four well-known supermarkets.

8.15 Fresh fruit should be available on the canteen list (7.21)

Achieved. The product list showed five fresh fruit choices. Fresh fruit was delivered to the prison each Thursday, in time for distribution the following day.

Additional information

8.16 A wide range of products was available, and in our survey more prisoners, both adult and young adult, reported favourably about the range of goods available than at comparator prisons. Quarterly meetings were held, at which adult prisoners were able to discuss changes to the local product list, but these were not minuted and there was no forum for young adults. We received a number of complaints from prisoners about the price of some of the items for minority groups on the list, including Muslim gowns. There were no other sources for buying religious items. The quarterly survey of comparisons with well-known supermarkets was not published to prisoners. The prison shop list was not widely publicised and was out of date on some wings.

8.17 Adult prisoners could order hobby items and all prisoners could order goods from a wide range of catalogues. However, the prison had recently introduced a 50 pence handling fee for catalogue orders following a Prison Service Instruction.

Further recommendations

8.18 The number of sources from which faith items can be bought should be increased.

8.19 Prisoners should not have to pay a handling fee for catalogue items.

Housekeeping point

8.20 The updated prison shop list and quarterly survey results of supermarket comparisons should be displayed in all accommodation areas.

Section 9: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 9.1 All prisoners with current or historical sexual offending should have a SARN assessment to ascertain levels of risk and need. The results of these assessments should routinely be collated to inform the development of services and the establishment's strategic approach to resettlement. (8.9)

Partially achieved. All prisoners with a history of sexual offending were assessed using the RM2000 criteria. Prisoners who were assessed as medium or high risk of reoffending were prioritised for sex offender treatment programmes, and on completion of these were further assessed using the structured assessment of risk and need (SARN) assessment to identify future training/treatment requirements and re-assess levels of risk.

- 9.2 A pre-release information package should be available to prisoners nearing the end of their sentence to help them to address practical issues such as licence conditions, arrangements for the day of discharge and any outstanding area of concern to the prisoner. (8.10)

Not achieved. No pre-release information package was provided to prisoners before release. A new pre-release course had begun during the inspection for adult and young adult prisoners alike.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 9.3 There was a strong framework to identify the resettlement needs of prisoners. The strategy document clearly identified how the resettlement needs of prisoners would be addressed and included a realistic action plan. The strategic meeting was well structured and included regular attendance from an appropriate range of staff, although residential staff, including managers, were regularly absent. The meetings were held quarterly, which was too infrequent to maintain a prison-wide focus on emerging issues and activities, although the minutes we saw demonstrated progress on issues raised at previous meetings.
- 9.4 Comprehensive initial screening of need took place during induction, and a wide range of referrals was made to ensure that new arrivals' concerns were addressed. This was followed up by initial meetings with offender supervisors (see section on offender management and planning). Relevant information was available to prisoners during their early days at the establishment. However, in our survey young adults responded more negatively than comparable populations over almost all issues relating to where to go for resettlement support, and adults responded much more negatively on these issues than at the time of the previous inspection.
- 9.5 At the time of the previous inspection, regular pre-release resettlement boards had been held to identify support requirements and evaluate the provision of services during custody. These

had been replaced by a paper-based questionnaire which prisoners were given around eight weeks before discharge. The quality and quantity of responses were varied and relied on prisoners having reasonable literacy skills, and also on their motivation to engage with and return the survey, making it more possible for key information to be missed from some of the neediest prisoners.

- 9.6 An appropriate range of programmes and other interventions for the population of both sites was delivered and adequately resourced, in line with the regional interventions policy (see section on resettlement pathways).
- 9.7 One of the residential managers was identified to lead on veterans in custody; he worked with four prisoner representatives in supporting prisoners identified as having a forces background. A meeting was held each month to collate information, and referrals were made to a wide range of service-based charities. The Royal British Legion (coordinated by the Nacro workers) regularly provided a representative to meet prisoners, to assist with housing issues, rental payments, clothing grants and business loans.

Further recommendations

- 9.8 Resettlement meetings should be held at a frequency that maintains the impetus and focus of the strategy.
- 9.9 The prison should explore the poor perception of access to resettlement services by young adults and review the mode of service delivery.
- 9.10 The pre-release screening and support procedures should be reviewed to ensure maximum coverage of individual need.

Housekeeping point

- 9.11 The residential function should be represented at resettlement meetings.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

Sentence planning and offender management

- 9.12 Suitable accommodation should be provided for the OMU to support joint working between relevant departments. (8.21)

Achieved. The offender management unit (OMU) was located in a large open-plan office in a new building. There was ample space to enable the co-located offender management teams to work in close proximity. All relevant hard-copy documentation was securely held in the unit, giving offender supervisors and case administrators easy access to key information.

9.13 Adequate resources should be made available to the OMU. (8.22)

Not achieved. The offender supervisors' caseloads were excessive, each managing over 100 prisoners, making regular contact almost impossible. This was exacerbated by the regular redeployment of the officer grade offender supervisors to other discipline tasks; in the six weeks before the inspection, over 32% of available officer offender supervisor hours were thus lost. It was almost impossible to arrange sentence planning boards with any certainty of the offender supervisors being able to attend, so the prison had identified a senior officer to act on behalf of offender supervisors. The senior officer could only act as a facilitator, having had no meaningful or regular contact with the prisoner before the review (see main recommendation HP67).

9.14 Guidance should be sought from the National Offender Management Service on appropriate contact levels between offender supervisors and prisoners. (8.23)

Achieved. NOMS guidance was available; this identified levels of contact based on prioritising prisoners according to their risk of harm to others, with highest risk of harm prisoners to be seen monthly. However, this was seldom applied or achieved, owing to the very high caseloads of offender supervisors (see main recommendation HP67).

Additional information

9.15 At the time of the inspection, approximately half of all the prisoners were within scope of the offender management model, although under the 'layered' approach all prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor, who met the prisoner within his first seven days at the establishment.

9.16 Offender supervisors worked in one of three 'pods' supported by case administrators. For many prisoners (especially those out of scope), the only meaningful contact with offender supervisors was at the reception stage (see recommendation 9.13) or following a written request from the prisoner. We were told that the initial interview was structured around a locally produced 'custody support document', which focused on resettlement needs and included a section on sentence planning reviews. In the 20 offender management files we looked at, we found only three of these documents. Two of these showed that the sentence plans had been reviewed at this early stage, to ensure that they were appropriate, but one had not been reviewed because the sentence plan had been drawn up by the community-based offender manager. In an attempt to increase access to offender supervisors, the prison had introduced weekly surgeries, which were held on two of the eight adult wings on a rolling basis. However, they were held only if resources were available and were sometimes cancelled at short notice. They were not held on the young adult site, where the prisoners had to rely on making applications to see their offender supervisor.

9.17 Offender management processes were accurately monitored but almost 300 offender assessment system (OASys) reviews were late. Approximately half of these were the responsibility of the prison and it was difficult to see how this would be rectified, given the staffing pressures. An additional burden was the arrival of around 20 prisoners each month from other prisons without an OASys assessment.

9.18 Caseloads were distributed evenly across offender supervisors and all had similar numbers of high-risk and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs). Risk of serious harm training had not been delivered to all offender supervisors, although this was mitigated in part by the support of trained probation officers in each of the three pods. We reviewed six completed OASys documents and found them to vary in quality. Sentence plan targets were mostly appropriate

and levels of risk were appropriately defined. However, there were concerns about the quality of some of the risk management plans, which failed to demonstrate how risk would be managed effectively; for example, one file showed that a prisoner had been convicted of a sexual assault linked to alcohol and substance use, with grooming identified as another key factor. However, there was no mention of these issues in the risk management plan and there were no links to the security department to establish warning systems in case he became involved in substance abuse and to warn female staff of the dangers surrounding potential conditioning.

- 9.19 Quality assurance was carried out on 10% of OASys documentation and we saw good examples of remedial action being taken to improve the quality.
- 9.20 A small number of prisoners were eligible for home detention curfew on the adult site, with more on the young adult site. The process was efficient and prisoners attended boards to make a personal contribution. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was granted to a few prisoners on the adult site, mostly for outside working parties in the external grounds and the staff mess (see also section on resettlement pathways). No ROTL was granted on the young adult site.

Further recommendations

- 9.21 The validity and appropriateness of all sentence plans should be reviewed during the initial offender supervisor interview and outcomes recorded.
- 9.22 Risk management plans should be regularly reviewed and updated as necessary, regardless of author.
- 9.23 Release on temporary licence for resettlement purposes should be expanded across the prison.

Categorisation

- 9.24 **The re-categorisation system should be streamlined in order to screen out high-risk prisoners and those with outstanding sentence planning targets at an early stage of the process. (6.11)**

Achieved. A calendar-based system indicated approaching eligibility dates for recategorisation. The criteria for applying for category D status were publicised across the prison and identified who could apply and who was automatically excluded. The screening process ensured that ineligible prisoners were sifted out before the formal board process.

- 9.25 **The responsibility for carrying out re-categorisation reviews should be firmly placed within the offender management unit, and resources reallocated to ensure that the unit has sufficient time to carry out this task. (6.12)**

Achieved. The administration and management of the recategorisation process was included within the role of the OMU.

Additional information

- 9.26 Across both sites, most prisoners were serving sentences of over one year and, where categorised (adult prisoners), were mainly category C prisoners, with only 12 category D prisoners; for the category D prisoners, the longest wait for transfer had been four months. Staff worked hard to facilitate early transfers for young adults and determinate-sentenced prisoners to open conditions. The categorisation of young adults was completed in good time as they approached the age of 21 and most were transferred to the adult side of the prison.

Public protection

- 9.27 **Residential staff should attend the monthly public protection meetings. (8.24)**

Not achieved. Our observations of minutes from the inter-departmental risk management team (IDRMT) and of multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) meetings showed only one attendance by any of the residential staff during 2011.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 9.28 Screening processes were efficient. When new restrictions were imposed, an offender supervisor met the prisoner to explain why this was the case and how they would be managed. If prisoners disagreed with sanctions, they could make a written appeal to the head of the OMU. The IDRMT met monthly to review ongoing restrictions and consider newly arrived prisoners who had been referred following the initial screening process.
- 9.29 Monitoring arrangements were proportionate and satisfactory in principle, but were not carried out consistently in relation to telephone monitoring (see section on accommodation and facilities, paragraph 2.5).
- 9.30 Use of the Violent and Sex Offender Register (ViSOR) was limited but the prison had recently trained some more staff, who were due to become operational in the near future, to ensure that security and offender management information would be linked into the system.
- 9.31 Offender supervisors contributed regularly to MAPPAs meetings for both level 2 and 3 prisoners. There had been some attendance at MAPPAs 3 boards in the community but this had been at offender supervisor level and not by a manager with the authority to commit resources to the arrangements needed. We observed some good work to ensure that the arrangements for prisoners managed under MAPPAs who were due for discharge were thorough and, as far as possible, in place before release.

Further recommendation

- 9.32 Telephone monitoring should be undertaken as required.

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

- 9.33 Adequate numbers of staff should be trained in 'life in the 21st century'. These staff should be allocated to all residential wings to ensure that life-sentenced prisoners have

appropriately trained staff in place to deal with their queries. (8.25)

No longer relevant. 'Life in the 21st century' training was no longer available and had not been delivered to residential staff. A small number of OMU staff had done the managing indeterminate sentences and risk (MISaR) training.

- 9.34 **The lifer management team should be trained as a matter of urgency, and the lifer manager should be given adequate facility time to undertake this role. (8.26)**

No longer relevant. There was no longer a post of lifer manager or a lifer management team. One of the wing governor grades had overall responsibility for the management of ISPs.

- 9.35 **Complete confidential summary dossiers should be in place for all life-sentenced prisoners. (8.27)**

No longer relevant. There was no longer a requirement to maintain confidential summary dossiers.

Additional information

- 9.36 At the time of the inspection, there were 140 ISPs. They were appropriately prioritised for interventions but, beyond the three ISP family visits a year, the only provision for this group was a poorly attended prisoner representatives meeting. Training for staff in dealing with ISPs was limited, with only three of the offender supervisors having undergone MiSAR training.

Further recommendation

- 9.37 More staff should be trained in managing indeterminate sentences and risk.

Resettlement pathways

Expected outcomes:

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

Reintegration planning

Accommodation

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 9.38 On average, 40 prisoners were released each month, with all but one going out to secure accommodation. All prisoners were seen soon after arrival by a number of agencies, including Tribal (the careers information and advice service (CIAS) provider) and Nacro. Tribal staff conducted screening as part of the education induction process and made referrals as

necessary in relation to each of the resettlement pathways. The two Nacro workers ensured that all prisoners were seen, assisted in the closure of tenancy agreements and provided support in managing accommodation-related debt.

- 9.39 There was a drop-in facility on the adult site and three trained prisoner orderlies worked with Nacro to make referrals and to offer advice. This was not duplicated on the young adult site, although the Nacro worker with responsibility for that site visited each wing daily to respond to applications. She also maintained a caseload of around 60 young adults within four months of release, to ensure that they would return to approved accommodation.
- 9.40 All prisoners were invited to attend a housing interview three months before release, where accommodation issues were identified and referrals made to agencies nationwide. Nacro staff worked hard to engage with reluctant local councils to facilitate the resettlement of sex offenders.

Education, training and employment

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

No recommendations were made under this heading at the previous inspection.

Additional information

- 9.41 The prison had a positive approach to the education, training and employment pathway and had developed a good vocational training programme. In addition, Milton Keynes College provided self-employment programmes for adults and young adults. CIAS provision was good, identifying prisoners during their sentence and at exit interviews for support and access to the pre-release course (see also recommendation 9.2). Links between the prison, Tribal and Nacro were good.
- 9.42 The prison had formed links with external agencies such as Switchback and had made contact with several employers and the Probation Service in a bid to provide placements and employment opportunities for prisoners on ROTL and on release. The virtual campus worked well for young adults, providing them with employment resources and opportunities to search for jobs on line.

Mental and physical health

- 9.43 Prisoners who are not registered with a GP prior to coming to prison should be given assistance to register with one before their release. (8.39)

Partially achieved. There was an expectation that prisoners were given assistance to register with a GP before their release. However, this did not occur consistently among the health services team.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

- 9.44 The care plan approach was used for all appropriate prisoners with mental health needs. Mental health discharge planning was effective and there were good links with community mental health services. Where necessary, mental health services maintained contact with

prisoners after release. The standard of palliative care was improving and links had been established with local services.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 9.45 **All prisoners should be encouraged and provided with assistance to open a bank account before their release. (8.58)**

Achieved. All prisoners were given the opportunity to open bank accounts through the 'Unlock' scheme. Over 30 such accounts had been opened in the year to date. Prisoners were contacted three months before release to see if they required an account, and accounts were opened four to six weeks before discharge. Prisoners opening bank accounts were also offered the opportunity to attend a half-day account management course run by Nacro.

Additional information

- 9.46 Nacro staff and prisoner orderlies assisted prisoners in applying for community care grants and in managing debt issues. There was a contract with Jobcentre Plus to provide benefits advice but at the time of the inspection no one from this agency had attended the prison for over six weeks and there were a large number of unanswered applications. Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs staff attended occasionally and ran tax awareness courses to supplement the business studies course run by the education provider. Other finance-related courses provided included a budgeting and money management course and a book-keeping and accounting course. On the young adult site, a basic-level finance awareness and a business management course were run but were available only to prisoners with over 12 months to serve.

