

Report on an announced inspection of

The Military Corrective

Training Centre

11 – 18 January 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy establishment summary	9
1 Safety	17
<hr/>	
2 Respect	27
<hr/>	
3 Purposeful activity	41
<hr/>	
4 Resettlement	47
<hr/>	
5 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	57
<hr/>	
Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	61
II Detainee population profile	62
III Summary of detainee questionnaires and interviews	65

Introduction

We inspect the Military Corrective Training Centre in Colchester, the armed services' central custodial facility, at the request of the Provost Marshal (Army). When we first inspected in 2004, my predecessor noted that although the inspection report painted a generally positive picture, there were a number of concerns. At that time the Centre had a formidable reputation and she noted that some detainees felt depressed or even suicidal on arrival – although the reality quickly dissipated their fears.

Each successive inspection has found that the Centre had improved and this inspection was no exception. A combination of very good relationships, plenty of activity and constructive preparation for the future, whether in the services or as a civilian, made the Centre a very safe and positive place. This was underpinned by effective procedures to ensure detainees were held safely and securely. The Military Corrective Training Centre was now a very impressive establishment. We rated outcomes for detainees as 'good' against each of our healthy custody tests (something we very rarely do) and some aspects now provided a model that other custodial institutions would do well to copy.

The Centre can hold 323 men and women aged 17 and above from all three services and may also hold Civilians Subject to Service Discipline. Eighty-three detainees were held at the time of this inspection – most were young men. Most detainees were held for offences against service discipline that would not be a criminal offence in civilian life – for instance, many had gone absent without leave.

Detainees are organised in two companies – A Company for those returning to active service and D Company for those who will be discharged once they have served their sentence. Detainees awaiting trial or who are to be transferred to a civilian prison are held in the 'Service Custody Platoon' attached to D Company. With a focus on returning detainees to active duty, the Centre properly emphasises adherence to service discipline and procedures and our inspection process recognises that.

Reception, first night and induction processes were very good; detainees' needs were efficiently identified and they were helped to settle with the assistance of detainee 'befrienders' if they wished. There was very little bullying or victimisation and staff were quick to respond to any tension. Incidents of self-harm were also rare and there was good support and monitoring of detainees who were vulnerable. Child protection referrals – which all related to historic concerns or the protection of children in the community – were dealt with well. Security was proportionate and detainees understood and respected the rules which were applied consistently. Consequently force and segregation were seldom used.

At the heart of the Centre's ethos were excellent staff-detainee relationships based on high levels of mutual respect – in the true sense of the word. Staff had high expectations of the detainees in their charge and expected high standards of behaviour and activity. This occurred in a context where, as it was put to me, staff and detainees 'wore the same skin' – staff acknowledged the experience they had in common with detainees, they recognised they might be deployed together in future and they received some of the same instruction. Nearly all detainees said they had a member of staff they could turn to with a problem and the padre was visible and available to detainees (all faiths were well catered for). This positive culture, which had been a feature of A Company (those returning to the services) in all our previous inspections, was now also much apparent in D Company (those who would be discharged).

There were no female detainees held at the time of this inspection and they were only ever held in small numbers. Sensible arrangements had been put in place to prevent them becoming isolated. Detainees from black and minority ethnic groups generally shared the same positive views as the detainee population as a whole, but when concerns had been raised the quality of investigations had been poor. However, effective intervention by the Commandant had addressed the shortcomings. The few foreign national detainees felt isolated and would have liked more opportunity to have contact with others of the same nationality. Health services were good.

Detainees were kept busy with plenty of activity: education and military training for those returning to active duty; education and good quality vocational training for those leaving the services. There was outstanding literacy and numeracy provision and excellent opportunities for detainees to undertake project work outside the Centre for local community groups. Detainees developed good employability skills. Physical education was very good and detainees had opportunities to take part in adventure activities away from the Centre at weekends.

Preparation for return to civilian life for those detainees who were to be discharged was very good and a new needs analysis process was expected to improve this further. Pre-release arrangements were good and the sentence planning process had improved. Detainees had very good help with debt, accommodation and finding a job on release. This included funding short-term bed and breakfast accommodation for those who would be homeless on release and an offer of follow-up advice for six months after detainees had left the Centre. Some detainees had obtained external work placements and were much more positive than before about the help they had been given to obtain employment on release.

The combination of civilian and military law made public protection particularly complex and the system required review to ensure it was sufficiently robust.

Many of those the Centre holds are very well motivated – but their backgrounds and circumstances are similar to those we might find in other forms of custody and the care and skill with which the staff work with them stand comparison with any other establishment we inspect. Some aspects of the Military Corrective Training Centre are not replicable elsewhere: the shared experience of detainees and staff that underpins much of the good relationships and the motivation of many of the detainees are probably unique to a services environment. However, good relationships, the focus of the whole establishment on preparing detainees for release, plenty of good quality activity and care for the vulnerable should be features of any custodial establishment and the Military Corrective Training Centre demonstrates these in full. It is important to remember how far the Centre has come, and the staff are to be congratulated. The future challenge will be to ensure that there is no failure of institutional memory and that the progress that has been made is not forgotten.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2012

Fact page

Background

The Military Corrective Training Centre Colchester (MCTC) is the armed services' only corrective training establishment. The MCTC was established shortly after the Second World War in a hutted camp at Berechurch, which previously held German prisoners of war. In 1988, this was replaced by a new purpose-built facility, which now provides high standard accommodation and facilities. Although under Army command, it is a tri-service establishment with both staff and detainees from the Royal Navy, Army and Royal Air Force. The great majority of staff and detainees are, however, from the Army.

Task of the establishment

MCTC can hold up to 323 male and female detainees, although in practice the population has rarely exceeded 180.

All detainees are held in accordance with the rules determining committal to custody within the Armed Forces Act 2006. The vast majority are serving periods of detention following court martial or a summary hearing by their commanding officers. Most detainees have offended against Armed Forces law (employment rather than criminal law), and few are committed for offences that would have resulted in custody had they been civilians. The centre only receives those who have been sentenced to periods of up to two years' detention.

Those with longer sentences are held at MCTC only briefly on their way to prison. The centre may also hold remanded detainees under investigation who have been committed to the centre because it was judged necessary to hold them in secure conditions. These can include Civilians Subject to Service Discipline located overseas.

The centre has a staff complement of 200, including civilian support staff (180 at the time of the inspection) of whom most are Sergeants and Staff Sergeants of the Military Provost Staff, a branch of the Adjutant General's Corps. They are normally in post for between two and three years.

Area organisation

The Commandant is responsible to the Provost Marshal (Army), Inspector of Service Custody Premises (Army) and Competent Army Authority and Inspectorate for Custody and Detention, who in turn reports to the Adjutant General.