Further recommendation

- 9.47 Benefits advice services should be resumed in line with the contract.

Drugs and alcohol

- 9.48 **The new drug strategy should contain detailed action plans and performance measures, and up-to-date joint working protocols. (8.52)**

Achieved. The drugs and alcohol strategy was up to date and contained a comprehensive action plan and all expected protocols.

- 9.49 **The security department should be represented at drug strategy meetings to ensure that supply and demand reduction measures are well integrated. (8.53)**

Partially achieved. Drug strategy meeting minutes for the six months from April to October 2011 showed that the security department had been represented at only two of the monthly meetings, although they had provided reports for all six meetings.

- 9.50 **The CARAT service should run an alcohol awareness module. (8.54)**

Achieved. The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team delivered the alcohol module of the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) psychosocial programme as needed.

- 9.51 The CARAT service's group room should be refurbished and undergo regular cleaning. (8.55)

Achieved. The CARAT service's group room was clean, tidy and adequate for purpose.

- 9.52 A separate compliance compact should be developed for enhanced prisoners on F and G wings. (8.56)

Achieved. There was a universal compact document describing three options for a prisoner's compact-based drug testing (CBDT). These were voluntary, compliance based and incentive based, with clear distinctions between the options. Prisoners we spoke to about their compacts were fully aware of the type of compact with which they had agreed to engage.

Additional information

- 9.53 There was a robust drug strategy. Although the drug strategy meeting was well attended, minutes showed that a number of action points had been carried over for many months.
- 9.54 As well as the alcohol module run by the CARAT service, other alcohol programmes available included an alcohol course run by Addaction on the adult site and an offending behaviour programme for young adults addressing alcohol-related violence (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).
- 9.55 As with mandatory drug testing, the redeployment of CBDT officers to other duties was causing problems for the delivery of regular tests. A further problem for the CBDT programme on H wing (the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) wing on the adult site) was the testing suite. The room comprised a normal-sized toilet, with no other modifications, and therefore could only operate with the door open. With prisoners and male and female staff passing by regularly, the arrangement provided no privacy for prisoners undergoing tests and was difficult for the testing officer to manage. Overall, the suite did not provide a suitably forensic environment. Given the uncertainty of regular testing (see also recommendation 3.61) and the inadequate testing facilities, the integrity of the abstinence-based RAPt programme was at risk.
- 9.56 The RAPt course achieved a high standard of delivery. Prisoners told us that the programme had helped them to face up to the realities of their addictions and offending, and that it had given them a strong framework on which to build their recovery. The programme employed several course graduates as peer supporters.
- 9.57 Since the opening of the young adult site, the CARAT team had successfully adapted to the different needs of the younger population. Young adult CARAT clients we spoke to said that the CARAT team was helpful and gave them good advice and information.
- 9.58 There were good levels of integration between the CARAT and health services teams on the young adult site and also on the adult site, where there was also close working between the IDTS and CARAT teams.
- 9.59 The CARAT workers had experienced difficulty in building relationships with drug intervention programmes (DIPs) in nearby communities, as many prisoners were not from the local area. However, this was improving with the use of video-conferencing with some of the London DIPs.

Further recommendations

- 9.60 Compact-based drug testing (CBDT) should be adequately staffed, to ensure that all testing is carried out appropriately, within identified timescales and without gaps in provision.
- 9.61 The CBDT suite on H wing should be relocated to a suitable area, to ensure a safe, respectful and forensic testing environment.

Children and families of offenders

- 9.62 **The opportunity to book the next visit while at the visitors centre should be widely publicised to staff and visitors. (3.72)**

Achieved. Opportunities for booking visits to the establishment were good. The visitors centre was managed and run by the Ormiston Trust, which staffed the visits booking line six days a week from 9am until 5pm. Visits could also be booked at the visitors centre and via email. The facilities to book visits were well publicised, both in the prison and in the visitors centre.

- 9.63 **The visitors centre should be expanded to offer additional space and quiet rooms for families or meetings. (3.73)**

Achieved. An excellent new visitors centre had been built. It was spacious, well equipped and welcoming, with a facility to purchase refreshments and a comfortable area for meetings with families. A full-time family liaison worker was employed by the Ormiston Trust and spent time with visitors to explain the provision available.

- 9.64 **Visitors should be searched in private and out of sight of other visitors. (3.74)**

Not achieved. We observed visitors being searched in the sight of other visitors. **We repeat the recommendation.**

- 9.65 **The noise levels in the visits hall should be reduced. (3.75)**

Partially achieved. As part of a refurbishment, the visits hall had been carpeted. Although this had helped to reduce noise levels, the acoustics in the room remained poor and staff and prisoners still spoke of a noisy experience when the visits hall was busy.

- 9.66 **Names of prisoners subject to closed conditions, and the names of banned visitors should be regularly updated to ensure that visits staff are full aware of all security concerns (3.76)**

Partially achieved. Banned visitors and prisoners subject to closed visits were discussed at the monthly security meetings and information passed to visits staff. Staff we spoke to were aware of individuals under restrictions. However, the central log of banned visitors and closed visits that we were provided with had not been fully maintained, with gaps in the information recorded – for example, the date on which the restriction had been removed.

Housekeeping point

9.67 The central log of closed visits and banned visitors held by the security department should be kept up to date.

9.68 A review should be conducted of the number of available visit opportunities and the take-up rate, to ensure that prisoners wishing to take their entitlement of visits are able to do so. The IEP policy should be reviewed, so that prisoners who do not receive visits are offered different incentives. (3.77)

Not achieved. No one we spoke to was aware of any review of the availability or take-up of opportunities for visits. There was only one visits hall, which served both the adult and young adult sites, and consequently each site could accommodate only six visit sessions per week across a range of morning and afternoons, and visits did not run on Mondays. During the inspection, the visits hall was not full but we were told that weekend sessions were generally better attended. There were no different incentives for prisoners who did not receive visits.
We repeat the recommendation.

9.69 Funding should be sought to develop and expand relationship counselling, involving prisoners' partners. (8.65)

Not achieved. Relationship counselling, and particularly that involving prisoners' partners, was still identified as a gap in provision. However, Relate attended each site once a week to deliver generic relationship counselling and at the time of the inspection was working with five prisoners on relationship issues.

We repeat the recommendation.

9.70 ROTL should be used to assist prisoners in preparing for a structured and safe release. (8.66)

Partially achieved. There was minimal use of ROTL for pre-release resettlement purposes, with, on average, fewer than three such releases each month over the six months before the inspection.

We repeat the recommendation.

Additional information

9.71 In our survey, 65% of adult prisoners said that their visitors were treated well by staff, which was better than the 54% comparator. Visitors we spoke to were positive about their treatment by staff.

9.72 We were told that there were often delays to the start of visits, particularly if residential staff were required to unlock on the wings before starting their duties on visits, and we saw an afternoon session starting 15 minutes late.

9.73 The visits hall was bright and clean and visits sessions we observed were relaxed. The children's play area was reasonably well equipped but was not always supervised. A range of refreshments was available in the visits hall but young adults and their visitors were not able to purchase hot drinks as a result of an incident that had taken place about 12 months before the inspection. Prisoners had to wear a prison uniform of a shirt and jeans.

- 9.74 Some security measures in the visits hall appeared disproportionate (see also section on security). Closed visits were imposed following a single drug dog indication and in the absence of other intelligence.
- 9.75 The family liaison worker had run two parenting courses for young adults since April 2011, which had involved 12 prisoners. The Mothers Union ran a further course involving eight young adults. Parenting courses for adults were also run by the Mothers Union and had engaged 24 prisoners in the 12 months before the inspection.
- 9.76 There were 12 family days a year, made up of days specifically for life-sentenced prisoners and ISPs, young adults and adults, both with and without children. These days were accessible only to prisoners on the enhanced privilege level. We were told that, even when prisoners met the criteria, security staff often removed up to 50% of prisoners from the list, sometimes owing to intelligence unconnected to visits. An evening family visit had been facilitated as a reward for prisoners who had offered their services as Listeners. Storybook Dads was well used with adult prisoners but less so with the young adults.

Further recommendations

- 9.77 Visits sessions should start on time.
- 9.78 Young adults and their visitors should be able to purchase hot drinks.
- 9.79 Prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes on visits.
- 9.80 A single indication by the drug dog should only result in a closed visit when there is additional intelligence to support this.
- 9.81 Family days should be accessible to prisoners on all privilege levels, and individuals should only be barred on the basis of directly relevant intelligence.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 9.82 **Training in working with prisoners in denial and motivational interview training should be rolled out to all residential staff to make certain that all staff are focused upon ensuring that, wherever appropriate, prisoners address their offending behaviour. (8.73)**

Partially achieved. The training had not been delivered to residential staff. There were regular meetings to identify such prisoners, and individual strategies to ensure that attempts to motivate them were maintained. Practical measures included information booklets for visitors, use of the incentives and earned privileges scheme, and the collation and display of an 'interventions library' for each wing. Information on the strategy was included in the programme awareness package that was delivered to staff.

- 9.83 **The system of prioritisation for ETS places should be reviewed by the Offending Behaviour Programmes Unit and potentially rolled out throughout the Prison Service estate. (8.74)**

Achieved. The prioritisation system was still used for the thinking skills programme (TSP), which had replaced the enhanced thinking skills (ETS) programme. The system had been shared with the wider Prison Service and had received recognition at the Butler Trust awards.

Additional information

- 9.84 Programme provision across the prison was adequately resourced and met the needs of most of the population; when needs were not met, prisoners were transferred to other prisons to complete courses. Provision included both core and rolling sex offender treatment programmes for the adult site and TSP, which was delivered on both sites. A course to address alcohol-related violence was delivered on both sites, having recently been expanded into the adult site.
- 9.85 An effective mentoring scheme for young adults was provided via the Trailblazers charity, which paired prisoners with volunteer mentors before discharge, who then supported them in the community. This was available only to prisoners with six months left to serve, which potentially excluded some of the neediest prisoners.

Housekeeping point

- 9.86 The scope of contact for the Trailblazers project should be reviewed, to consider prisoners with less than six months to serve in custody.

Section 10: Summary of 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

-
- 10.1 Managers should review association times for young adult prisoners, to allow at least an hour each day for all prisoners. (HP64)
 - 10.2 The prison should increase the number of purposeful activity places in order to reduce to a minimum the number locked in their cells during the working day. (HP65)
 - 10.3 Young adults should be subjected to restrictive security measures such as strip-searching and banning from attendance at religious worship only on the basis of current individual risk assessment. (HP66)
 - 10.4 All prisoners should have regular face-to-face contact with a member of the offender management team, leading to practical resettlement support and timely review of OASys assessments where applicable. (HP67)

Recommendations

To NOMS

-
- 10.5 Prisoner escorts should be provided with the support and equipment to enable them to deliver prisoners efficiently and safely. (1.6)
 - 10.6 Prisons should provide all relevant information with transferred prisoners. (1.7)
 - 10.7 Cells designed for one prisoner should not be used for two. (2.1)
 - 10.8 The range of drugs covered by MDT should be widened to include the most commonly diverted medications, including tramadol and gabapentin. (3.70)
 - 10.9 Time out of cell should be accurately recorded. (6.2)
 - 10.10 Prisoners should not have to pay a handling fee for catalogue items. (8.19)

Recommendation

To UKBA

-
- 10.11 The UK Border Agency should ensure that decisions to deport and maintain detention after sentence expiry are made and communicated to prisoners well before the end of sentence. (4.43)

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 10.12 Reception should stay open during the lunchtime period so that prisoners arriving during this time can be admitted without delay. (1.1)

First days in custody: first night

- 10.13 Prisoners should be offered a shower on their first night, regardless of what day and time they arrive at the establishment. (1.13)
- 10.14 A first night officer should be available on a Wednesday (or any day when prisoners have arrived and the first night wing is shut down early), so that newly arrived prisoners can be appropriately supported. (1.14)

First days in custody: induction

- 10.15 Induction assessment interviews should be conducted in private. (1.23)

Residential units: accommodation and facilities

- 10.16 Prisoners' outgoing mail should be posted within 24 hours (48 when received on a Saturday). (2.4)
- 10.17 The telephone calls of prisoners who have been identified as high priority for public protection should be monitored regularly. (2.5)
- 10.18 An alternative venue should be found for H wing meetings, to allow prisoners to maximise their association times and use the room provided. (2.12)
- 10.19 Prisoners' incoming mail should be delivered to them, and outgoing mail posted out, within 24 hours. (2.13)
- 10.20 There should be at least one telephone per 20 prisoners on the adult wings. (2.14)

Residential units: clothing and possessions

- 10.21 The range of items of personal clothing and bedding, including duvets and covers, allowed in-possession should be increased. (2.15)
- 10.22 Laundry facilities should be available on all adult wings. (2.17)
- 10.23 Quality control measures in the young adult clothing exchange store should be improved, to sift out unacceptable clothing and bedding items. (2.19)

Residential units: hygiene

- 10.24 Recesses, bathrooms and shower rooms in the adult accommodation should be refurbished. (2.23)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 10.25 In all correspondence to or about prisoners, and also over the tannoy, prisoners should be addressed as 'Mr...' or by their preferred name. (2.24)

Personal officers

- 10.26 Managers should ensure that personal officers make regular, informative entries in case records. (2.30)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 10.27 Violence reduction management information should be broken down by ethnic origin. The information should be presented in a format that enables monthly analysis of trends to be easily identified and monitored. (3.2)
- 10.28 Violence reduction management information should be published prominently to staff and prisoners, along with any action taken to address problem areas. (3.3)
- 10.29 All staff in direct prisoner contact roles should undertake anti-bullying refresher training. (3.4)
- 10.30 The violence reduction process should be reviewed and each step implemented as described in the strategy. (3.16)

Self-harm and suicide

- 10.31 The deputy safer custody coordinator should be given sufficient time to carry out her duties. (3.19)
- 10.32 All staff in prisoner contact roles should be ACCT trained, and a programme of refresher training instigated. (3.21)
- 10.33 A dedicated Listener suite should be available on the adult side of the prison. (3.31)
- 10.34 Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) supervision should be improved by ensuring a consistency of care manager, increased interaction with prisoners and wider representation of departments at reviews. (3.32)

Applications and complaints

- 10.35 Replies to complaints should not be delayed unnecessarily due to staff absences. (3.35)
- 10.36 Complaints should be collected from the wings by the complaints clerk, to ensure confidentiality. (3.37)
- 10.37 Complaint forms should be freely available on all wings. (3.43)

Legal rights

- 10.38 A legal services officer with adequate facility time should be appointed. (3.44)

Faith and religious activity

- 10.39 Prisoners should be banned from attendance at corporate worship services, and particularly Muslim prayers, only when there is relevant and sufficient evidence in the individual case. (3.57)
- 10.40 Levels of staff supervision at Muslim prayers should be reviewed, to ensure proportionality. (3.58)
- 10.41 The provision of faith and religious activities should be developed for young adult prisoners. (3.59)

Substance use: drug testing

- 10.42 Mandatory drug testing (MDT) should be appropriately staffed, to ensure that all testing and record-keeping duties are carried out appropriately, within identified timescales and without gaps in provision. (3.62)
- 10.43 The MDT suite on the adult side of the prison should be refurbished, and both suites should be kept clean and tidy. (3.64)
- 10.44 A discipline officer should always be made available as a matter of priority to supervise the administration of opiate substitution medication and the general health care medication rounds, to minimise the risk of medication diversion. (3.69)
- 10.45 The prison should work closely with the GP providers to ensure a consistent approach to the delivery of the strategy on misuse of medication. (3.71)