Number held

83 (plus four in post-charge custody)

Certified normal accommodation

323

Operational capacity

323

Date of last full inspection

November 2008

Short description of residential units

The establishment is organised around two companies: A Company holding those returning to the services after their period of detention and D Company holding detainees being discharged from the services and returning to civilian life. Detainees under investigation or awaiting trial or transfer to civilian prison are located in a spur of D Company known as the Service Custody Platoon. D Block, the only

high security facility within the centre, has 17 cells and one unfurnished cell. Currently used for training, D Block remains functional and could be used to accommodate high security detainees if required.

Healthy establishment summary

Introduction

HE.1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police custody.

HE.2 HM Inspectorate of Prisons carries out inspections of the Military Corrective Training Centre by invitation. These inspections mirror the expectations and processes we use to inspect other custodial establishments and we have the same free access to all areas of the establishment, detainees, personnel and records.

HE.3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of detainees, based on the four tests of healthy custody that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. Expectations for the Military Corrective Training Centre are based on our Expectations for prisons, but have been adapted for the context of the centre. The criteria are:

Safety detainees, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect detainees are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

Resettlement detainees are prepared for their release back into the Services or into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

HE.4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for detainees 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 Ministry of Defence or Armed Forces command.

- outcomes for detainees are good against this healthy custody test.

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

- outcomes for detainees are reasonably good against this healthy custody test.

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

- outcomes for detainees are not sufficiently good against this healthy custody test.

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

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

- outcomes for detainees are poor against this healthy custody test.

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

Safety

HE.5 Detainees were being briefed better by their sending units about what to expect at MCTC. New receptions were dealt with sensitively on arrival, including those who arrived after hours. Initial assessments were thorough and detainees were appreciative of the prompt help they received as part of the reception process. Befrienders were an important component of good first night arrangements. Induction had improved. Staff took effective measures to prevent bullying, and detainees said that there was almost no bullying or violence. Vulnerable detainees were well cared for and child protection was managed efficiently. Security was sound and disciplinary procedures were applied fairly to individuals with an appropriate element of discretion. More needed to be done to ensure consistency when elements of judgement and discretion were involved. The use of force and segregation for disciplinary reasons was rare and cool-down rooms were used effectively. All detainees we spoke to said they felt safe at MCTC and, in our survey, detainees reported much more positively than previously about feelings of safety. Outcomes for detainees were good in relation to this healthy custody test.

HE.6 There had been progress in providing detainees with information about MCTC prior to their arrival and an increase in the number who were shown a helpful DVD produced by the centre, although this practice was still not consistently applied by all sending units. Out-of-hours arrivals were common and there were indications that they were increasing. This was usually attributable to lengthy journeys but sometimes because of delays on the part of the sending unit. Detainees who arrived after normal reception times were dealt with well. Detainees were asked about their treatment during escort but there had been no complaints.

HE.7 The majority of detainees said that the reception process was helpful and our survey findings indicated significantly better treatment by reception staff than reported at the previous inspection. Generally detainees appreciated having an early interview with specialists from the welfare department and some spoke highly of the help they had received from the substance misuse counsellor very soon after their arrival. Staff dealing with new arrivals were well briefed about them and did all that was necessary to settle them on their first night. The initial written assessments which formed part of the detainees' assessment records (DARs) that we examined were very good quality. New arrivals were routinely offered the support of detainee befrienders who were available at any time of the day or night. The induction process was comprehensive and included useful input from a range of staff. Our survey findings in this regard were significantly better than the previous inspection survey.

HE.8 Detainees said that there was almost no bullying or victimisation, either by detainees or staff, and physical altercations were very rare. Detainees were frequently asked

about bullying and families were also encouraged to report any concerns. Staff were quick to respond to tension or any suggestion of bullying or victimisation and there were good procedures in place to check property and purchases from the shop to ensure that this was not an avenue for intimidating others.

- HE.9 Incidents of self-harm were rare. Detainees whom we spoke to who had been identified as vulnerable and subject to monitoring said that staff had looked after them very well. Extremely detailed staff handovers and good general monitoring by staff ensured that essential information about vulnerable detainees was shared. There was regular discussion of individual detainees through the detainee management meetings (DMMs) and company meetings but individual care plans were not regularly reviewed with the detainee and individual records did not always reflect the high level of engagement that detainees had had with staff.
- HE.10 Child protection procedures were efficient and the centre was suitably supported by the local safeguarding children board and the local authority who continued to provide expert training. Staff made referrals appropriately and demonstrated a good understanding of child protection. There had never been any allegations of ill treatment by staff at MCTC and the majority of referrals made related to historic abuse disclosed to a trusted member of staff. Detainees who needed it following a disclosure could access therapeutic or specialist counselling services readily.
- HE.11 Security procedures were proportionate to risk and implemented properly. Individual risk assessments as part of the DAR were thorough. There were reasonable arrangements for the clinical treatment of drug or alcohol abuse, but they were rarely needed. Detainees and staff were subject to compulsory drug tests and finds of illegal substances were extremely rare.
- HE.12 Detainees had a very clear understanding of the rules and generally abided by them. The staging system was an effective tool for managing behaviour. Further changes had been made to reduce the time it took to progress to the highest level of the staging system, although it remained unattainable for some detainees on short sentences.
- HE.13 The use of segregation for poor behaviour, either in the Service Custody Platoon or in designated rooms on company lines, was rare but on those rare occasions, segregation was used for the shortest possible time. Staff engaged well with detainees who were segregated with a view to reintegrating them to their company lines as soon as possible. The use of force was only used as a last resort and rarely. There were good checks and balances through the chain of command to ensure that disciplinary procedures in all forms were applied fairly in individual cases, although more needed to be done to analyse overarching patterns and trends to ensure that discretion and judgement were exercised consistently.

Respect

- HE.14 The living environment was clean and decent and detainees were more positive about the food and accessing the telephones. The majority of staff demonstrated a genuinely caring approach towards detainees and detainees valued the help that they received from staff: there was a good level of mutual respect. Good attention was paid to legal rights. Detainees from minority groups felt that they were treated

equitably. Quality checks on investigations into allegations of discriminatory treatment had identified some concerns about the behaviour of some staff. Equality monitoring had improved substantially but needed to be put into use. Detainees' religious beliefs were respected and the help on offer from the padre was well known. Complaints were managed efficiently and detainees reported more favourably with regard to complaints being dealt with fairly. Health services had improved and were good. Outcomes for detainees were good in relation to this healthy custody test.