Diversity

- 10.46 There should be an overarching strategy, based on an assessment of local need, which covers all strands of diversity. (4.2)
- 10.47 Equality staff should be given sufficient time to undertake their roles effectively. (4.12)
- 10.48 The equality management team meeting should cover all aspects of diversity and should manage the strategic development of provision across all strands. (4.13)
- 10.49 All main areas of the prison should be consistently represented at the equality meeting, and all prisoner representatives should be able to attend each meeting. (4.14)
- 10.50 There should be regular support groups/forums for all prisoners from a minority group. (4.15)
- 10.51 Equality impact assessments should be completed as soon as possible. (4.16)

- 10.52 Investigations resulting from discrimination incident report forms should be thorough and timely, and there should be consequences when discrimination is proved and support for victims of discrimination. (4.17)

Diversity: race equality

- 10.53 Concerns highlighted by ethnic monitoring data should be explored and addressed promptly. (4.22)
- 10.54 Contact with external organisations such as the local race equality council should be vigorously pursued and they should be invited to attend monthly management meetings. (4.24)
- 10.55 A sample of RIRFs should be quality checked by an appropriate external body. Any findings should be reported to the REAT. (4.25)
- 10.56 There should be formal interventions to challenge prisoners who engage in racist behaviour. (4.29)

Diversity: foreign nationals

- 10.57 A foreign national policy should be drawn up in consultation with foreign national prisoners and based on local needs. (MR3)
- 10.58 The needs of all foreign national prisoners should be formally assessed and recorded. (4.36)
- 10.59 Information for foreign nationals about PIN telephone credit, legal advice and translation services should be displayed in a range of languages on notice boards in residential areas. (4.37)
- 10.60 Foreign national prisoners should be provided with information about immigration status and procedures in different languages. (4.38)
- 10.61 Prisoners should have regular access to independent immigration advice. (4.44)

Diversity: disability and older prisoners

- 10.62 Older prisoners and/or those with disabilities should have a multidisciplinary care plan, where appropriate. (4.50)

Diversity: gender and sexual orientation

- 10.63 Support services for young adult prisoners who are gay/bisexual should be improved. (4.55)
- 10.64 Positive support should be given to transgender prisoners. (4.56)

Health services: general

- 10.65 Clinical and administrative areas on both sites should be cleaned every day, and clinical areas on the adult site should be deep-cleaned. (5.3)

Health services: primary care

- 10.66 Barrier protection should be freely available to prisoners. (5.8)
- 10.67 Action should be taken to reduce the waiting time for access to the optometrist. (5.9)
- 10.68 The Primary Care Trust should review arrangements for medical cover, to ensure consistent provision. (5.13)
- 10.69 There should be robust monitoring arrangements for all appointments and action should be taken to reduce all waiting lists for primary care services. (5.14)

Health services: pharmacy

- 10.70 A review of the times when medications are given should be completed to ensure that patients on a 'see to take' basis receive their medication at an appropriate time. (5.16)
- 10.71 Monthly in-possession medication should be administered as a preferred option, once prisoners have been appropriately risk assessed. (5.17)
- 10.72 Patient group directives should be introduced to enable the supply of more potent medications by the pharmacist and/or nurses to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (5.18)
- 10.73 A step-wise approach to pain management should be introduced, with appropriate allowance made for the prison environment. (5.19)
- 10.74 There should be access to a pharmacist, to provide counselling sessions, pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication review. The role of the pharmacy technician should be reviewed; and appropriate professional support introduced. (5.24)
- 10.75 All medicines procedures and policies should be formally reviewed and adopted via the medicines and therapeutics committee. All staff should read, sign and implement the agreed adopted procedures. (5.25)
- 10.76 The special sick policy should be reviewed, to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied; only medicines in that policy should be supplied as special sick. (5.26)
- 10.77 A prescribing formulary should be agreed by the medicines and therapeutics committee, and implemented. (5.27)
- 10.78 The system for patients requesting repeat medicines should be reviewed and prisoners should receive them in a timely manner. (5.28)
- 10.79 The prescribing and administration of medicines should be audited. (5.29)

Time out of cell

- 10.80 Prisoners should spend at least 10 hours out of their cell on weekdays. (6.1)

Learning and skills and work activities: leadership and management

- 10.81 An analysis should be completed to ensure that the provision of purposeful activities meets the needs of the population. (6.15)
- 10.82 Sufficient support should be provided for prisoners on Open University and distance learning programmes. (6.16)
- 10.83 The core day should be extended and delays to the start times of training reduced. (6.17)

Learning and skills and work activities: vocational training

- 10.84 Sentence plans should be organised so that prisoners are able to complete education and training programmes without being taken out for other activities. (6.30)
- 10.85 Qualifications should be introduced into all vocational training areas, with appropriate progression routes that meet the needs of industry. (6.31)

Learning and skills and work activities: education

- 10.86 A formal system of observation of teaching and learning should be introduced for all programmes delivered by the prison. (6.33)
- 10.87 Appropriate English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) qualifications should be offered on both sites. (6.41)
- 10.88 Individual learning plans should be used better to plan learning and support needs. (6.42)
- 10.89 Best practice in education provision should be shared across both sites. (6.43)

Learning and skills and work activities: library

- 10.90 The library should introduce an open learning study area and the number of computers should be increased. (6.44)
- 10.91 The library should not close owing to a shortage of staff to escort prisoners. (6.47)
- 10.92 Prisoners who work off their wings and/or attend vocational training programmes should be provided with regular library sessions. (6.48)

Physical education and health promotion

- 10.93 The showers in the gymnasium should be refurbished and updated. (6.49)
- 10.94 The access of young adults to PE should be improved and the range of recreational activities increased. (6.55)

Security and rules

- 10.95 Local rules should be translated into key foreign languages and displayed in all of the residential units. (7.1)
- 10.96 Basic security tasks such as drug testing and searching should be completed fully and on time. (7.8)

Discipline: disciplinary procedures

- 10.97 A senior member of staff should carry out quality checks on completed adjudications. (7.10)

Discipline: the use of force

- 10.98 In completing use of force forms, the supervising officer and certifying officer should not be the same person. (7.15)
- 10.99 The use of force on the young adult site should be monitored and reduced further. (7.20)
- 10.100 All planned uses of force should be video-recorded and reviewed by a manager, in order to identify lessons learnt and make any necessary changes. (7.21)
- 10.101 A risk assessment should be undertaken before the use of ratchet handcuffs when escorting compliant prisoners to the care and separation unit. (7.22)
- 10.102 Quality assurance of completed use of force paperwork should be undertaken and issues addressed. (7.23)
- 10.103 The over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the use of force should be investigated and appropriate action taken to reduce it. (7.24)

Discipline: segregation unit

- 10.104 Targets in prisoners' reviews should be based on getting out of segregation and not limited solely to behaviour. (7.25)
- 10.105 Regime opportunities should be extended for those spending more than two weeks on the care and separation units (CSUs). (7.36)
- 10.106 In-cell work should be available in the CSUs. (7.37)
- 10.107 A risk assessment should be undertaken to determine if young adult prisoners on the CSU can exercise with others. (7.38)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 10.108 The negative views of young adult, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners about the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be investigated and action taken to address issues. (7.48)

10.109 Objectives in IEP reviews should be individualised and specific to the behavioural changes needed. (7.49)

Catering

10.110 There should be a delay of no more than 45 minutes between the preparation and serving of meals, particularly in the case of hot food. (8.4)

10.111 Prisoners should have the opportunity to cater for themselves. (8.6)

10.112 The negative views of black and minority ethnic, foreign national and Muslim prisoners about the quality of the food should be addressed. (8.11)

Prison shop

10.113 The number of sources from which faith items can be bought should be increased. (8.18)

Strategic management of resettlement

10.114 A pre-release information package should be available to prisoners nearing the end of their sentence to help them to address practical issues such as licence conditions, arrangements for the day of discharge and any outstanding area of concern to the prisoner. (9.2)

10.115 Resettlement meetings should be held at a frequency that maintains the impetus and focus of the strategy. (9.8)

10.116 The prison should explore the poor perception of access to resettlement services by young adults and review the mode of service delivery. (9.9)

10.117 The pre-release screening and support procedures should be reviewed to ensure maximum coverage of individual need. (9.10)

Offender management and planning: sentence planning and offender management

10.118 The validity and appropriateness of all sentence plans should be reviewed during the initial offender supervisor interview and outcomes recorded. (9.21)

10.119 Risk management plans should be regularly reviewed and updated as necessary, regardless of author. (9.22)

10.120 Release on temporary licence for resettlement purposes should be expanded across the prison. (9.23)

Offender management and planning: public protection

10.121 Residential staff should attend the monthly public protection meetings. (9.27)

10.122 Telephone monitoring should be undertaken as required. (9.32)

Offender management and planning: indeterminate-sentenced prisoners

10.123 More staff should be trained in managing indeterminate sentences and risk. (9.37)

Resettlement pathways: mental and physical health

10.124 Prisoners who are not registered with a GP prior to coming to prison should be given assistance to register with one before their release. (9.43)

Resettlement pathways: finance, benefit and debt

10.125 Benefits advice services should be resumed in line with the contract. (9.47)

Resettlement pathways: drugs and alcohol

10.126 Compact-based drug testing (CBDT) should be adequately staffed, to ensure that all testing is carried out appropriately, within identified timescales and without gaps in provision. (9.60)

10.127 The CBDT suite on H wing should be relocated to a suitable area, to ensure a safe, respectful and forensic testing environment. (9.61)

Resettlement pathways: children and families of offenders

10.128 Visitors should be searched in private and out of sight of other visitors. (9.64)

10.129 A review should be conducted of the number of available visit opportunities and the take-up rate, to ensure that prisoners wishing to take their entitlement of visits are able to do so. The IEP policy should be reviewed, so that prisoners who do not receive visits are offered different incentives. (9.68)

10.130 Funding should be sought to develop and expand relationship counselling, involving prisoners' partners. (9.69)

10.131 ROTL should be used to assist prisoners in preparing for a structured and safe release. (9.70)

10.132 Visits sessions should start on time. (9.77)

10.133 Young adults and their visitors should be able to purchase hot drinks. (9.78)

10.134 Prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes on visits. (9.79)

10.135 A single indication by the drug dog should only result in a closed visit when there is additional intelligence to support this. (9.80)

10.136 Family days should be accessible to prisoners on all privilege levels, and individuals should only be barred on the basis of directly relevant intelligence. (9.81)

Housekeeping points

First days in custody: first night

10.137 Graffiti in first night cells should be removed promptly. (1.19)

Applications and complaints

10.138 Responses to applications should be logged consistently by wing staff. (3.34)

Legal rights

10.139 Information displayed about legal services should be up to date and in languages other than English. (3.49)

Diversity: race equality

10.140 A list of prisoners currently or previously convicted of a racially aggravated offence and those having engaged in racist behaviour in custody should be maintained. (4.30)

Diversity: gender and sexual orientation

10.141 The Real Voices support meeting should be held in a more appropriate venue. (4.57)

Health services: pharmacy

10.142 Maximum and minimum temperatures should be recorded daily for the drug refrigerators in treatment rooms, to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2–8°C range. Corrective action should be taken where necessary and should be monitored by pharmacy staff. (5.30)

Learning and skills and work activities: leadership and management

10.143 The self-assessment report should clearly differentiate between the two sites, to identify the strengths and areas for improvement for both. (6.18)

Security and rules

10.144 Security information reports should be monitored year on year to identify trends and changes. (7.9)

Discipline: segregation unit

10.145 Daily records should evidence the full extent of interactions between CSU staff and prisoners, and their outcome. (7.39)

10.146 Sufficient staff working in the CSUs should be first-aid trained to provide cover for all shifts. (7.40)

Incentives and earned privileges

10.147 Entries on case records should be of a good quality, including evidence of both positive and negative behaviour. (7.50)

Catering

10.148 All food should be removed from the trolley after the meal has been served and the trolleys should be thoroughly cleaned before returning them to the kitchen. (8.12)

10.149 The breakfast pack should be issued on the morning it is to be eaten. (8.13)

Prison shop

10.150 The updated prison shop list and quarterly survey results of supermarket comparisons should be displayed in all accommodation areas. (8.20)

Strategic management of resettlement

10.151 The residential function should be represented at resettlement meetings. (9.11)

Resettlement pathways: children and families of offenders

10.152 The central log of closed visits and banned visitors held by the security department should be kept up to date. (9.67)

Resettlement pathways: attitudes, thinking and behaviour

10.153 The scope of contact for the Trailblazers project should be reviewed, to consider prisoners with less than six months to serve in custody. (9.86)

Examples of good practice

Bullying and violence reduction

10.154 The LEAP intervention provided instruction in the development of cognitive skills to deal with conflict in a non-violent way. (3.17)

Diversity

10.155 The prison had produced an award winning DVD, which promoted diversity and was shown during induction. (4.18)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Martin Kettle	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Michael Calvert	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Chloe Flint	Researcher
Alice Reid	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Adam Altoft	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Drugs inspector
Helen Carter	Health services inspector
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Julia Horsman	Ofsted inspector
Richard Beaumont	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	323	699	90.4
Recall	13	76	7.9
Convicted unsentenced	1	0	0.1
Remand	0	1	0.1
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	5	8	1.2
Other	1	3	0.4
Total	343	787	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	6	13	1.7
Less than 6 months	2	1	0.3
6 months to less than 12 months	17	2	1.7
12 months to less than 2 years	56	39	8.4
2 years to less than 3 years	69	85	13.6
3 years to less than 4 years	77	82	14.1
4 years to less than 10 years	102	386	43.2
10 years and over (not life)	6	47	4.7
ISPP			
Life	8	132	12.4
Total	343	787	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Minimum age: 18	-	-
21 years to 29 years	232	20.5
30 years to 39 years	178	15.8
40 years to 49 years	180	15.9
50 years to 59 years	115	10.2
60 years to 69 years	55	4.9
70 plus years	27	2.4
Under 21	343	30.4
maximum age: 83	-	-
Total	1130	100

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	291	654	83.6
Foreign nationals	49	120	15
Not stated	3	13	1.4
Total	343	787	100

Security category	18–20-year olds	21 and over	%
Category A exceptional	0	0	0
Category A high risk	0	0	0
Category A provisional	0	0	0

Category A standard	0	0	0
Category B	0	0	0
Category C	5	714	63.6
Category D	1	7	0.7
Other	0	0	0
Uncategorised sentenced	1	3	0.4
Uncategorised sentenced male	0	0	0
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	0	0
Unclassified	15	3	1.6
Unsentenced	12	3	1.3
YOI closed	305	55	31.9
YOI open	3	2	0.4
Total	343	787	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	4	0.4
Buddhist	1	22	2.0
Church of England	49	201	22.1
Hindu	0	10	0.9
Jewish	0	1	0.1
Muslim	70	108	15.8
No religion	91	203	26.0
Not stated	1	23	2.1
Other	0	23	2.0
Roman Catholic	69	108	15.7
Sikh	1	9	0.9
Other Christian denominations	61	75	12.0
Total	343	787	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>			
Bangladeshi	4	10	1.2
Indian	2	14	1.4
Other	9	21	2.7
Pakistani	8	13	1.9
Total	23	58	7.2
<i>Black or black British</i>			
African	31	38	6.1
Caribbean	30	61	8.1
Other black	21	20	3.6
Total	82	119	17.8
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>	7	3	0.9
Chinese	0	2	0.2
Total	7	5	1.1
<i>Mixed</i>			
African	7	3	0.9
Asian	0	0	0
Caribbean	15	8	2.0
Other mixed	3	10	1.2
Total	25	21	4.1
<i>Not stated, code missing</i>	21	24	4.0
Total	21	24	4.0

<i>White</i>			
British	170	509	60.1
Irish	3	13	1.4
Other white	12	38	4.4
Total	185	509	65.9
Total	343	787	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
1 month to 3 months	81	7.2	68	6.0
1 year to 2 years	20	1.8	199	17.6
2 years to 4 years	0	0	96	8.5
3 months to 6 months	91	8.1	139	12.3
4 years or more	0	0	9	0.8
6 months to 1 year	90	8.0	188	16.6
Less than 1 month	55	4.9	75	6.6
Total	337	29.8	774	68.5

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
1 month to 3 months	0	0	2	0.2
1 year to 2 years	1	0.1	6	0.5
2 years to 4 years	0	0	3	0.3
3 months to 6 months	2	0.2	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
6 months to 1 year	3	0.3	1	0.1
Less than 1 month	0	0	1	0.1
Total	6	0.5	13	1.2

Main offence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Available in later version of Nomis			
Total			

Appendix III: Summary of adult prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

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

At the time of the survey on 25 October 2011, the prisoner population at HMP Littlehey was 720. The sample size was 205. Overall, this represented 29% 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. Four respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 185 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 26% of the prison population. The response rate was 90%. In addition to the four respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, six questionnaires were not returned and 10 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 2011 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 38 category C training prisons since April 2006.
- The current survey responses in 2011 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Littlehey in 2007.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2011 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 2011 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be gay, bisexual or other and those who consider themselves to be heterosexual.
- A comparison within the 2011 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.