- HE.15 The environment was very clean and orderly and detainees maintained their rooms in good order commensurate with daily inspections. Access to showers was good for all detainees and our survey indicated significant improvements regarding access to telephones, although those on the lowest level of the staging system complained that it was more difficult for them because they could not use the telephone after 7pm. Detainees said that staff responded promptly to requests and applications for services. Notices on display on company lines were helpful, well displayed and user friendly.
- HE.16 The majority of detainees were very positive about staff and the way they were treated. In our survey, 96% of detainees said that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help if they had a problem, which was significantly better than the previous survey. Detainees generally described staff as friendly with a good level of rapport – similar or better than they experienced in their units. The DAR system provided a comprehensive record of individual needs and enabled instant sharing of information between different departments within the centre. Staff at all levels were knowledgeable about the detainees in their care and appeared genuine in their wish to help them to make progress. This was particularly noteworthy in D Company where the motivation of detainees was likely to be less than A Company detainees. Detainees with particular needs or vulnerabilities received additional help from an allocated personal support officer (PSO) and detainees who had a PSO said that they found them helpful. Consultation arrangements between staff and detainees were very effective and gave them the opportunity to raise any areas of concern or make suggestions for improvement, as they did for example with regard to the food. In our survey, a third of detainees said the food was good, significantly better than at the last inspection. There was a reasonable choice of food and portions were good. The shop stocked a suitable range of goods to meet the needs of detainees.
- HE.17 Detainees were able to make complaints easily and confidentially and they were dealt with quickly and efficiently. Our survey indicated greater detainee satisfaction that complaints were dealt with fairly.
- HE.18 All detainees received early advice about matters relating to their sentence, what would happen to them when they left the centre and how the earned remission scheme operated, and centre staff facilitated access to any legal advice they needed, particularly those in the SCP. There was a problem with detainees in D Company who expected to be discharged having to return to their unit unnecessarily because their papers had not been completed on time. We were told this affected as many as 30% of D Company.
- HE.19 Detainees had free access to religious services and provision was made to cater for minority faiths when the need arose. The Padre was well known to detainees and staff and detainees could speak to him in private whenever they wished to. The padre

attended the weekly detainee management meeting but was not routinely consulted about other meetings at which detainees he might be working with were discussed.

- HE.20 Detainees from minority groups who we spoke to said that staff were fair and equitable in their treatment of them. The first routine quarterly equality and diversity surveys had recently been carried out and this was a good initiative. There were very few complaints about discriminatory treatment but the quality of investigations into those we examined were poor. However, robust action had been taken by the Commandant to address the shortcomings. Equality monitoring had recently improved substantially but there was little evidence of active use of this information to analyse trends, shape policies and influence decisions. Some action had been taken to address isolation for women, who were only ever held in small numbers. However, detainees who belonged to minority nationalities described to us feeling isolated since they did not have opportunities for regular contact with each other for mutual support. There was a staff lead for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender detainees, although little was done to promote the role.
- HE.21 There had been obvious and continuing improvements to health services, since the health department became part of the garrison medical reception station (MRS). Reception screening had improved and the use of Department of Community Mental Health was beneficial. There were clear clinical governance structures and appropriate staffing levels. Medical staff were courteous and professional. They appropriately referred health issues that were outside their own areas of competence and expertise. There was a relevant range of services offered, some on site and others at the MRS or local NHS facilities. Staff were able to respond to clinical incidents effectively. Medicines management was safe and well monitored. Detainees, particularly in D Company, had poor perceptions of the dentist. We were unable to ascertain the exact reasons for this, which needed further exploration. Mental health services were very responsive and well integrated within the centre.

Purposeful activity

- HE.22 Detainees spent a lot of their time out of their rooms and were mostly engaged in purposeful activities. Good efforts had been made to increase the range of recreational activities at the weekend. There was particularly effective planning of detainees' learning, a good range of work and vocational training and success rates were high. Detainees developed good employability skills and gained useful accreditations but more needed to be done to make better use of unit accreditation. There was an excellent range of useful project work in the community and links with local and service community groups were very good. Library and PE provision were good and detainees achieved extremely well on the YMCA course. Outcomes for detainees were good in relation to this healthy custody test.
- HE.23 Detainees had plenty of time out of their rooms and the majority were purposefully occupied for most of the weekdays. Detainees had plenty of opportunities to spend time in the open air and had association daily. Detainees complained that boredom at the weekend was one of the main sources of dissatisfaction, although there was a good and increasing range of activities on offer for them to choose. The small number of detainees in the SCP did not always undertake a full timetable of activity. Although SCP detainees were permitted to attend education and vocational training, subject to risk assessments and availability of places, they were not always actively encouraged

to do so and some felt that A Company military training was not relevant to their needs.

- HE.24 There was a good range of work and vocational training and new provision had been added since the previous inspection. Teaching staff were highly skilled and effective use was made of civilian staff with specific skills, for example on the farm. Resources were good and work and learning environments were clean and tidy and well laid out.
- HE.25 Assessments were thorough and teaching was good overall with some outstanding teaching and learning. Individual learning plans were good quality and well linked to sentence planning. The drop-out rate for courses was extremely low and success rates were high on vocational training and education courses averaging between 80 and 85%. Success rates on literacy and numeracy classes were outstanding at over 90% and commendably had been maintained with the introduction of functional skills.
- HE.26 Detainees developed good employability skills, with particularly high quality work in plastering and plumbing, agriculture and animal husbandry. Most training was accredited to level 1 which worked well for short sentences and provided a good taster for detainees to progress to level 2, into employment or further education when they were released. Better use needed to be made of units of accreditation for detainees on shorter sentences to recognise the skills that they were developing.
- HE.27 There was an excellent range of purposeful project work in the community where detainees developed a range of useful skills. Partnership working was good. Links with local and community groups were particularly good with many staff and detainees participating in brigade sporting events.
- HE.28 Leadership and management of learning and skills were good as was the capacity to improve. Self assessment was nascent but effective, although there was insufficient use of data to support performance. It was impressive that staff and detainees learnt and trained together in some settings.
- HE.29 Library provision was good and the library was well used. The introduction of the library trolley was a good initiative and appreciated by detainees.
- HE.30 There was well structured and effectively delivered physical training for detainees on A Company and appropriate access to recreational training and games for D Company detainees. There was a good range of indoor and outdoor facilities and adventurous training activities to build fitness and skills. Healthy living and nutrition was promoted well through the PE programme. Success rates for the YMCA course were outstanding.

Resettlement

- HE.31 A resettlement needs analysis and improved management information were promising developments but were not being fully used to inform ongoing work on resettlement services. Pre-release arrangements were good and the sentence planning process had improved. The helpful support that was delivered by the welfare department needed to be better integrated with sentence planning. Public protection arrangements needed strengthening. Good attention was paid to all reintegration pathways, with particularly impressive support in relation to accommodation,

employment and offending behaviour programmes. Detainees reported more favourably about pre-release support and maintaining contact with their families. Outcomes for detainees were good in relation to this healthy custodial environment test.

- HE.32 There was a comprehensive and relevant up-to-date resettlement policy. A needs analysis had been carried out, although it had not been used to directly inform the development of the resettlement policy or related services. The resettlement committee met regularly and attendance by centre staff was good and community agencies and other partners usually attended, although not consistently.
- HE.33 With the introduction of a researcher to work on the trends analysis database, the quality and range of management information available had improved overall. However, there were a number of different databases which were not coordinated and did not facilitate easy access to good management information. Some useful management information was not used, for example reasons for detainees going absent without leave. The work that was ongoing with the Regular Forces Employment Association led by the Senior Education Officer to match courses and qualifications with employment prospects looked promising.
- HE.34 There was little mention of foreign national issues in the resettlement committee meetings, although a good level of assistance was provided by welfare staff. Contact with the UK Border Agency had recently improved with a single point of contact now in place.
- HE.35 All detainees had a pre-release meeting with a member of the welfare team to make sure that practical arrangements were in place. There was a lack of coordination between the sentence planning process and the work carried out by the welfare department, which potentially led to missed opportunities or duplication. Good efforts had been made to follow up detainees' progress post release by questionnaires to their units, but return rates were poor. Reintegration leave continued to be used effectively and was appreciated by detainees.
- HE.36 All detainees had a sentence plan and detainees spoke highly of the attention and support they received during the assessment interview. The sentence plans that we examined lacked sufficient detail, although the timetable element was appreciated by detainees.
- HE.37 The combination of military and civilian law made the application of public protection arrangements particularly complex. Centre staff checked the offences of all new arrivals against an agreed checklist to be referred on to the local MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) coordinator, although he expressed a lack of confidence that the referral system was sufficiently robust. This suggested that a joint review of the process was required. We were not assured that detainees who posed a risk to the public were being correctly identified as requiring suitable monitoring, for example of their mail or telephone calls, to manage their risk.
- HE.38 Detainees reported more favourably than they had previously about the help that they had received to prepare for release. Finance and debt problems routinely formed part of all detainees' initial welfare assessment interview. The regimental administrative officer delivered a helpful session on the induction programme and the Citizen's Advice Bureau delivered monthly presentations providing general finance and debt

management information to all detainees. Specialist advice was available to detainees with serious debt problems. Service charities were promoted and the welfare department helped detainees to access grants and other financial help as required.

- HE.39 The accredited thinking skills programme delivered by Essex Probation was targeted according to need and was accessed and completed by an impressive number of detainees. Additional individual work and courses were delivered according to need by the Probation Service and others. Detainees spoke very highly of the benefits of the programmes they had attended.
- HE.40 All detainees had easy access to very effective in-house specialist accommodation advice. Those who did not have settled accommodation to go to were given practical help to obtain short-term provision on release and were also offered follow-up support, although take up was low. Ongoing health needs were well catered for.
- HE.41 There was a particularly purposeful and effective employability programme. There were useful links with a range of external employers and a number of detainees had been able to secure employment. Detainees had access to a useful job search facility which included access to the internet to make applications for jobs. Particularly good use was made of Jobcentre Plus for advice and guidance and to identify employment opportunities.
- HE.42 Visits were well organised. The environment was pleasant, light refreshments were available and staff were polite and helpful to visitors. Accumulated visits were available and family days were firmly established and take up was improving. Centre staff had recently developed a parenting programme and post-course feedback from detainees had been positive. Detainees reported more favourably with regard to the help that they received from staff to maintain contact with their family.

Main concern and recommendation

- HE.43 Concern: Centre staff followed local MAPPAs procedures but the combination of military and civilian law made the application of public protection arrangements particularly complex. We were not assured that the systems in place to refer detainees to the MAPPAs coordinator or, to assess them fully to manage their risk, were sufficiently robust.

Recommendation: A review of public protection procedures should be carried out jointly with the local MAPPAs manager to ensure that risks to the public are being correctly identified and managed, both within the centre and on release.

Section 1: Safety

Escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Detainees transferring to and from the centre are treated safely, decently and efficiently.

- 1.1 There had been improvement in sending units providing detainees with information about the Military Corrective Training Centre (MCTC) and many were being shown a useful DVD about the centre prior to their arrival. Out-of-hours arrivals were common and the centre's own data indicated that they were increasing and were usually attributable to lengthy journeys. However, some could have been avoided by improved cooperation with the sending unit. Detainees had no complaints about their treatment under escort.
- 1.2 MCTC had provided written information and a useful DVD about the centre for sending units to give detainees prior to arrival, although not all units did so. In our survey, only 14% of detainees said that they had received the written information, but the centre's survey of 477 new arrivals showed that 74% had been given a verbal briefing prior to arrival and 65% had been shown the DVD. Detainees we spoke to confirmed this. Detainees who had not seen it were able to view the DVD in the reception area before being taken to the company lines.
- 1.3 It was common for detainees to arrive outside normal reception hours and the centre's survey indicated that 45% did so and that this was an increasing trend. This was usually attributable to lengthy journeys but reception staff said that in some cases late arrivals could have been avoided if administrative arrangements by the sending units had been completed earlier in the day.
- 1.4 Detainees usually arrived at the centre in hire cars with two members of staff, and female detainees were always escorted by at least one female staff member from her unit. Detainees were routinely asked on arrival about their treatment during escort but there had been no complaints. Detainees we spoke to had no complaints about their treatment during escort, which included comfort breaks and meals as necessary.

Early days in detention

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.5 Most detainees said that the reception process was helpful and they appreciated the early interviews with specialist services. The initial written assessments (detainees' assessment records) that we examined were of very high quality. New arrivals were routinely offered the support of detainee befrienders who were available during the day and night. Staff were well briefed about new arrivals and there was a good level of monitoring on the first night to ensure

their safety and well being. The induction process was comprehensive and detainees reported more positively about the usefulness of induction than at the previous inspection.