Summary of prisoner survey results

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	45 (25%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	49 (27%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	47 (26%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	8 (4%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes.....	162 (90%)
	Yes - on recall.....	17 (9%)
	No - awaiting trial.....	0 (0%)
	No - awaiting sentence.....	0 (0%)
	No - awaiting deportation.....	2 (1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	Not sentenced	2 (1%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	44 (24%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	70 (39%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>IPP (Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection)</i>	26 (14%)
	<i>Life</i>	9 (5%)
Q1.5	Approximately, how long do you have left to serve (if you are serving life or IPP, please use the date of your next board)?	
	Not sentenced	2 (1%)
	<i>6 months or less</i>	48 (30%)
	<i>More than 6 months</i>	108 (68%)
Q1.6	How long have you been in this prison?	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>1 to less than 3 months</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>3 to less than 6 months</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>6 to less than 12 months</i>	34 (19%)
	<i>12 months to less than 2 years</i>	41 (22%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 years</i>	45 (25%)
	<i>4 years or more</i>	24 (13%)
Q1.7	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not hold UK citizenship)	
	Yes.....	20 (11%)
	No.....	163 (89%)
Q1.8	Is English your first language?	
	Yes.....	167 (92%)
	No.....	14 (8%)

Q1.9 What is your ethnic origin?

<i>White - British</i>	122 (67%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	2 (1%)
<i>White - Irish</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>White - Other</i>	11 (6%)	<i>Mixed race - White and black Caribbean</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	18 (10%)	<i>Mixed race - White and black African</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Black or black British - African</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - Other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - Other</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Chinese</i>	1 (1%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	8 (4%)
<i>No</i>	173 (96%)

Q1.11 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	40 (22%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	60 (33%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	32 (18%)	<i>Muslim</i>	20 (11%)
<i>Protestant</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Sikh</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	10 (5%)	<i>Other</i>	13 (7%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	3 (2%)		

Q1.12 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	162 (89%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Other</i>	2 (1%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	43 (24%)
<i>No</i>	139 (76%)

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

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
100 (55%)	27 (15%)	30 (16%)	26 (14%)

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

<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
15 (8%)	149 (83%)	16 (9%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	82 (45%)
<i>No</i>	101 (55%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

- Q2.1 We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons. How was:**
- | | <i>Very good</i> | <i>Good</i> | <i>Neither</i> | <i>Bad</i> | <i>Very bad</i> | <i>Don't remember</i> | <i>N/A</i> |
|--|------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| The cleanliness of the van? | 20 (11%) | 88 (49%) | 26 (15%) | 24 (13%) | 7 (4%) | 9 (5%) | 4 (2%) |
| Your personal safety during the journey? | 31 (18%) | 90 (53%) | 16 (9%) | 20 (12%) | 6 (4%) | 3 (2%) | 3 (2%) |
| The comfort of the van? | 7 (4%) | 36 (20%) | 29 (16%) | 54 (30%) | 48 (27%) | 1 (1%) | 3 (2%) |
| The attention paid to your health needs? | 10 (6%) | 59 (34%) | 42 (24%) | 31 (18%) | 16 (9%) | 3 (2%) | 12 (7%) |
| The frequency of toilet breaks? | 2 (1%) | 21 (12%) | 33 (19%) | 27 (15%) | 56 (32%) | 3 (2%) | 34 (19%) |
- Q2.2 How long did you spend in the van?**
- | <i>Less than 1 hour</i> | <i>Over 1 hour to 2 hours</i> | <i>Over 2 hours to 4 hours</i> | <i>More than 4 hours</i> | <i>Don't remember</i> |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 14 (8%) | 83 (47%) | 67 (38%) | 11 (6%) | 3 (2%) |
- Q2.3 How did you feel you were treated by the escort staff?**
- | <i>Very well</i> | <i>Well</i> | <i>Neither</i> | <i>Badly</i> | <i>Very badly</i> | <i>Don't remember</i> |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 42 (24%) | 88 (49%) | 31 (17%) | 12 (7%) | 2 (1%) | 3 (2%) |
- Q2.4 Please answer the following questions about when you first arrived here:**
- | | <i>Yes</i> | <i>No</i> | <i>Don't remember</i> |
|---|------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison? | 148 (81%) | 33 (18%) | 1 (1%) |
| Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you? | 27 (15%) | 145 (82%) | 5 (3%) |
| When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you? | 161 (92%) | 13 (7%) | 1 (1%) |

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

- Q3.1 In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help or support with the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|---|----------|---|-----------|
| <i>Didn't ask about any of these</i> | 39 (23%) | <i>Money worries.....</i> | 22 (13%) |
| <i>Loss of property.....</i> | 20 (12%) | <i>Feeling depressed or suicidal..</i> | 73 (43%) |
| <i>Housing problems.....</i> | 21 (12%) | <i>Health problems.....</i> | 100 (59%) |
| <i>Contacting employers.....</i> | 15 (9%) | <i>Needing protection from other prisoners.....</i> | 23 (14%) |
| <i>Contacting family.....</i> | 78 (46%) | <i>Accessing phone numbers.....</i> | 62 (37%) |
| <i>Ensuring dependants were being looked after.....</i> | 13 (8%) | <i>Other.....</i> | 3 (2%) |
- Q3.2 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| <i>Didn't have any problems.....</i> | 63 (37%) | <i>Money worries.....</i> | 17 (10%) |
| <i>Loss of property.....</i> | 23 (14%) | <i>Feeling depressed or suicidal.....</i> | 32 (19%) |
| <i>Housing problems.....</i> | 21 (12%) | <i>Health problems.....</i> | 53 (31%) |

Contacting employers	7 (4%)	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	9 (5%)
Contacting family	38 (22%)	Accessing phone numbers.....	36 (21%)
Ensuring dependants were looked after.....	9 (5%)	Other.....	3 (2%)

Q3.3 Please answer the following questions about reception:

	Yes	No	Don't remember
Were you seen by a member of health services?	169 (92%)	12 (7%)	3 (2%)
When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	152 (86%)	19 (11%)	6 (3%)

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

Very well	Well	Neither	Badly	Very badly	Don't remember
47 (25%)	99 (54%)	27 (15%)	8 (4%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)

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

Information about what was going to happen to you.....	81 (46%)
Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	93 (53%)
Information about how to make routine requests.....	65 (37%)
Information about your entitlement to visits.....	76 (43%)
Information about health services	90 (51%)
Information about the chaplaincy	79 (45%)
Not offered anything	53 (30%)

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

A smokers/non-smokers pack	159 (86%)
The opportunity to have a shower.....	54 (29%)
The opportunity to make a free telephone call.....	94 (51%)
Something to eat.....	138 (75%)
Did not receive anything	5 (3%)

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

Chaplain or religious leader	49 (28%)
Someone from health services.....	124 (70%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	68 (38%)
Did not meet any of these people	39 (22%)

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

Yes.....	28 (15%)
No.....	153 (85%)

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

Yes.....	146 (80%)
No.....	28 (15%)
Don't remember	9 (5%)

Q3.10 How soon after your arrival did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course	5 (3%)
Within the first week	153 (85%)

More than a week 18 (10%)
 Don't remember 5 (3%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 5 (3%)
 Yes 127 (72%)
 No 32 (18%)
 Don't remember 12 (7%)

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?	27 (15%)	57 (32%)	27 (15%)	27 (15%)	11 (6%)	28 (16%)
Attend legal visits?	25 (15%)	59 (35%)	25 (15%)	14 (8%)	4 (2%)	40 (24%)
Obtain bail information?	3 (2%)	11 (7%)	26 (17%)	14 (9%)	7 (4%)	95 (61%)

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 24 (14%)
 Yes 77 (44%)
 No 74 (42%)

Q4.3 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know	N/A
Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	111 (62%)	65 (36%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	174 (96%)	8 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	145 (81%)	28 (16%)	5 (3%)	2 (1%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	138 (76%)	39 (22%)	3 (2%)	1 (1%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	75 (44%)	51 (30%)	28 (16%)	18 (10%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	121 (68%)	54 (31%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	43 (24%)	76 (43%)	49 (28%)	8 (5%)

Q4.4 What is the food like here?

Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
13 (7%)	66 (36%)	47 (26%)	39 (21%)	18 (10%)

Q4.5 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?
Have not bought anything yet..... 6 (3%)
 Yes 100 (54%)
 No 78 (42%)

Q4.6	Is it easy or difficult to get:						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	A complaint form?	75 (41%)	71 (39%)	10 (5%)	15 (8%)	4 (2%)	7 (4%)
	An application form?	86 (49%)	67 (39%)	12 (7%)	7 (4%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Q4.7	Have you made an application?						
	Yes.....						166 (92%)
	No.....						14 (8%)
Q4.8	Please answer the following questions concerning applications: (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)						
				Not made one		Yes	No
	Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with fairly?			14 (8%)		102 (59%)	57 (33%)
	Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with promptly? (Within seven days)			14 (8%)		90 (53%)	66 (39%)
Q4.9	Have you made a complaint?						
	Yes.....						99 (56%)
	No.....						79 (44%)
Q4.10	Please answer the following questions concerning complaints: (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)						
				Not made one		Yes	No
	Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with fairly?			79 (45%)		33 (19%)	64 (36%)
	Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with promptly? (Within seven days)			79 (46%)		37 (21%)	57 (33%)
	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?			53 (33%)		49 (31%)	57 (36%)
Q4.11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?						
	Not made a complaint						79 (44%)
	Yes.....						19 (11%)
	No.....						82 (46%)
Q4.12	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?						
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	
	41 (23%)	12 (7%)	50 (28%)	49 (28%)	18 (10%)	7 (4%)	
Q4.13	What level of the IEP scheme are you on now?						
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is						4 (2%)
	Enhanced						83 (45%)
	Standard						95 (52%)
	Basic						1 (1%)
	Don't know						0 (0%)
Q4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?						
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is						4 (2%)
	Yes.....						86 (48%)
	No.....						71 (40%)
	Don't know						18 (10%)

Q4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	4 (2%)		
	Yes	81 (46%)		
	No	64 (36%)		
	<i>Don't know</i>	28 (16%)		
Q4.16	Please answer the following questions about this prison?			
		Yes	No	
	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5 (3%)	178 (97%)	
	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	9 (5%)	169 (95%)	
Q4.17	Please answer the following questions about your religious beliefs?			
		Yes	No	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	105 (59%)	22 (12%)	52 (29%)
	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	104 (60%)	14 (8%)	54 (31%)
Q4.18	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?			
		Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>
		147 (82%)	5 (3%)	27 (15%)
Q4.19	Please answer the following questions about staff in this prison?			
		Yes	No	
	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	144 (81%)	34 (19%)	
	Do most staff treat you with respect?	143 (80%)	35 (20%)	

Section 5: Safety

Q5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?		
	Yes	57 (31%)	
	No	127 (69%)	
Q5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?		
	Yes	14 (8%)	
	No	169 (92%)	
Q5.3	In which areas of this prison do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe	127 (73%)	
	<i>Everywhere</i>	7 (4%)	
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	1 (1%)	
	<i>Association areas</i>	13 (8%)	
	<i>Reception area</i>	3 (2%)	
	<i>At the gym</i>	13 (8%)	
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	12 (7%)	
	<i>At work</i>	4 (2%)	
	<i>During movement</i>	15 (9%)	
	<i>At education</i>	7 (4%)	
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	9 (5%)	
	<i>At health services</i>	7 (4%)	
	<i>Visit's area</i>	4 (2%)	
	<i>In wing showers</i>	16 (9%)	
	<i>In gym showers</i>	7 (4%)	
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	14 (8%)	
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	10 (6%)	
	<i>In your cell</i>	7 (4%)	
	<i>At religious services</i>	1 (1%)	

- Q5.4 Have you been victimised by another prisoner or group of prisoners here?**
 Yes..... 44 (24%)
 No..... 137 (76%)
- Q5.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|---|----------|--|----------|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i> | 23 (13%) | <i>Because of your sexuality.....</i> | 8 (4%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i> | 6 (3%) | <i>Because you have a disability</i> | 6 (3%) |
| <i>Sexual abuse.....</i> | 3 (2%) | <i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i> | 3 (2%) |
| <i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> | 6 (3%) | <i>Because of your age</i> | 7 (4%) |
| <i>Because of drugs.....</i> | 2 (1%) | <i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i> | 5 (3%) |
| <i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> | 13 (7%) | <i>Because of your offence/ crime...</i> | 22 (12%) |
| <i>Because you were new here.....</i> | 5 (3%) | <i>Because of gang related issues ..</i> | 2 (1%) |
- Q5.6 Have you been victimised by a member of staff or group of staff here?**
 Yes..... 43 (24%)
 No..... 138 (76%)
- Q5.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|---|----------|--|---------|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i> | 18 (10%) | <i>Because you have a disability</i> | 7 (4%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i> | 3 (2%) | <i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i> | 6 (3%) |
| <i>Sexual abuse.....</i> | 1 (1%) | <i>Because of your age.....</i> | 4 (2%) |
| <i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> | 8 (4%) | <i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i> | 5 (3%) |
| <i>Because of drugs.....</i> | 2 (1%) | <i>Because of your offence/ crime...</i> | 15 (8%) |
| <i>Because you were new here.....</i> | 7 (4%) | <i>Because of gang related issues ..</i> | 2 (1%) |
| <i>Because of your sexuality.....</i> | 4 (2%) | | |
- Q5.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?**
Not been victimised..... 109 (62%)
 Yes..... 37 (21%)
 No..... 29 (17%)
- Q5.9 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?**
 Yes..... 44 (24%)
 No..... 136 (76%)
- Q5.10 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff/group of staff in here?**
 Yes..... 34 (19%)
 No..... 143 (81%)
- Q5.11 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?**
- | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| <i>Very easy</i> | <i>Easy</i> | <i>Neither</i> | <i>Difficult</i> | <i>Very difficult</i> | <i>Don't know</i> |
| 14 (8%) | 10 (6%) | 12 (7%) | 7 (4%) | 15 (8%) | 120 (67%) |