- 1.6 The majority of detainees in our focus groups said that the reception process had been helpful. In our survey, 79% of detainees said they had been treated well or very well in reception against 54% in our previous survey.
- 1.7 Information from sending units about new detainees was sent to the centre prior to their arrival and read by reception staff in order to prepare for new arrivals. The quality of information varied and the centre was working with sending units to try to improve it.
- 1.8 Reception procedures that we observed were conducted sensitively and searches were conducted discreetly in the presence of one of the escort staff. Detainees who arrived during the day were seen by welfare and health care staff as a standard part of the reception procedures or the following day if they arrived out of hours (see also health care section). Comprehensive initial risk assessments, including a room-sharing risk assessment, were carried out and recorded on the detainees' assessment records (DARs), regardless of their time of arrival. Sources of help and support were explained and offered to the detainee and a number of our survey results indicated that this was more thorough than at the time of the previous inspection. The welfare interview was appreciated and some detainees spoke of the useful help they had received from a substance misuse counsellor shortly after their arrival. The DAR interview that we observed was conducted thoroughly and sensitively and addressed the detainee's concerns, and detainees we spoke to described a similarly sensitive reception experience. One particularly vulnerable detainee told us that the quality of this initial interview had reassured him that the centre was a safe place and had given him the confidence to raise the concerns he had. In our survey, 90% of detainees said that they felt safe on their first night in the centre.
- 1.9 All new arrivals were located in a first night room on A Company which had been properly prepared. They were offered a free telephone call and a hot meal. Staff were well briefed about new detainees and there was a good level of monitoring to ensure their safety and wellbeing. New arrivals were routinely offered the support of detainee befrienders who were available at any time of the day or night. Befrienders told us that they continued to offer ongoing informal support to some detainees throughout their detention. The befrienders' service was well established with a clear set of operational instructions, but befrienders had not been trained to carry out their role and they did not receive ongoing support or supervision from staff to assist them to carry out this important role.
- 1.10 The comprehensive induction process included individual sessions with dedicated induction officers, visits to specialist services and a group programme covering all relevant areas. A clear booklet explained what detainees needed to know about the centre and a range of notices on display gave further information. All detainees were interviewed by the Commandant within 48 hours of their arrival. In our survey, 68% said that the induction course covered everything they needed to know about the centre against 48% in our 2008 survey.
- 1.11 The recent introduction of a post-induction questionnaire about early experiences, based on our survey, was an effective quality assurance measure.

Recommendation

- 1.12 Appropriate training and ongoing support should be provided to detainees acting as befrienders.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels and is safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Detainees at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, detainees and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

- 1.13 There was a comprehensive anti-bullying policy. Detainees reported that there was very little bullying or victimisation by staff or other detainees and that they felt safe. Physical altercations were very rare and staff responded quickly to tension or any suggestion of bullying or victimisation. Good efforts were made to consult detainees about bullying or victimisation and checks were made, for example property checks, for any evidence that it was taking place. There were efficient procedures for the management of detainees who victimised others on the rare occasions that they were identified, as well as support for those who were the subject of any victimisation.
- 1.14 The quarterly anti-bullying committee, chaired by the Deputy Commandant, was well attended, including detainee representatives. The committee had oversight of the implementation of the comprehensive anti-bullying policy which reinforced the zero tolerance approach to bullying.
- 1.15 Detainees we spoke to said they felt safe at the centre and, in our survey, only 6% of detainees said they had ever felt unsafe against 22% in our previous survey. Detainees confirmed that there was very little bullying or victimisation by staff or other detainees although comments made by staff and detainees, described by detainees as banter about different cultures, sometimes caused offence. Physical altercations were rare. Detainees said that staff were very quick to respond to tensions or any suggestion of bullying or victimisation. There were good procedures for checking that detainees were not intimidated by others for their property and purchases from the shop. The centre carried out a regular anti-bullying survey which was completed by most detainees and confirmed that there was very little bullying at the centre.
- 1.16 Families were encouraged to report any concerns they had about detainees and were able to do so confidentially if they wished. There were notices about contacting the welfare department and 'concerns' forms were available in the visits waiting area and in the visits hall. Envelopes were available to keep them private and there were boxes to place them in which were kept locked and opened by the welfare department. The availability of concerns forms was also flagged up in the visits information sent to families.
- 1.17 There was a clear system in place to manage detainees who were perpetrators or victims of bullying, but it was rarely used. During 2011 there had only been six incidents of identified bullying. All these incidents had been appropriately addressed using the lowest level of sanctions and interventions. All perpetrators had an intervention plan which was monitored at weekly company meetings and victims were offered support by a personal support officer.

- 1.18 Fighting was very rare and usually ceased when a verbal instruction was given by a member of staff. Force had only been used once in the previous six months to separate a fight.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.19 Incidents of self-harm were rare but there was a high level of awareness of the potential vulnerability of detainees and detainees with concerns were well supported. Detainees whom we spoke to who had been identified as vulnerable said that staff had looked after them very well and they had found their personal support officer helpful. Vulnerable detainees were discussed regularly at detainee management meetings (DMM) and company meetings but individual care plans were not regularly reviewed with the detainee. There were insufficient data on the use of anti-ligature clothing and special observation rooms.
- 1.20 Staff demonstrated a good deal of understanding in relation to the range of problems experienced by detainees. The initial DAR interview was used effectively to identify concerns and open up avenues of support for detainees to share their anxieties with specialist staff and staff on company lines. The exchange of information at staff handovers about vulnerable detainees that we observed was extremely detailed. In our survey, 96% of detainees said there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem against 84% in the previous survey.
- 1.21 Detainees who had been assessed as vulnerable and who were subject to monitoring were reviewed weekly at the company meetings and the DMM, chaired by the Commandant, to agree the appropriate level of support and care needed. The DMM meeting that we observed demonstrated an appropriate level of discussion and consideration of each individual and actions that were needed to help them, but this did not involve a review and update of individual care plans. Detainees identified as vulnerable were allocated a personal support officer (PSO). Records that we examined showed that PSOs engaged well with detainees who spoke positively of the support they received from them. There were other avenues of support including the Samaritans, Befrienders and counselling services.
- 1.22 Nine detainees had been placed on the highest level of support and observation – blue star – in the six months prior to the inspection, most because of concerns by staff. There had been one self-harm incident over the same period involving an overdose of drugs which had not proved to be serious. Detainees we spoke to who had been subject to monitoring were very positive about the support and encouragement they had received from staff. One detainee who said he had been particularly distressed on his arrival was now looking forward to a new career on leaving and told us: 'They couldn't do enough for me, they brought the best out in me'.
- 1.23 Although overall support for the most vulnerable detainees was good, there were procedural frailties in the documentation, and information in the records was inconsistent and sometimes lacked the detail of the engagement that detainees had clearly had with staff. The concerns and issues faced by detainees were described clearly, but few assessments adequately described the triggers which might increase the likelihood of self-harm, and initial plans to

outline immediate actions which were needed to reduce the risks identified were lacking. The staff observation records showed helpful, appropriate engagement with the PSO, but comments from other staff lacked detail. All the detainees had care plans, but they were not regularly reviewed and updated with the detainee to ensure their effectiveness.

- 1.24 We were told that the use of anti-ligature clothing was rare and had to be authorised by the Commandant, with a record kept in individual files. However, there were no data readily available to show how often it had been used. We were also told that special observation rooms next to the company lines office were used regularly for vulnerable detainees, although there was no record of frequency of use or monitoring which was only recorded in the company observation books.

Recommendation

- 1.25 Care plans should be regularly reviewed with input from the detainee as well as appropriate staff.

Housekeeping points

- 1.26 The use of anti-ligature clothing and the special observation rooms should be monitored.
- 1.27 Staff observations should include frequent and good quality entries which demonstrate a good level of interaction and engagement with detainees.

Child protection and child welfare

Expected outcomes:

The centre promotes the welfare of detainees under the age of 18 and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect, including maltreatment by adults and others in a position of authority.

- 1.28 There was a comprehensive child protection policy and guidance and regular safeguarding children meetings, which were reasonably well attended. The centre continued to be suitably supported by the local safeguarding children board and the local authority. Child protection procedures were efficient: staff made referrals appropriately and demonstrated a good understanding of child protection. There had never been allegations of ill-treatment by staff and the majority of referrals related to disclosures of historic abuse made to staff or concerns for children in the community. Therapeutic and specialist counselling services were available for detainees who needed it following a disclosure. Very few young people under the age of 18 were sent to MCTC but good attention was paid to their needs.

- 1.29 There was a comprehensive child protection policy and guidance that had been agreed with the Essex Safeguarding Children Board (ESCB). The policy outlined the risks to detainees under the age of 18 years and described how to recognise abuse and neglect and how to make a child protection referral and actions that would follow. It also included the respective roles and responsibilities of the centre staff and child protection agencies and how they would work together. The MCTC quarterly Safeguarding Children Board chaired by the Commandant

was responsible for governance. There was reasonable attendance at these meetings by centre staff, and attendance by local authority representatives had recently improved. The implementation of the policy was supported by an ongoing training programme for all staff that had been approved by the ESCB. Staff we spoke to were familiar with the policy and related procedures.

- 1.30 The head of the welfare department attended ESCB meetings on behalf of the centre and other welfare staff attended appropriate standing committees. There was evidence of good contact with the ESCB and the local authority who continued to deliver expert child protection training to centre staff.
- 1.31 The number of detainees under the age of 18 years held at the centre had decreased and there had been only one young person under the age of 18 at the centre in the previous six months. A personal support officer had been allocated to him and a care plan devised, but there was no evidence in the records that the plan had been regularly reviewed (see also suicide and self-harm prevention section). Good work had been undertaken by the welfare department to ensure that his local authority offered appropriate support to him when he was released.
- 1.32 Child protection referrals were made appropriately and showed that staff had a good understanding of child protection. There had never been any allegations of ill treatment by staff at the centre. The majority of child protection referrals related to historical abuse and a small number concerned allegations of children being at risk in the community. Many disclosures were made to staff on company lines, often during DAR interviews, which indicated the level of trust that detainees had in staff. Timely referrals were made to the relevant local authorities. Detainees who disclosed historical abuse were offered quick access to therapeutic or specialist counselling services and a good number accepted the offer.

Security

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective intelligence security as well as positive staff-detainee relationships. Detainees are safe from exposure to substance misuse while detained.

- 1.33 Security procedures were proportionate to risk and implemented appropriately. Individual risk assessments were thorough. Dynamic security, based on effective staff-detainee relationships, was excellent. Detainees and staff were subject to compulsory drug tests and finds of illegal substances were very rare.
- 1.34 Security procedures were rigorous, although proportionate to risk. Detainee management meetings were used effectively to share relevant security intelligence. Only in exceptional circumstances were detainees denied access to activities due to poor behaviour. Some detainees were not allowed access to weapons on the advice of mental health professionals.
- 1.35 Individual risk assessments as part of the DAR process were thorough and detainees who were considered a security or escape risk were placed on observation and allocated a personal support officer. These detainees were escorted by a member of staff at all times and the front gates of the centre were closed if they were involved in movements outside company lines.

- 1.36 Dynamic security was excellent underpinned by open, effective engagement between staff and detainees, purposeful activity and a sound complaints system. Detainees and their property were thoroughly searched when they entered or left the centre. We received mixed responses from staff about their understanding of the need for cultural awareness when searching detainees.
- 1.37 Rooms were randomly searched and three items associated with the use of drugs or alcohol had been found in the previous six months. A minimum of 15 detainees were randomly drug tested each month. Staff were also randomly drug tested although none had proved positive. Of the 282 tests of detainees carried out in the last 12 months, there had only been one positive result and finds of illegal substances were very rare.

Housekeeping point

- 1.38 The cultural sensitivities of searching detainees should be made explicit in staff training.

Staging system

Expected outcomes:

Detainees understand the purpose of the staging system and how to progress through it. The staging system provides detainees with incentives and rewards for effort and performance. The system is applied fairly, transparently and consistently.

- 1.39 The staging system was an effective tool for managing behaviour, which was understood by detainees and staff. The system was transparent and fair and offered sufficient incentive for detainees to want to progress, although those on short sentences were prevented from achieving the highest level of the staging system.
- 1.40 Detainees were told about the staging system during induction and there was clear information on notice boards about how the system worked. Staff and detainees showed a good understanding of how it operated. Detainees appeared to value the increased trust placed in them at each level of the staging system, for example not being locked up at night, having greater unescorted movement around the centre and access to telephones later in the evening. Other incentives included a higher weekly allowance to spend in the shop and opportunity at the top level for town visits on Sundays.
- 1.41 Although most detainees progressed over a period of weeks, it was possible to be downgraded following one act that contravened a rule, although this would only take place following a review with the Company Sergeant Major. Staff used appropriate discretion to allow detainees who had been downgraded the opportunity to regain their status at the earliest opportunity. There was no routine monitoring of the system for consistency of application, but the built-in checks and balances enabled anomalies in individual scores or comments to be identified (see also section on disciplinary procedures).
- 1.42 Detainees were given written copies of their daily performance scores which they could discuss with staff who had made comments about them. 'Recommends' were awarded in accordance with the detainee's performance and behaviour and the number of recommends determined progress or otherwise within the staging system. Detainees at risk of being downgraded following a decrease in scores were interviewed by the Company Sergeant Major

before a decision was made. Appeals were considered by the officer commanding the company.

- 1.43 The time that it took to reach the highest level of the staging system had been reduced since the previous inspection and there was no restriction on the number of detainees who could reach the higher levels, although in reality, progression opportunities for those serving shorter sentences were limited.

Disciplinary procedures

Expected outcomes:

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

1.44 Detainees had a very clear understanding of the rules and generally abided by them. There were good checks and balances in the chain of command to ensure that rules and disciplinary procedures were applied fairly in individual cases. However, analysis of overarching patterns and trends was needed to ensure that discretion and judgement were exercised consistently. Force was used very rarely and only as a last resort. Records that we examined showed good de-escalation. Cool-down rooms on company lines were used infrequently for very short periods and to good effect. Monitoring arrangements had improved and were very thorough. There was very little use of either the Service Custody Platoon (SCP) or designated rooms on company lines to segregate detainees for poor behaviour.