Section 6: Health services

Q6.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people:					
	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	14 (8%)	18 (10%)	44 (25%)	32 (18%)	54 (30%)	16 (9%)
The nurse	10 (6%)	30 (17%)	82 (47%)	21 (12%)	25 (14%)	6 (3%)
The dentist	23 (13%)	3 (2%)	13 (7%)	15 (9%)	59 (34%)	62 (35%)
The optician	44 (25%)	4 (2%)	15 (9%)	17 (10%)	50 (29%)	44 (25%)
Q6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?					
Yes.....						53 (35%)
No.....						99 (65%)
Q6.3	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?					
	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	25 (14%)	19 (11%)	46 (26%)	34 (19%)	31 (17%)	24 (13%)
The nurse	12 (7%)	40 (23%)	65 (37%)	28 (16%)	17 (10%)	13 (7%)
The dentist	46 (27%)	26 (15%)	36 (21%)	24 (14%)	17 (10%)	22 (13%)
The optician	73 (43%)	18 (11%)	26 (15%)	28 (17%)	7 (4%)	17 (10%)
Q6.4	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?					
	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	9 (5%)	26 (15%)	46 (26%)	29 (16%)	35 (20%)	33 (19%)
Q6.5	Are you currently taking medication?					
Yes.....						95 (53%)
No.....						85 (47%)
Q6.6	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?					
<i>Not taking medication</i>						85 (47%)
Yes.....						86 (48%)
No.....						8 (4%)
Q6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?					
Yes.....						57 (32%)
No.....						119 (68%)
Q6.8	Are your emotional wellbeing/mental health issues being addressed by any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)					
<i>Do not have any issues/not receiving any help</i>						134 (77%)
<i>Doctor</i>						7 (4%)
<i>Nurse</i>						4 (2%)
<i>Psychiatrist</i>						10 (6%)
<i>Mental health in-reach team</i>						27 (16%)
<i>Counsellor</i>						12 (7%)
<i>Other</i>						5 (3%)
Q6.9	Did you have a problem with either of the following when you came into this prison?					
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>			
Drugs		33 (19%)	144 (81%)			
Alcohol		29 (17%)	146 (83%)			

Q6.10	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?			
	Yes	6	(3%)	
	No.....	173	(97%)	
Q6.11	Do you know who to contact in this prison to get help with your drug or alcohol problem?			
	Yes	44	(25%)	
	No.....	1	(1%)	
	Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem	133	(75%)	
Q6.12	Have you received any intervention or help (including, CARATs, Health Services etc.) for your drug/alcohol problem, while in this prison?			
	Yes	39	(22%)	
	No.....	5	(3%)	
	Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem	133	(75%)	
Q6.13	Was the intervention or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?			
	Yes	35	(20%)	
	No.....	3	(2%)	
	Did not have a problem/have not received help	138	(78%)	
Q6.14	Do you think you will have a problem with either of the following when you leave this prison?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	Drugs	4 (2%)	153 (88%)	16 (9%)
	Alcohol	7 (4%)	151 (87%)	15 (9%)
Q6.15	Do you know who in this prison can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?			
	Yes	22	(13%)	
	No.....	4	(2%)	
	N/A	147	(85%)	

Section 7: Purposeful activity

Q7.1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Prison job	101	(57%)		
	Vocational or skills training.....	37	(21%)		
	Education (including basic skills).....	53	(30%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	27	(15%)		
	Not involved in any of these	23	(13%)		
Q7.2	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think it will help you on release?				
		Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Prison job	18 (13%)	60 (43%)	49 (35%)	12 (9%)
	Vocational or skills training	19 (15%)	61 (50%)	32 (26%)	11 (9%)
	Education (including basic skills)	20 (14%)	85 (59%)	29 (20%)	9 (6%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	29 (24%)	49 (40%)	34 (28%)	10 (8%)
Q7.3	How often do you go to the library?				
	Don't want to go			20 (11%)	

Never.....	19 (11%)
Less than once a week.....	57 (33%)
About once a week.....	53 (30%)
More than once a week.....	20 (11%)
Don't know.....	6 (3%)

Q7.4 On average how many times do you go to the gym each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1	2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
46 (26%)	33 (19%)	23 (13%)	29 (17%)	32 (18%)	11 (6%)	1 (1%)

Q7.5 On average how many times do you go outside for exercise each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
19 (11%)	15 (9%)	74 (42%)	39 (22%)	23 (13%)	5 (3%)

Q7.6 On average how many hours do you spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

Less than 2 hours.....	11 (6%)
2 to less than 4 hours.....	18 (10%)
4 to less than 6 hours.....	38 (22%)
6 to less than 8 hours.....	51 (29%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	24 (14%)
10 hours or more.....	27 (15%)
Don't know.....	7 (4%)

Q7.7 On average, how many times do you have association each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
4 (2%)	1 (1%)	5 (3%)	16 (9%)	142 (82%)	6 (3%)

Q7.8 How often do staff normally speak to you during association time?

Do not go on association	4 (2%)
Never.....	30 (17%)
Rarely.....	47 (26%)
Some of the time.....	50 (28%)
Most of the time.....	35 (19%)
All of the time.....	14 (8%)

Section 8: Resettlement

Q8.1 When did you first meet your personal officer?

Still have not met him/her	27 (15%)
In the first week.....	75 (42%)
More than a week.....	49 (28%)
Don't remember.....	27 (15%)

Q8.2 How helpful do you think your personal officer is?

<i>Do not have a personal officer/ still have not met him/her</i>	Very helpful	Helpful	Neither	Not very helpful	Not at all helpful
27 (15%)	45 (25%)	57 (32%)	24 (13%)	17 (10%)	8 (4%)

Q8.3 Do you have a sentence plan/OASys?

Not sentenced	2 (1%)
Yes.....	134 (76%)
No.....	40 (23%)

Q8.4	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?				
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>				42 (25%)
	<i>Very involved</i>				29 (17%)
	<i>Involved</i>				22 (13%)
	<i>Neither</i>				15 (9%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>				22 (13%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>				39 (23%)
Q8.5	Can you achieve all or some of your sentence plan targets in this prison?				
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>				42 (25%)
	<i>Yes</i>				85 (51%)
	<i>No</i>				42 (25%)
Q8.6	Are there plans for you to achieve all/some of your sentence plan targets in another prison?				
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>				42 (25%)
	<i>Yes</i>				38 (23%)
	<i>No</i>				89 (53%)
Q8.7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to address your offending behaviour whilst at this prison?				
	<i>Not sentenced</i>				2 (1%)
	<i>Yes</i>				66 (39%)
	<i>No</i>				102 (60%)
Q8.8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?				
	<i>Yes</i>				28 (16%)
	<i>No</i>				142 (84%)
Q8.9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?				
	<i>Yes</i>				87 (50%)
	<i>No</i>				77 (44%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				10 (6%)
Q8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?				
	<i>Yes</i>				35 (20%)
	<i>No</i>				133 (76%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				6 (3%)
Q8.11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?				
	<i>Not been here a week yet</i>				2 (1%)
	<i>Yes</i>				34 (19%)
	<i>No</i>				128 (73%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>				11 (6%)
Q8.12	How many visits did you receive in the last week?				
	<i>Not been in a week</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1 to 2</i>	<i>3 to 4</i>	<i>5 or more</i>
	2 (1%)	106 (67%)	51 (32%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Q8.13	How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?				
	<i>Not had any visits</i>				38 (22%)
	<i>Very well</i>				35 (20%)
	<i>Well</i>				52 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i>				19 (11%)
	<i>Badly</i>				8 (5%)

Very badly 3 (2%)
 Don't know 16 (9%)

Q8.14 Have you been helped to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?
 Yes 66 (40%)
 No 100 (60%)

Q8.15 Do you know who to contact to get help with the following within this prison: (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Don't know who to contact</i>	69 (44%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i>	45 (29%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships</i>	31 (20%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i>	58 (37%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	24 (15%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i>	30 (19%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	54 (35%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i>	33 (21%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release</i>	65 (42%)	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	43 (28%)

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

<i>No problems</i>	52 (32%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i>	45 (27%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships</i>	21 (13%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i>	52 (32%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	16 (10%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i>	23 (14%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	80 (48%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i>	23 (14%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release</i>	68 (41%)	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	37 (22%)

Q8.17 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 2 (1%)
 Yes 95 (59%)
 No 63 (39%)

Appendix IV: Summary of young adult prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Young adult prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

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

At the time of the survey on 26 October 2011, the young adult population at HMYOI Littlehey was 403. The sample size was 173. Overall, this represented 43% of the young adult prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a P-Nomis young adult 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. Two respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, four respondents were interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; 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, 164 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 41% of the young adult population. The response rate was 95%. In addition to the two respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, five questionnaires were not returned and two 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 2011 against comparator figures for all young adults surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young adult surveys carried out in fifteen young offender institutions since March 2005.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of young adults who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of Muslim young adults and non-Muslim young adults.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of young adults who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Summary of young adult prisoner survey results

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	132 (81%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	142 (89%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	26 (16%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	63 (39%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	41 (26%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>IPP (Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection)</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Life</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.5	Approximately, how long do you have left to serve (if you are serving life or IPP, please use the date of your next board)?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>6 months or less</i>	63 (45%)
	<i>More than 6 months</i>	77 (55%)
Q1.6	How long have you been in this prison?	
	<i>Less than 1 month</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>1 to less than 3 months</i>	29 (18%)
	<i>3 to less than 6 months</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>6 to less than 12 months</i>	51 (31%)
	<i>12 months to less than 2 years</i>	27 (17%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 years</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>4 years or more</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.7	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not hold UK citizenship)	
	<i>Yes</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	132 (85%)
Q1.8	Is English your first language?	
	<i>Yes</i>	137 (87%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (13%)

Q1.9	What is your ethnic origin?			
	<i>White - British</i>	83 (52%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Other</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>White - Other</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - White and black Caribbean</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> ..	14 (9%)	<i>Mixed race - White and black African</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	15 (9%)	<i>Mixed race - White and Asian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - Other</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - Other</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Chinese</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> ..	6 (4%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	8 (5%)
Q1.10	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?			
	<i>Yes</i>			3 (2%)
	<i>No</i>			146 (98%)
Q1.11	What is your religion?			
	<i>None</i>	52 (32%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	30 (19%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	33 (20%)	<i>Muslim</i>	39 (24%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Other</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (1%)		
Q1.12	How would you describe your sexual orientation?			
	<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>			156 (99%)
	<i>Homosexual/gay</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Other</i>			1 (1%)
Q1.13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			
	<i>Yes</i>			18 (11%)
	<i>No</i>			142 (89%)
Q1.14	How many times have you been in prison before?			
	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>
	58 (36%)	30 (18%)	64 (39%)	11 (7%)
Q1.15	Including this prison, how many prisons have you been in during this sentence/remand time?			
	<i>1</i>	<i>2 to 5</i>	<i>More than 5</i>	
	13 (8%)	138 (85%)	11 (7%)	
Q1.16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?			
	<i>Yes</i>			38 (23%)
	<i>No</i>			126 (77%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

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

	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>	<i>N/A</i>
The cleanliness of the van?	6 (4%)	64 (40%)	43 (27%)	28 (17%)	10 (6%)	9 (6%)	1 (1%)
Your personal safety during the journey?	15 (10%)	79 (52%)	35 (23%)	14 (9%)	5 (3%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
The comfort of the van?	3 (2%)	13 (8%)	22 (14%)	44 (28%)	78 (49%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
The attention paid to your health needs?	7 (5%)	39 (25%)	57 (37%)	25 (16%)	11 (7%)	5 (3%)	11 (7%)
The frequency of toilet breaks?	4 (3%)	14 (9%)	28 (18%)	25 (16%)	61 (38%)	10 (6%)	18 (11%)

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

<i>Less than 1 hour</i>	<i>Over 1 hour to 2 hours</i>	<i>Over 2 hours to 4 hours</i>	<i>More than 4 hours</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
7 (4%)	76 (47%)	71 (44%)	4 (2%)	5 (3%)

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

<i>Very well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Badly</i>	<i>Very badly</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
13 (8%)	88 (54%)	54 (33%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)	2 (1%)

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

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't remember</i>
Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	139 (85%)	23 (14%)	1 (1%)
Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	39 (24%)	112 (70%)	10 (6%)
When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	152 (93%)	8 (5%)	3 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

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

<i>Didn't ask about any of these..</i>	40 (26%)	<i>Money worries.....</i>	15 (10%)
<i>Loss of property</i>	19 (12%)	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal.....</i>	57 (37%)
<i>Housing problems.....</i>	36 (24%)	<i>Health problems.....</i>	89 (58%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	15 (10%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners.....</i>	25 (16%)
<i>Contacting family</i>	80 (52%)	<i>Accessing phone numbers.....</i>	58 (38%)
<i>Ensuring dependants were being looked after</i>	24 (16%)	<i>Other.....</i>	6 (4%)

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

<i>Didn't have any problems.....</i>	48 (36%)	<i>Money worries.....</i>	22 (16%)
<i>Loss of property</i>	16 (12%)	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal.....</i>	14 (10%)
<i>Housing problems.....</i>	31 (23%)	<i>Health problems.....</i>	12 (9%)

Contacting employers	7 (5%)	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	11 (8%)
Contacting family	31 (23%)	Accessing phone numbers.....	27 (20%)
Ensuring dependants were looked after.....	1 (1%)	Other.....	3 (2%)

Q3.3 Please answer the following questions about reception:

	Yes	No	Don't remember
Were you seen by a member of health services?	140 (88%)	15 (9%)	5 (3%)
When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	122 (77%)	26 (16%)	11 (7%)

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

Very well	Well	Neither	Badly	Very badly	Don't remember
25 (16%)	63 (39%)	53 (33%)	14 (9%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)

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

Information about what was going to happen to you.....	64 (42%)
Information about what support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	64 (42%)
Information about how to make routine requests.....	51 (33%)
Information about your entitlement to visits.....	55 (36%)
Information about health services	96 (62%)
Information about the chaplaincy	59 (38%)
Not offered anything	44 (29%)

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

A smokers/non-smokers pack	151 (94%)
The opportunity to have a shower.....	85 (53%)
The opportunity to make a free telephone call.....	123 (76%)
Something to eat.....	106 (66%)
Did not receive anything	1 (1%)

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

Chaplain or religious leader	33 (22%)
Someone from health services.....	111 (74%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	4 (3%)
Did not meet any of these people	34 (23%)

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

Yes.....	13 (8%)
No.....	144 (92%)

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

Yes	135 (85%)
No.....	11 (7%)
Don't remember.....	13 (8%)

Q3.10 How soon after your arrival did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course	9 (6%)
Within the first week	107 (67%)

More than a week 34 (21%)
 Don't remember 9 (6%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 9 (6%)
 Yes 89 (57%)
 No 41 (26%)
 Don't remember 17 (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?	9 (6%)	59 (37%)	30 (19%)	26 (16%)	11 (7%)	24 (15%)
Attend legal visits?	12 (8%)	58 (37%)	29 (19%)	10 (6%)	4 (3%)	42 (27%)
Obtain bail information?	1 (1%)	17 (11%)	33 (22%)	22 (15%)	11 (7%)	66 (44%)

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 27 (17%)
 Yes 58 (37%)
 No 71 (46%)

Q4.3 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know	N/A
Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	95 (61%)	61 (39%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	157 (98%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	127 (79%)	32 (20%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	124 (78%)	29 (18%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	71 (46%)	63 (41%)	17 (11%)	3 (2%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	103 (66%)	51 (33%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	45 (29%)	67 (43%)	33 (21%)	11 (7%)

Q4.4 What is the food like here?

Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
13 (8%)	63 (41%)	46 (30%)	25 (16%)	8 (5%)

Q4.5 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?
Have not bought anything yet..... 4 (3%)
 Yes 82 (52%)
 No 73 (46%)

Q4.6	Is it easy or difficult to get:						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	A complaint form?	61 (39%)	62 (39%)	16 (10%)	8 (5%)	6 (4%)	4 (3%)
	An application form?	71 (46%)	68 (44%)	10 (6%)	2 (1%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)

Q4.7	Have you made an application?	
	Yes.....	147 (93%)
	No.....	11 (7%)

Q4.8	Please answer the following questions concerning applications: <i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with fairly?	11 (7%)	92 (62%)	46 (31%)
	Do you feel <i>applications</i> are dealt with promptly? (Within seven days)	11 (7%)	82 (54%)	59 (39%)

Q4.9	Have you made a complaint?	
	Yes.....	75 (48%)
	No.....	80 (52%)

Q4.10	Please answer the following questions concerning complaints: <i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with fairly?	80 (51%)	27 (17%)	50 (32%)
	Do you feel <i>complaints</i> are dealt with promptly? (Within seven days)	80 (53%)	28 (18%)	44 (29%)
	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	55 (37%)	42 (28%)	53 (35%)

Q4.11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	
	Not made a complaint	80 (52%)
	Yes.....	19 (12%)
	No.....	55 (36%)

Q4.12	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?					
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	39 (25%)	5 (3%)	33 (21%)	49 (32%)	19 (12%)	9 (6%)

Q4.13	What level of the IEP scheme are you on now?	
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is	0 (0%)
	<i>Enhanced</i>	60 (38%)
	<i>Standard</i>	84 (53%)
	<i>Basic</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	5 (3%)

Q4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is	0 (0%)
	Yes	68 (44%)
	No	70 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (11%)

Q4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?		
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>		0 (0%)
	Yes		62 (41%)
	No		74 (49%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		16 (11%)
Q4.16	Please answer the following questions about this prison?		
		Yes	No
	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	31 (20%)	123 (80%)
	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	26 (17%)	131 (83%)
Q4.17	Please answer the following questions about your religious beliefs?		
		Yes	No
	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	82 (52%)	29 (18%)
	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	82 (52%)	12 (8%)
			<i>Don't know/ N/A</i> 46 (29%) 63 (40%)
Q4.18	Can you speak to a listener at any time if you want to?		
		Yes	No
		69 (44%)	16 (10%)
			<i>Don't know</i> 73 (46%)
Q4.19	Please answer the following questions about staff in this prison?		
		Yes	No
	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	116 (75%)	38 (25%)
	Do most staff treat you with respect?	99 (66%)	52 (34%)

Section 5: Safety

Q5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?		
	Yes		49 (31%)
	No		110 (69%)
Q5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?		
	Yes		23 (15%)
	No		133 (85%)
Q5.3	In which areas of this prison do you/have you ever felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe		110 (73%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>		7 (5%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>		4 (3%)
	<i>Association areas</i>		15 (10%)
	<i>Reception area</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>At the gym</i>		22 (15%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>At work</i>		11 (7%)
	<i>During movement</i>		23 (15%)
	<i>At education</i>		17 (11%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i>		11 (7%)
	<i>At health services</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>Visit's area</i>		7 (5%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>		10 (7%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>		12 (8%)
	<i>In your cell</i>		10 (7%)
	<i>At religious services</i>		5 (3%)

- Q5.4 Have you been victimised by another prisoner or group of prisoners here?**
 Yes..... 27 (18%)
 No..... 127 (82%) **If No, go to question 5.6**
- Q5.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---------|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i> | 12 (8%) | <i>Because of your sexuality.....</i> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i> | 9 (6%) | <i>Because you have a disability</i> | 1 (1%) |
| <i>Sexual abuse.....</i> | 0 (0%) | <i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i> | 5 (3%) |
| <i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> | 7 (5%) | <i>Because of your age</i> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>Because of drugs.....</i> | 3 (2%) | <i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i> | 10 (6%) |
| <i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> | 8 (5%) | <i>Because of your offence/ crime..</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>Because you were new here.....</i> | 8 (5%) | <i>Because of gang related issues .</i> | 9 (6%) |
- Q5.6 Have you been victimised by a member of staff or group of staff here?**
 Yes..... 44 (28%)
 No..... 111 (72%) **If No, go to question 5.8**
- Q5.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|---|---------|--|--------|
| <i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i> | 13 (8%) | <i>Because you have a disability</i> | 1 (1%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i> | 4 (3%) | <i>Because of your religion/religious beliefs.....</i> | 9 (6%) |
| <i>Sexual abuse.....</i> | 0 (0%) | <i>Because of your age.....</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>Because of your race or ethnic origin</i> | 12 (8%) | <i>Being from a different part of the country than others.....</i> | 7 (5%) |
| <i>Because of drugs.....</i> | 2 (1%) | <i>Because of your offence/ crime..</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>Because you were new here.....</i> | 8 (5%) | <i>Because of gang related issues .</i> | 7 (5%) |
| <i>Because of your sexuality.....</i> | 1 (1%) | | |
- Q5.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?**
Not been victimised..... 97 (66%)
 Yes..... 16 (11%)
 No..... 34 (23%)
- Q5.9 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?**
 Yes..... 27 (17%)
 No..... 130 (83%)
- Q5.10 Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff/group of staff in here?**
 Yes..... 27 (17%)
 No..... 128 (83%)
- Q5.11 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?**
- | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| <i>Very easy</i> | <i>Easy</i> | <i>Neither</i> | <i>Difficult</i> | <i>Very difficult</i> | <i>Don't know</i> |
| 11 (7%) | 7 (4%) | 11 (7%) | 10 (6%) | 18 (11%) | 100 (64%) |

Section 6: Health services

Q6.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?					
	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	24 (15%)	13 (8%)	60 (39%)	28 (18%)	27 (17%)	3 (2%)
The nurse	20 (13%)	28 (18%)	74 (49%)	18 (12%)	11 (7%)	1 (1%)
The dentist	31 (20%)	5 (3%)	28 (18%)	17 (11%)	42 (27%)	32 (21%)
The optician	65 (43%)	6 (4%)	18 (12%)	20 (13%)	24 (16%)	19 (13%)
Q6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?					
Yes.....						68 (49%)
No.....						70 (51%)
Q6.3	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?					
	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	43 (28%)	22 (15%)	47 (31%)	22 (15%)	11 (7%)	6 (4%)
The nurse	24 (16%)	30 (19%)	63 (41%)	15 (10%)	13 (8%)	9 (6%)
The dentist	67 (44%)	27 (18%)	29 (19%)	20 (13%)	5 (3%)	4 (3%)
The optician	94 (64%)	10 (7%)	20 (14%)	16 (11%)	3 (2%)	4 (3%)
Q6.4	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?					
	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	19 (12%)	20 (13%)	71 (46%)	23 (15%)	16 (10%)	5 (3%)
Q6.5	Are you currently taking medication?					
Yes.....						38 (24%)
No.....						120 (76%)
Q6.6	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?					
<i>Not taking medication</i>						120 (76%)
Yes.....						32 (20%)
No.....						5 (3%)
Q6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?					
Yes.....						32 (21%)
No.....						123 (79%)
Q6.8	Are your emotional wellbeing/mental health issues being addressed by any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)					
<i>Do not have any issues/not receiving any help</i>						138 (90%)
<i>Doctor</i>						1 (1%)
<i>Nurse</i>						1 (1%)
<i>Psychiatrist</i>						5 (3%)
<i>Mental health in-reach team</i>						10 (7%)
<i>Counsellor</i>						1 (1%)
<i>Other</i>						4 (3%)
Q6.9	Did you have a problem with either of the following when you came into this prison?					
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>			
Drugs		34 (22%)	121 (78%)			
Alcohol		30 (20%)	121 (80%)			

Q6.10	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?			
	Yes	5	(3%)	
	No.....	151	(97%)	
Q6.11	Do you know who to contact in this prison to get help with your drug or alcohol problem?			
	Yes	35	(22%)	
	No.....	10	(6%)	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem</i>	113	(72%)	
Q6.12	Have you received any intervention or help (including, CARATs, Health Services etc.) for your drug/alcohol problem, while in this prison?			
	Yes	34	(22%)	
	No.....	11	(7%)	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug or alcohol problem</i>	113	(72%)	
Q6.13	Was the intervention or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?			
	Yes	27	(17%)	
	No.....	6	(4%)	
	<i>Did not have a problem/have not received help</i>	124	(79%)	
Q6.14	Do you think you will have a problem with either of the following when you leave this prison?			
		Yes	No	Don't know
	Drugs	7 (4%)	135 (85%)	17 (11%)
	Alcohol	3 (2%)	132 (85%)	21 (13%)
Q6.15	Do you know who in this prison can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?			
	Yes	21	(14%)	
	No.....	9	(6%)	
	N/A	124	(81%)	

Section 7: Purposeful activity

Q7.1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	Prison job	45	(28%)		
	Vocational or skills training.....	31	(20%)		
	Education (including basic skills).....	79	(50%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes.....	13	(8%)		
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	29	(18%)		
Q7.2	If you have been involved in any of the following, whilst in this prison, do you think it will help you on release?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	Yes	No	Don't know
	Prison job	29 (25%)	39 (34%)	34 (30%)	12 (11%)
	Vocational or skills training	23 (21%)	56 (52%)	19 (18%)	10 (9%)
	Education (including basic skills)	11 (8%)	85 (64%)	26 (20%)	11 (8%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	30 (30%)	37 (37%)	18 (18%)	14 (14%)
Q7.3	How often do you go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>			13 (8%)	

Never.....	25 (16%)
Less than once a week.....	39 (25%)
About once a week.....	61 (39%)
More than once a week.....	12 (8%)
Don't know.....	6 (4%)

Q7.4 On average how many times do you go to the gym each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1	2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
19 (13%)	10 (7%)	28 (19%)	54 (37%)	29 (20%)	2 (1%)	4 (3%)

Q7.5 On average how many times do you go outside for exercise each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
4 (3%)	17 (11%)	51 (34%)	42 (28%)	25 (16%)	13 (9%)

Q7.6 On average how many hours do you spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

Less than 2 hours.....	25 (16%)
2 to less than 4 hours.....	26 (17%)
4 to less than 6 hours.....	60 (39%)
6 to less than 8 hours.....	24 (16%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	4 (3%)
10 hours or more.....	5 (3%)
Don't know.....	9 (6%)

Q7.7 On average, how many times do you have association each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	0	1 to 2	3 to 5	More than 5	Don't know
0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (8%)	106 (69%)	29 (19%)	6 (4%)

Q7.8 How often do staff normally speak to you during association time?

Do not go on association	5 (3%)
Never.....	16 (10%)
Rarely.....	28 (18%)
Some of the time.....	64 (42%)
Most of the time.....	33 (21%)
All of the time.....	8 (5%)

Section 8: Resettlement

Q8.1 When did you first meet your personal officer?

Still have not met him/her	44 (29%)
In the first week.....	35 (23%)
More than a week.....	40 (26%)
Don't remember.....	35 (23%)

Q8.2 How helpful do you think your personal officer is?

<i>Do not have a personal officer/ still have not met him/her</i>	Very helpful	Helpful	Neither	Not very helpful	Not at all helpful
44 (29%)	21 (14%)	33 (22%)	24 (16%)	13 (8%)	18 (12%)

Q8.3 Do you have a sentence plan/OASys?

Not sentenced	1 (1%)
Yes.....	90 (58%)
No.....	65 (42%)

Q8.4	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?				
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>				66 (43%)
	<i>Very involved</i>				23 (15%)
	<i>Involved</i>				22 (14%)
	<i>Neither</i>				18 (12%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>				14 (9%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>				11 (7%)
Q8.5	Can you achieve all or some of your sentence plan targets in this prison?				
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>				66 (43%)
	<i>Yes</i>				67 (44%)
	<i>No</i>				20 (13%)
Q8.6	Are there plans for you to achieve all/some of your sentence plan targets in another prison?				
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/OASys</i>				66 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i>				35 (24%)
	<i>No</i>				46 (31%)
Q8.7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to address your offending behaviour whilst at this prison?				
	<i>Not sentenced</i>				1 (1%)
	<i>Yes</i>				40 (27%)
	<i>No</i>				106 (72%)
Q8.8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?				
	<i>Yes</i>				28 (18%)
	<i>No</i>				125 (82%)
Q8.9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?				
	<i>Yes</i>				74 (47%)
	<i>No</i>				70 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				12 (8%)
Q8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?				
	<i>Yes</i>				40 (26%)
	<i>No</i>				112 (72%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				4 (3%)
Q8.11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?				
	<i>Not been here a week yet</i>				4 (3%)
	<i>Yes</i>				23 (15%)
	<i>No</i>				115 (74%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>				13 (8%)
Q8.12	How many visits did you receive in the last week?				
	<i>Not been in a week</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1 to 2</i>	<i>3 to 4</i>	<i>5 or more</i>
	4 (3%)	96 (64%)	47 (32%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
Q8.13	How are you and your family/friends usually treated by visits staff?				
	<i>Not had any visits</i>				35 (23%)
	<i>Very well</i>				19 (13%)
	<i>Well</i>				41 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i>				24 (16%)
	<i>Badly</i>				7 (5%)

Very badly 4 (3%)
 Don't know 21 (14%)

Q8.14 Have you been helped to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?
 Yes 52 (34%)
 No 99 (66%)

Q8.15 Do you know who to contact to get help with the following within this prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Don't know who to contact</i>	77 (55%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i>	21 (15%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships</i> ...	13 (9%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i>	30 (21%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	10 (7%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i>	20 (14%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	28 (20%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i>	14 (10%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release</i>	52 (37%)	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	20 (14%)

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

<i>No problems</i>	46 (32%)	<i>Help with your finances in preparation for release</i>	40 (28%)
<i>Maintaining good relationships</i> ...	19 (13%)	<i>Claiming benefits on release</i>	38 (27%)
<i>Avoiding bad relationships</i>	22 (15%)	<i>Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release</i>	39 (27%)
<i>Finding a job on release</i>	79 (56%)	<i>Continuity of health services on release</i>	19 (13%)
<i>Finding accommodation on release</i>	59 (42%)	<i>Opening a bank account</i>	36 (25%)

Q8.17 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 1 (1%)
 Yes 84 (56%)
 No 65 (43%)

Thank you for completing this survey

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011 (ADULTS)