1.45 Detainees were reminded weekly of the rules of the establishment which they understood, and they were generally compliant. Rules and policies were displayed on notice boards on the company lines. There was evidence that staff only used formal disciplinary procedures as a last resort and that assessments of a detainee's vulnerability were taken into consideration. Detainees confirmed to us that they were given warnings if their behaviour was considered unacceptable before formal action was taken. Most poor behaviour was managed through the staging system or the loss of earned remission from their sentence for those to whom it was applicable. There were good checks and balances through the chain of command to ensure that all disciplinary procedures, and the staging system, were applied fairly to individuals. However, more needed to be done to collect data and analyse overarching patterns and trends to ensure that discretion and judgement were exercised consistently. Detainees were aware of avenues for complaint and appeal if they felt they had not been fairly treated.

1.46 Serious charges of indiscipline were rare and were adjudicated upon by the Commandant unless they were considered too serious when they were referred to an independent adjudicator for a court martial. During the previous six months, three matters had been adjudicated by the Commandant and four dealt with by court martial, two of which involved the same detainee. Records of these cases had been archived and were not available to inspectors. However, there were clear procedures for dealing with such cases, with due regard to the rights of the defendant, and there was no evidence to suggest that these had not been followed. Detainees appearing in front of the Commandant could be represented by a member of staff of their choice and those being court martialled were offered legal representation. Punishments were proportionate and often involved the detainee carrying out extra work on company lines.

The use of force

- 1.47 The use of force was rare and there had been only two incidents in the previous year, both of which had been to separate detainees who were fighting. There were comprehensive records of these incidents which showed that force had been used as a last resort and included good de-escalation which had ended the incidents quickly. The documentation had been scrutinised and signed off by a senior custody officer.
- 1.48 Detainees were seen by medical staff soon after the incident and their company's commanding officer spoke to them. The detainee involved in the most recent use of force incident had spent a short time segregated in the 'cool-down' room on his company lines before his adjudication by the Commandant.
- 1.49 The 'cool-down' rooms were clean and well maintained. They were rarely used but when they were it was usually for short periods. Monitoring arrangements were good and records indicated that staff carried out 15-minute checks on detainees and that they engaged well with them. The shortest period of time in a 'cool-down' room over the previous six months had been 15 minutes and the longest three hours.

Segregation and the Service Custody Platoon

- 1.50 The Service Custody Platoon (SCP) was a separate unit with its own set of orders and discrete staff group, sited adjacent to D Company and part of D Company chain of command. It held in the main detainees on remand waiting for court martial hearings and occasionally those waiting to be transferred to Prison Service accommodation, usually HMP Chelmsford. Very rarely, detainees were placed there for short periods of segregation for poor behaviour in the centre. Since July 2011, 42 detainees had been admitted to the SCP, of whom only one had been segregated for disciplinary reasons.
- 1.51 Detainees who displayed poor behaviour were segregated as a last resort and it was rare. When a decision was made to separate a detainee from others because of poor behaviour, a risk assessment was carried out to determine the risk they posed to others, where they should be located and what activities they could take part in. Staff told us that segregation on company lines for a short period was always the preferred option if possible. Only three detainees had been segregated for poor behaviour since July 2011. Two had been segregated in designated rooms on company lines and one had been detained in the SCP.
- 1.52 All segregated detainees were allocated a personal support officer (PSO) and records indicated good engagement between the PSO and the detainee. The records of the detainee who had been most recently segregated in the SCP for poor behaviour showed that he had been visited on average three times a day by his PSO who had recorded a good level of detail about their discussions. The detainee had also been visited regularly by his commanding officer, but the detail of this contact had not been recorded.
- 1.53 Detainees segregated for poor behaviour, both in the SCP and on company lines, were expected to complete work books, with the assistance of the PSO. Some of the work books that we examined showed that the detainee had good insight into his behaviour. Individual records did not include risk assessments or indicate what activities segregated detainees engaged in, but we were told that most were permitted to attend activities with A Company. Of the three most recently segregated detainees, only one had not been permitted to attend activities with A Company and the learning and skills department had provided him with an education pack to be completed in his room. The extent of their segregation was that

detainees were not permitted to associate with detainees from company lines in the evenings or weekends or at mealtimes, although they were able to associate with each other as a group. SCP and company staff ensured that segregated detainees were able to use showers and have access to the telephone and exercise.

- 1.54 It was evident from records we examined that good efforts had been made to plan a gradual reintegration to ensure that detainees were separated from others for the shortest possible period and returned to their rooms in their company as soon as possible.

Housekeeping point

- 1.55 Records for segregated detainees should include a daily record of all contacts made with them, the activities they have engaged in and risk assessments leading to decisions made about them.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

Detainees with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their detention.

- 1.56 There were reasonable arrangements for the clinical treatment of drug or alcohol abuse, but they were rarely needed. Counselling was available and all detainees received harm minimisation advice on arrival and discharge from the centre.
- 1.57 In our survey, 6% of detainees said that they had had a problem with drugs and 18% with alcohol on arrival at the centre. There was a comprehensive drugs and alcohol detoxification policy but it was rarely used. Detainees who showed any signs of withdrawal were admitted to the medical reception station for care.
- 1.58 All new arrivals were seen within the first few days by the welfare officer who discussed drugs and alcohol with detainees. The initial health assessment also included drug and alcohol use. If detainees were in agreement, staff referred them to a drugs and alcohol counsellor from the local community who provided two sessions a week at the centre. During the previous year the counsellor had seen 142 clients. In our survey, 60% of detainees with a drug problem and 70% of those with alcohol issues said they had received assistance. One detainee commented that: 'the alcohol help is great – better than my unit'.
- 1.59 Detainees and staff were subject to compulsory drug tests. Seven staff at the centre were able to carry out the tests and they aimed to test at least 15 detainees a month, including those who had been on home leave or had just arrived. During the previous 12 months, 282 tests of detainees had been carried out and there had only been one positive result. Finds of illegal substances were very rare.