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 Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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		185	5035	185	121
SECTION 1: General information					
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	0%	0%
3a	Are you sentenced?	99%	100%	99%	100%
3b	Are you on recall?	9%	10%	9%	20%
4a	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	1%	5%	1%	4%
4b	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	14%	8%	14%	0%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	30%	38%	30%	37%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	5%	7%	5%	4%
7	Are you a foreign national?	11%	12%	11%	16%
8	Is English your first language?	92%	91%	92%	85%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	23%	26%	23%	24%
10	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	4%	4%	
11	Are you Muslim?	11%	11%	11%	10%
12	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	11%	3%	11%	9%
13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	24%	15%	24%	21%
14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	34%	55%	51%
15	Have you been in more than five prisons this time?	9%	14%	9%	
16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	45%	52%	45%	46%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
For the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons:					
1a	Was the cleanliness of the van good/very good?	61%	53%	61%	61%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	72%	62%	72%	78%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	24%	18%	24%	22%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	40%	32%	40%	36%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	13%	12%	13%	19%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	6%	8%	6%	8%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	65%	73%	77%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	81%	83%	81%	77%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	15%	18%	15%	12%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	88%	92%	91%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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 3: Reception, first night and induction				
1	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:			
1b	12%	14%	12%	
1c	13%	19%	13%	
1d	9%	10%	9%	
1e	46%	43%	46%	
1f	8%	11%	8%	
1g	13%	15%	13%	
1h	43%	45%	43%	
1i	59%	58%	59%	
1j	14%	17%	14%	
1k	37%	35%	37%	
2	When you first arrived:			
2a	63%	61%	63%	62%
2b	14%	16%	14%	10%
2c	12%	17%	12%	16%
2d	4%	4%	4%	3%
2e	22%	23%	22%	19%
2f	5%	5%	5%	6%
2g	10%	15%	10%	19%
2h	19%	14%	19%	22%
2i	31%	22%	31%	24%
2j	5%	5%	5%	6%
2k	21%	22%	21%	
3a	92%	90%	92%	85%
3b	86%	78%	86%	76%
4	79%	69%	79%	79%
5	On your day of arrival, were you offered information about any of the following:			
5a	46%	53%	46%	50%
5b	53%	47%	53%	55%
5c	37%	42%	37%	39%
5d	43%	47%	43%	50%
5e	51%	59%	51%	
5f	45%	52%	45%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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					
6	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:				
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	87%	84%	87%	65%
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	29%	40%	29%	34%
6c	The opportunity to make a free telephone call?	51%	47%	51%	62%
6d	Something to eat?	75%	76%	75%	73%
7	Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:				
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	28%	45%	28%	52%
7b	Someone from health services?	70%	77%	70%	66%
7c	A Listener/Samaritans?	39%	28%	39%	63%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	16%	17%	16%	53%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	83%	80%	82%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	93%	97%	92%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	74%	65%	74%	70%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
1	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	48%	48%	48%	57%
1b	Attend legal visits?	50%	53%	50%	49%
1c	Obtain bail information?	9%	17%	9%	22%
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	44%	42%	44%	34%
3	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	62%	60%	62%	61%
3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	92%	96%	95%
3c	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	81%	80%	81%	80%
3d	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76%	74%	76%	81%
3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	39%	44%	58%
3f	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	68%	70%	68%	78%
3g	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	24%	29%	24%	30%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	43%	29%	43%	24%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54%	47%	54%	45%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	80%	85%	80%	91%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	88%	90%	88%	90%
7	Have you made an application?	92%	90%	92%	80%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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 4: Legal rights and respectful custody continued					
For those who have made an application:					
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	64%	60%	64%	75%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	58%	52%	58%	68%
9	Have you made a complaint?	56%	54%	56%	51%
For those who have made a complaint:					
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	34%	33%	34%	48%
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	39%	39%	39%	54%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	19%	25%	19%	26%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	31%	30%	31%	24%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	35%	33%	35%	45%
13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	45%	58%	45%	40%
14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	48%	56%	48%	45%
15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	46%	49%	46%	
16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	3%	5%	3%	9%
16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	5%	10%	5%	17%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	55%	59%	55%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	58%	60%	56%
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	82%	59%	82%	92%
15a	Is there a member of staff in this prison that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	81%	74%	81%	77%
15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	80%	74%	80%	77%
SECTION 5: Safety					
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	31%	31%	31%	34%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	8%	14%	8%	14%
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	24%	18%	24%	25%
5	Since you have been here, has another prisoner:				
5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	9%	13%	12%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	5%	3%	5%
5c	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	3%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	2%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	7%	4%	7%	4%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	9%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	4%	1%	4%	3%
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	3%
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	3%
5k	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	
5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	5%	3%	4%
5m	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	12%	4%	12%	
5n	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	3%	1%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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: Safety continued					
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	24%	22%	24%	19%
7	Since you have been here, has a member of staff:				
7a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	10%	10%	8%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	2%	2%	3%
7c	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	5%	4%	4%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	3%	1%	0%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	5%	4%	4%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	2%	4%	4%
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	2%
7j	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	
7k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%	3%	3%
7l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	4%	8%	
7m	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:					
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	56%	39%	56%	35%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	24%	21%	24%	28%
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	19%	19%	19%	14%
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	13%	32%	13%	8%
SECTION 6: Health services					
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	39%	35%	
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	64%	61%	64%	
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	9%	15%	9%	
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	11%	18%	11%	
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	35%	54%	35%	
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:					
3a	The doctor?	42%	52%	42%	44%
3b	The nurse?	64%	65%	64%	69%
3c	The dentist?	50%	46%	50%	53%
3d	The optician?	46%	47%	46%	39%
4	The overall quality of health services?	43%	45%	43%	43%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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				
Health services continued					
5	Are you currently taking medication?	53%	44%	53%	52%
For those currently taking medication:					
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	92%	87%	92%	95%
7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	32%	25%	32%	
For those with emotional wellbeing/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:					
8a	Not receiving any help?	28%	34%	28%	
8b	A doctor?	13%	31%	13%	
8c	A nurse?	8%	17%	8%	
8d	A psychiatrist?	19%	16%	19%	
8e	The mental health in-reach team?	50%	33%	50%	
8f	A counsellor?	22%	12%	22%	
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	19%	21%	19%	11%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	17%	15%	17%	6%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	3%	8%	3%	
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	98%	89%	98%	
12	Have you received any help or intervention while in this prison?	89%	80%	89%	
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:					
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	92%	80%	92%	
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	12%	21%	12%	12%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	13%	16%	13%	13%
For those who may have a drug or alcohol problem on release, do you know who in this prison:					
15	Can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?	84%	61%	84%	65%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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 7: Purposeful activity					
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
1a	A prison job?	57%	64%	57%	
1b	Vocational or skills training?	21%	19%	21%	
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	30%	30%	30%	
1d	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	15%	17%	15%	
2ai	Have you had a job while in this prison?	87%	88%	87%	
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	50%	46%	50%	
2bi	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	85%	78%	85%	
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:					
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	59%	67%	59%	
2ci	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	86%	83%	86%	
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	69%	68%	69%	
2di	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	76%	77%	76%	
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	53%	60%	53%	
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42%	48%	42%	62%
4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	41%	55%	41%	38%
5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	35%	51%	35%	45%
6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	15%	14%	15%	16%
7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	82%	76%	82%	78%
8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	27%	19%	27%	25%
SECTION 8: Resettlement					
1	Do you have a personal officer?	85%	76%	85%	89%
For those with a personal officer:					
2	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	68%	62%	68%	64%
For those who are sentenced:					
3	Do you have a sentence plan?	77%	69%	77%	66%
For those with a sentence plan?					
4	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	40%	57%	40%	53%
5	Can you achieve some/all of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	68%	70%	68%	68%
6	Are there plans for you to achieve some/all your targets in another prison?	30%	36%	30%	28%
For those who are sentenced:					
7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you address your offending behaviour while at this prison?	39%	33%	39%	
8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	17%	19%	17%	
9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	50%	41%	50%	31%
10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	24%	20%	15%
11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	19%	22%	19%	18%
12	Did you receive one or more visits in the last week?	32%	30%	32%	28%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Littlehey 2011	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Littlehey 2011	HMP Littlehey 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				
Resettlement continued					
For those who have had visits:					
13	How are you and your family/ friends usually treated by visits staff? (Very well/well)	65%	54%	65%	
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends whilst in this prison?	40%	37%	40%	
15	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with the following:				
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	20%	18%	20%	
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	15%	13%	15%	
15d	Finding a job on release?	35%	35%	35%	59%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	42%	37%	42%	60%
15f	With money/finances on release?	29%	26%	29%	53%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	37%	38%	37%	63%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	19%	24%	19%	43%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	21%	26%	21%	49%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	28%	26%	28%	45%
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison?				
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	13%	11%	13%	
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	10%	12%	10%	
16d	Finding a job?	48%	45%	48%	46%
16e	Finding accommodation?	41%	38%	41%	47%
16f	Money/finances?	27%	31%	27%	48%
16g	Claiming benefits?	32%	27%	32%	35%
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	14%	20%	14%	27%
16i	Accessing health services?	14%	16%	14%	24%
16j	Opening a bank account?	22%	30%	22%	40%
For those who are sentenced:					
17	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	60%	55%	60%	60%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, nationality and religion) HMP/YOI Littlehey (ADULTS) 2011

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	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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		42	140	20	163	20	162
1.3	Are you sentenced?	97%	99%	89%	100%	100%	99%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	31%	5%			35%	8%
1.8	Is English your first language?	81%	96%	55%	97%	60%	96%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			65%	18%	70%	18%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	6%	0%	5%	0%	5%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	33%	4%	35%	8%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	28%	10%	25%	5%	25%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	60%	53%	55%	54%	60%	54%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good on your journey here?	29%	43%	27%	42%	21%	42%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	75%	53%	76%	69%	74%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	71%	85%	70%	83%	70%	83%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	32%	52%	29%	49%	39%	48%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	37%	46%	35%	45%	39%	44%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	53%	62%	59%	59%	44%	62%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	65%	62%	69%	62%	58%	63%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	83%	94%	100%	91%	90%	93%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	87%	71%	88%	74%	89%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	83%	60%	82%	80%	80%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	54%	75%	82%	70%	53%	73%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	84%	67%	82%	84%	81%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	99%	83%	99%	95%	97%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	47%	37%	48%	35%	49%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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						
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	54%	65%	50%	64%	64%	63%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	96%	88%	96%	89%	96%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	46%	44%	44%	44%	44%	45%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	29%	48%	30%	45%	21%	47%
4.5	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	33%	61%	42%	56%	53%	54%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	83%	80%	80%	81%	90%	79%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	94%	87%	76%	90%	88%	88%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	73%	50%	61%	55%	69%	53%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	41%	47%	30%	48%	40%	46%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	28%	55%	26%	51%	35%	51%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	39%	49%	47%	46%	45%	47%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	1%	11%	2%	5%	3%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	7%	4%	6%	5%	5%	5%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	59%	64%	59%	69%	59%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	72%	58%	67%	60%	88%	59%
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	67%	87%	77%	83%	74%	85%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	83%	67%	83%	84%	81%
4.19b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	82%	61%	83%	67%	82%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	48%	26%	50%	28%	35%	29%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	12%	6%	5%	8%	10%	7%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	22%	24%	16%	25%	11%	25%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	3%	0%	3%	0%	3%
5.5i	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	0%	3%	0%	3%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	35%	19%	37%	22%	37%	21%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	15%	1%	11%	3%	16%	3%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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						
5.7h	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	4%	0%	4%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	8%	1%	0%	3%	11%	2%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	29%	23%	27%	24%	26%	23%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	27%	17%	17%	19%	37%	16%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	14%	16%	13%	15%	14%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	32%	37%	30%	36%	16%	38%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	58%	67%	58%	66%	59%	66%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	33%	36%	27%	36%	25%	37%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	48%	54%	42%	54%	39%	54%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	26%	35%	29%	33%	23%	34%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	61%	57%	56%	58%	47%	58%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	29%	19%	27%	20%	18%	22%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	37%	28%	17%	31%	6%	33%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	18%	17%	15%	12%	15%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	29%	46%	39%	42%	29%	43%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	63%	34%	50%	40%	59%	40%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	35%	36%	33%	36%	35%	36%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	13%	16%	11%	16%	18%	15%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	65%	87%	67%	84%	69%	83%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	26%	28%	11%	30%	26%	28%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	82%	86%	78%	86%	78%	86%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	59%	47%	69%	47%	53%	49%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	17%	27%	18%	26%	18%

Diversity Analysis - Disability



Key questions (disability analysis) HMP/YOI Littlehey (ADULTS) 2011

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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		43	139
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	99%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	5%	13%
1.8	Is English your first language?	100%	90%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	10%	27%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	4%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	3%	14%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	49%	57%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	39%	41%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72%	74%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	74%	83%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	40%	48%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	32%	47%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	57%	60%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	81%	56%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	93%	91%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	87%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	85%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	71%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	81%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	96%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	49%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

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
	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		
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	69%	60%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	96%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42%	45%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	42%	44%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	49%	57%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	79%	82%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	93%	88%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	67%	51%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	44%	45%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	51%	47%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	47%	45%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	2%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	7%	5%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	65%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	51%	64%
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	79%	84%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	71%	84%
4.19b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	82%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	49%	25%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	17%	4%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	36%	20%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	2%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	10%	1%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	1%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	42%	18%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	2%	4%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	14%	0%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	3%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

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
	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		
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	43%	18%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	32%	15%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	24%	10%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%	36%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	70%	62%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	24%	39%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	77%	45%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	49%	27%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	53%	59%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	16%	22%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	28%	31%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	28%	11%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	57%	36%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	36%	43%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	32%	37%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	16%	15%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	90%	79%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	14%	31%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	86%	85%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	48%	51%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	12%	23%

Diversity Analysis - Sexual Orientation

Key questions (sexual orientation analysis) HMP/YOI Littlehey (ADULTS) 2011

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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		20	162
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	5%	11%
1.8	Is English your first language?	95%	93%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	15%	24%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	4%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	5%	11%
1.13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	31%	23%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	57%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	60%	37%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	73%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	95%	79%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	69%	43%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	78%	39%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	84%	56%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	77%	61%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	95%	91%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	86%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	79%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	80%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	70%	81%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	97%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	67%	46%

Diversity Analysis - Sexual Orientation

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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		
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	78%	60%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	90%	97%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42%	44%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	60%	42%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	60%	53%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	80%	81%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	84%	89%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	83%	52%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	60%	44%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	55%	48%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	40%	47%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	3%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	10%	5%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	58%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	61%
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	90%	81%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	80%	82%
4.19b	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	78%	81%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	40%	30%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	15%	6%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	44%	22%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	3%
5.5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	39%	0%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	3%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	22%	24%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	4%
5.7f	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	16%	0%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	4%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	3%

Diversity Analysis - Sexual Orientation

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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		
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	39%	23%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	17%	19%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	0%	15%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	47%	34%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	78%	63%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	22%	36%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	64%	52%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	37%	32%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	64%	57%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	22%	21%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	37%	30%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	22%	15%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42%	43%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	26%	43%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	37%	36%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	22%	14%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	78%	82%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	42%	26%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	84%	86%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	37%	51%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	22%



Diversity Analysis - Age

Key question responses (age - over 50) HMP/YOI Littlehey (adults) 2011

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		42	141
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	3%	13%
1.8	Is English your first language?	100%	90%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	14%	26%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	5%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	0%	14%
1.13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	36%	20%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	67%	51%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	51%	37%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	83%	70%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	83%	80%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	35%	50%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	35%	46%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	54%	61%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	60%	64%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	88%	93%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	95%	83%

Diversity Analysis - Age

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	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		
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	90%	76%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	68%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	79%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	98%	97%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	50%
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	70%	59%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	95%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	43%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	61%	39%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	62%	53%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	78%	81%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	88%	88%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	44%	59%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	42%	46%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	49%	48%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	40%	48%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	4%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	0%	7%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60%	59%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	68%	58%

Diversity Analysis - Age

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	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		
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	86%	82%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	82%
4.19b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	86%	79%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	26%	32%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	3%	9%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	27%	24%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	4%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	8%	2%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
5.5k	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	10%	2%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	22%	25%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	3%	5%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	4%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	3%
5.7j	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	2%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	22%	25%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	21%	19%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	3%	16%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	46%	31%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	76%	61%

Diversity Analysis - Age

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	36%	35%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	74%	47%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	26%	35%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	49%	60%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	18%	22%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	38%	28%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	15%	14%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	55%	38%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	35%	42%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50%	32%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	18%	15%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	81%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	25%	28%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	82%	85%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	35%	54%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	11%	23%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prisoner's 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		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		164	1998
SECTION 1: General information			
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	81%	87%
3a	Are you sentenced?	100%	86%
3b	Are you on recall?	10%	7%
4a	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	13%	15%
4b	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	7%
5	Do you have six months or less to serve?	45%	38%
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	9%	13%
7	Are you a foreign national?	15%	12%
8	Is English your first language?	87%	91%
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	45%	36%
10	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	5%
11	Are you Muslim?	24%	17%
12	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	1%
13	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	11%
14	Is this your first time in prison?	36%	42%
15	Have you been in more than five prisons this time?	7%	4%
16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	23%	23%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
For the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between prisons:			
1a	Was the cleanliness of the van good/very good?	43%	40%
1b	Was your personal safety during the journey good/very good?	61%	61%
1c	Was the comfort of the van good/very good?	10%	11%
1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	30%	33%
1e	Was the frequency of toilet breaks good/very good?	11%	14%
2	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	3%	6%
3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	62%
4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	85%	83%
4b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	24%	25%
4c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	93%	85%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prison's 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			
1	In the first 24 hours, did staff ask you if you needed help/support with the following:		
1b	Problems with loss of property?	13%	14%
1c	Housing problems?	24%	29%
1d	Problems contacting employers?	10%	12%
1e	Problems contacting family?	52%	56%
1f	Problems ensuring dependants were looked after?	16%	12%
1g	Money problems?	10%	16%
1h	Problems of feeling depressed/suicidal?	37%	48%
1i	Health problems?	58%	60%
1j	Problems in needing protection from other prisoners?	16%	18%
1k	Problems accessing phone numbers?	38%	43%
2	When you first arrived:		
2a	Did you have any problems?	64%	60%
2b	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	16%
2c	Did you have any housing problems?	23%	20%
2d	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	5%	6%
2e	Did you have any problems contacting family?	23%	23%
2f	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	4%
2g	Did you have any money worries?	16%	19%
2h	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	10%	13%
2i	Did you have any health problems?	9%	12%
2j	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	9%
2k	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%	19%
3a	Were you seen by a member of health services in reception?	88%	90%
3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	78%
4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	60%
5	On your day of arrival, were you offered information about any of the following:		
5a	What was going to happen to you?	42%	52%
5b	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	42%	52%
5c	How to make routine requests?	33%	44%
5d	Your entitlement to visits?	36%	55%
5e	Health services?	62%	61%
5f	The chaplaincy?	38%	55%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prison's 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			
6	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:		
6a	A smokers/non-smokers pack?	94%	90%
6b	The opportunity to have a shower?	53%	39%
6c	The opportunity to make a free telephone call?	77%	67%
6d	Something to eat?	66%	80%
7	Within the first 24 hours did you meet any of the following people:		
7a	The chaplain or a religious leader?	22%	44%
7b	Someone from health services?	74%	77%
7c	A Listener/Samaritans?	3%	15%
8	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	8%	10%
9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	85%	78%
10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	88%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	61%	59%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
1	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
1a	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	39%
1b	Attend legal visits?	45%	51%
1c	Obtain bail information?	12%	21%
2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	37%	38%
3	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	61%	52%
3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	70%
3c	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	79%	78%
3d	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	78%	58%
3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	46%	41%
3f	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	66%	57%
3g	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	29%	36%
4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	49%	24%
5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	52%	42%
6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	78%	83%
6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	89%	86%
7	Have you made an application?	93%	84%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prisoner's 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 4: Legal rights and respectful custody continued			
For those who have made an application:			
8a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	67%	60%
8b	Do you feel applications are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	58%	46%
9	Have you made a complaint?	48%	44%
For those who have made a complaint:			
10a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	35%	33%
10b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with promptly (within seven days)?	39%	40%
11	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	26%	25%
10c	Were you given information about how to make an appeal?	28%	28%
12	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	25%	24%
13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	38%	34%
14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44%	48%
15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	41%	55%
16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	20%	16%
16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	17%	18%
13a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	53%
13b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	58%
14	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	44%	42%
15a	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	75%	72%
15b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	67%
SECTION 5: Safety			
1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	31%	37%
2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	15%	15%
4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	18%	21%
5	Since you have been here, has another prisoner:		
5a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	12%
5b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	9%
5c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
5d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%
5e	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%
5f	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	6%
5g	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	7%
5h	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	0%	1%
5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%
5j	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%
5k	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
5l	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	6%
5m	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	4%
5n	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	5%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMPPYOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prison's 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: Safety continued			
6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	28%	24%
7	Since you have been here, has a member of staff:		
7a	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	12%
7b	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	5%
7c	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
7d	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	5%
7e	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%
7f	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	6%
7g	Victimised you because of your sexuality?	1%	1%
7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%
7i	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	3%
7j	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
7k	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	5%
7l	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	4%
7m	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	4%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	32%	33%
9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	17%	27%
10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	17%	19%
11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	11%	19%
SECTION 6: Health services			
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	47%	42%
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	67%	60%
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	21%	17%
1d	Is it easy/very easy to see the optician?	16%	17%
2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	49%	48%
For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:			
3a	The doctor?	64%	61%
3b	The nurse?	72%	64%
3c	The dentist?	66%	45%
3d	The optician?	57%	46%
4	The overall quality of health services?	68%	53%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prison's 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		
Health services continued			
5	Are you currently taking medication?	24%	23%
For those currently taking medication:			
6	Are you allowed to keep possession of your medication in your own cell?	87%	67%
7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	21%	22%
For those with emotional wellbeing/mental health issues, are these being addressed by any of the following:			
8a	Not receiving any help?	50%	43%
8b	A doctor?	3%	26%
8c	A nurse?	3%	19%
8d	A psychiatrist?	16%	21%
8e	The mental health in-reach team?	34%	35%
8f	A counsellor?	3%	9%
9a	Did you have a drug problem when you came into this prison?	22%	30%
9b	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into this prison?	20%	25%
10a	Have you developed a drug problem since you have been in this prison?	3%	5%
For those with drug or alcohol problems:			
11	Do you know who to contact in this prison for help?	78%	83%
12	Have you received any help or intervention while in this prison?	76%	79%
For those who have received help or intervention with their drug or alcohol problem:			
13	Was this intervention or help useful?	82%	82%
14a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	15%	24%
14b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison? (Yes/don't know)	15%	23%
For those who may have a drug or alcohol problem on release, do you know who in this prison:			
15	Can help you contact external drug or alcohol agencies on release?	70%	52%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prison's 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: Purposeful activity			
1	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
1a	A prison job?	29%	42%
1b	Vocational or skills training?	20%	19%
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	50%	37%
1d	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	8%	10%
2ai	Have you had a job while in this prison?	75%	75%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:			
2aii	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	46%	50%
2bi	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	79%	69%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:			
2bii	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	66%	64%
2ci	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	92%	81%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:			
2cii	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	70%	67%
2di	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	70%	64%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:			
2dii	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	54%	54%
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	32%
4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	58%	52%
5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	45%
6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	3%	8%
7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	19%	55%
8	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	27%	24%
SECTION 8: Resettlement			
1	Do you have a personal officer?	72%	73%
For those with a personal officer:			
2	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	50%	60%
For those who are sentenced:			
3	Do you have a sentence plan?	58%	61%
For those with a sentence plan?			
4	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	51%	63%
5	Can you achieve some/all of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	77%	80%
6	Are there plans for you to achieve some/all your targets in another prison?	43%	46%
For those who are sentenced:			
7	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you address your offending behaviour while at this prison?	27%	38%
8	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	20%
9	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	47%	47%
10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	34%
11	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	15%	30%
12	Did you receive one or more visits in the last week?	33%	40%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011	Young Adult prison's 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		
Resettlement continued			
For those who have had visits:			
13	How are you and your family/ friends usually treated by visits staff? (Very well/well)	52%	51%
14	Have you been helped to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	34%	43%
15	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with the following:		
15b	Maintaining good relationships?	9%	17%
15c	Avoiding bad relationships?	7%	12%
15d	Finding a job on release?	20%	32%
15e	Finding accommodation on release?	37%	33%
15f	With money/finances on release?	15%	21%
15g	Claiming benefits on release?	21%	28%
15h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	14%	25%
15i	Accessing health services on release?	10%	17%
15j	Opening a bank account on release?	14%	18%
16	Do you think you will have a problem with any of the following on release from prison?		
16b	Maintaining good relationships?	13%	14%
16c	Avoiding bad relationships?	16%	15%
16d	Finding a job?	56%	47%
16e	Finding accommodation?	42%	29%
16f	Money/finances?	28%	26%
16g	Claiming benefits?	27%	24%
16h	Arranging a place at college/continuing education?	28%	25%
16i	Accessing health services?	13%	12%
16j	Opening a bank account?	25%	17%
For those who are sentenced:			
17	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	56%	56%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, nationality and religion) HMP/YOI Littlehey 2011 (young adults)

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	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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		72	89	23	132	39	123
1.3	Are you sentenced?	99%	100%	96%	100%	98%	100%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	22%	8%			21%	12%
1.8	Is English your first language?	74%	98%	52%	92%	63%	95%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			69%	42%	98%	30%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	3%	0%	2%	0%	2%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	50%	1%	37%	23%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	6%	15%	20%	8%	6%	13%
1.13	Is this your first time in prison?	39%	33%	37%	38%	39%	35%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good on your journey here?	24%	33%	43%	27%	30%	30%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	66%	59%	62%	58%	63%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	79%	91%	70%	87%	82%	86%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	57%	49%	81%	48%	51%	53%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	31%	42%	52%	34%	29%	40%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	59%	59%	71%	56%	61%	58%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	75%	57%	86%	62%	81%	60%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	86%	90%	90%	88%	87%	89%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	65%	86%	58%	80%	58%	83%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	45%	62%	53%	55%	46%	58%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	67%	79%	60%	75%	59%	78%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	90%	71%	87%	73%	90%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	97%	86%	97%	89%	96%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	35%	48%	32%	43%	37%	44%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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						
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	62%	60%	60%	61%	58%	62%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	98%	96%	98%	98%	98%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	46%	47%	32%	50%	46%	47%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	43%	53%	46%	50%	42%	52%
4.5	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	37%	63%	55%	51%	41%	54%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	72%	84%	79%	79%	78%	78%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	88%	91%	90%	90%	86%	91%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	49%	47%	47%	48%	47%	48%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	33%	42%	33%	40%	33%	40%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	23%	60%	32%	47%	22%	51%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	36%	45%	32%	43%	21%	47%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	27%	15%	29%	17%	25%	18%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	19%	14%	10%	17%	30%	12%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	45%	58%	51%	54%	52%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	68%	40%	58%	51%	78%	45%
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	33%	52%	31%	44%	35%	47%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	61%	86%	68%	77%	61%	80%
4.19b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	58%	72%	57%	68%	61%	67%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	32%	29%	42%	29%	35%	29%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	15%	14%	19%	14%	11%	15%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	17%	19%	14%	17%	17%	18%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11%	0%	14%	3%	14%	2%
5.5i	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	8%	0%	10%	2%	11%	1%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	36%	23%	20%	29%	43%	23%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	16%	1%	11%	7%	23%	4%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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						
5.7h	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	11%	1%	0%	7%	23%	1%
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	16%	18%	14%	18%	17%	18%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	25%	11%	14%	17%	34%	12%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	11%	12%	10%	10%	8%	13%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	41%	52%	53%	46%	40%	50%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	64%	69%	64%	68%	73%	66%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	40%	59%	50%	49%	26%	56%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	21%	24%	31%	22%	34%	22%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	18%	21%	25%	20%	31%	18%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	23%	32%	29%	29%	22%	30%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	13%	25%	14%	21%	17%	20%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	56%	45%	71%	47%	52%	49%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	10%	0%	9%	8%	8%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	51%	43%	50%	48%	59%	43%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	61%	56%	57%	58%	62%	57%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	44%	55%	42%	38%	45%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	4%	3%	0%	4%	8%	2%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	13%	24%	10%	21%	19%	19%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	21%	31%	23%	27%	19%	28%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	67%	77%	64%	76%	70%	73%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	49%	46%	40%	50%	53%	46%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	27%	19%	27%	17%	28%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

Key questions (disability analysis) HMP/YOI Littlehey (young adults) 2011

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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		18	142
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.7	Are you a foreign national?	29%	12%
1.8	Is English your first language?	96%	87%
1.9	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	24%	46%
1.1	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	2%
1.11	Are you Muslim?	11%	25%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	27%	37%
2.1d	Was the attention paid to your health needs good/very good?	46%	28%
2.3	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	61%
2.4a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another prison?	77%	87%
3.1e	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems contacting family within the first 24 hours?	56%	52%
3.1h	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with problems of feeling depressed/suicidal within the first 24 hours?	50%	35%
3.1i	Did staff ask if you needed any help/support in dealing with health problems within the first 24 hours?	73%	56%
3.2a	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	63%
3.3a	Were you seen by a member of health care staff in reception?	88%	87%
3.3b	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	76%
3.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	55%
3.7b	Did you have access to someone from health care within the first 24 hours?	82%	72%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	87%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	95%
4.1a	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	41%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

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
	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		
4.3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	56%	60%
4.3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	97%
4.3e	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	47%
4.4	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	56%	50%
4.5	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	73%	49%
4.6a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	82%	78%
4.6b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	95%	88%
4.9	Have you made a complaint?	50%	48%
4.13	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	16%	41%
4.14	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	36%	46%
4.15	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	40%
4.16a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	29%	19%
4.16b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit?	12%	18%
4.17a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	50%
4.17b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	50%
4.18	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	61%	41%
4.19a	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	76%	75%
4.19b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	61%	66%
5.1	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	50%	28%
5.2	Do you feel unsafe in this prison at the moment?	33%	12%
5.4	Have you been victimised by another prisoner?	29%	16%
5.5d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	3%
5.5i	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	0%
5.5j	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	12%	2%
5.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	27%	28%
5.7d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	8%
5.7h	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	0%
5.7i	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	7%

Diversity Analysis - Disability

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
	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		
5.9	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by another prisoner/group of prisoners in here?	24%	16%
5.10	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by a member of staff in here?	17%	18%
5.11	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	23%	10%
6.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	61%	45%
6.1b	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	82%	65%
6.2	Are you able to see a pharmacist?	60%	48%
6.5	Are you currently taking medication?	50%	21%
6.7	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	36%	19%
7.1a	Are you currently working in the prison?	36%	28%
7.1b	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	24%	20%
7.1c	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	60%	48%
7.1d	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	9%
7.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	48%
7.4	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	41%	60%
7.5	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56%	43%
7.6	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	0%	4%
7.7	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	29%	18%
7.8	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	38%	26%
8.1	Do you have a personal officer?	71%	72%
8.9	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	39%	49%
8.10	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	50%	22%