Section 2: Respect

Company lines

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The company lines were maintained in good order. All dormitories had en suite showers and toilets and detainees had their own lockable cupboards. Suitable clothing and bedding was provided and there were good laundry arrangements. Company line rules were clearly displayed. There were sufficient telephones and no restriction on mail.
- 2.2 All dormitories and communal areas were well lit and ventilated, clean, tidy and well decorated. Daily inspection and a good supply of cleaning products encouraged detainees to maintain high standards of cleanliness and tidiness in their dormitories. Staff supervision was effective. Each dormitory had a functioning call bell and en suite showers and toilet which were clean and in good working order. All detainees had their own lockable cupboard. Detainees described the environment as quiet at night. Drinking water was available 24 hours a day. Personal hygiene products were available free of charge and these could be supplemented with purchases from the shop.
- 2.3 All clothing of the correct size was provided by the centre and there was a good laundry facility which could be used daily, with weekly changes of bedding.
- 2.4 A number of clear, helpful notices were displayed throughout the centre. Company line rules and routines were clearly displayed in all dormitories and these were read to detainees on arrival and weekly thereafter.
- 2.5 A formal room-sharing risk assessment was in place and the majority of detainees we spoke to reported feeling very safe on company lines, describing the staff as extremely supportive. At the time of the inspection, there were no female detainees at the centre. We were shown two-bedded dormitories for female detainees of a similar standard to the other dormitories and we were told that they were able to work and associate with other detainees with appropriate supervision.
- 2.6 Detainees said that the application process was informal and did not give rise to any problems. There were four telephone booths within the company lines which afforded privacy. This was sufficient to meet the entitlements of detainees and no undue delays or queues were seen or reported.
- 2.7 There was no restriction on the quantity of mail that could be sent or received by detainees, which they funded themselves. They were permitted one letter each week at public expense. Incoming mail was opened, but not read, in front of the detainee to check for unauthorised enclosures. Mail was posted or distributed within 24 hours of receipt.
- 2.8 Personal property was securely stored within the centre. There were few requests to access the property, most of which would not have been authorised in the centre.

Staff-detainee relationships

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their detention, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

- 2.9 Staff knew the detainees well and maintained positive, supportive relationships with them. Consultation meetings were effective and extra staff support was provided when needed. The welfare staff provided good back-up and a new IT-based case records system was beginning to make information about detainees more readily available.
- 2.10 Staff on the company lines showed detailed knowledge of and real concern for the state of mind and progress of detainees in their care. In our survey, 96% of detainees said that they could turn to a member of staff in case of need against 84% at the previous inspection. Although there were some exceptions who complained about staff attitudes, the majority of detainees described good relationships with staff and on the whole detainees felt that staff attitudes were similar to or more positive than they experienced in their own units. We observed staff and detainees relating to each other in a courteous and friendly way in their day-to-day exchanges. At the same time, inappropriate conduct was challenged. Detainees were encouraged and supported to take responsibility for their own progress and were invited to write comments on the weekly reports submitted on them. The reports contained constructive staff comments about the detainee's progress and many staff took the initiative to motivate and engage with detainees, particularly in D Company.
- 2.11 Detainees were positive about the consultation process. The monthly consultation meeting which we observed was conducted with openness, vigour and good humour and detainees contributed their views freely. It was helpful and appropriate that these meetings were led and mainly attended by staff who were not responsible for discipline.
- 2.12 Personal support officers (PSOs) were allocated only to detainees who had been identified with particular risks or needs (see sections on self-harm and suicide prevention and discipline). Personal support for other detainees if required was provided by groups of named Sergeants who were responsible for each of the seven platoons and this arrangement was understood by detainees. In our survey, less than a quarter of detainees said that they had a PSO but, of those who did, 89% against 49% at the previous inspection said that their personal officer was helpful. Staff were alert to detainees who did not attend activities other than training/education/workshops or appeared not to be talking during meals. One detainee said that staff were 'brilliant' and sensed if a detainee wanted to be left alone or preferred to chat and joke.
- 2.13 A flexible approach was taken to meeting detainees' needs: the welfare service enabled detainees of any rank to talk about personal issues and the work of welfare staff was appreciated. The welfare officer had a mature and sensitive approach to the needs of specific groups, particularly female detainees. A web-based detainee management system had recently been introduced and, although it was not yet live, was beginning to collect comprehensive information about detainees. The detainee assessment record system continued to provide a thorough record of personal and offence details and of the risks and criminogenic needs associated with each detainee. It also facilitated instant sharing of information between different departments and between the centre and other service detention facilities. This was providing a more comprehensive overview of the detainee to enable staff to make better informed decisions about their care.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The centre promotes a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no detainee is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality.

2.14 Detainees reported that staff treated them fairly. Equality and diversity priorities were served by appropriate structures. However, a firmer strategy was needed covering all areas of equality, including the use of monitoring and impact assessments. The standard of investigations into the small number of complaints relating to equality and diversity issues were poor but appropriate action had been taken to address this shortcoming. Foreign national detainees felt isolated and there was little active support for any gay or bisexual detainees, but the small number of women and civilians detained had been well looked after.

Strategic management

- 2.15 At the time of the inspection, 90% of detainees were white British. Detainees from minority groups said that staff treated them fairly and that any banter from other detainees focussed mainly on regional differences within the UK. They felt confident that staff would challenge and take action if the banter went too far.
- 2.16 The Deputy Commandant had overall responsibility for equality and diversity and there were three trained equality and diversity advisers on the staff. All staff had received equality and diversity training and an annual refresher module. An equality and diversity committee met each quarter. A useful detainee survey had been distributed, receiving a 41% return rate, and was being analysed at the time of the inspection. This was programmed to be a quarterly exercise, but it needed a more specific focus on equality and diversity issues.
- 2.17 There is a general exemption of the Armed Forces from the Equality Act 2010. While the short equality policy mentioned the main minority groups represented in the centre, it did not provide principles or guidance to ensure equality of outcomes for detainees with the protected characteristics defined in the 2010 Equality Act.
- 2.18 Equality monitoring had improved substantially in recent months but there was little evidence that this information was used to analyse trends, develop policies and influence decisions.
- 2.19 Impact assessment screening had been carried out on all standing orders and new policies and this was continuing, but no policy had been identified as needing a full impact assessment since the previous inspection.
- 2.20 Only one complaint about discriminatory behaviour had been recorded as such during the previous 12 months. We came across another complaint concerning discriminatory language which had not been categorised as an equality and diversity issue. The reports into the investigations indicated a serious lack of understanding of equality and diversity. However, the two complaints had been reported at consecutive DMM meetings and, although there were no further entries which formed part of the complaint records, robust action had been taken by the

Commandant against the perpetrators of the discriminatory behaviour and shortcomings of the investigations had been brought to the attention of the investigating officers.

- 2.21 The few foreign national detainees felt isolated as they were distributed among different platoons and did not have regular contact with each other for mutual support. Over the previous 18 months, foreign nationals had formed approximately 6% of the population. Almost all detainees spoke English fluently, although Gurkha detainees sometimes had difficulty and Gurkha staff were able to interpret when necessary. Staff had established contact with a community Fijian group and visits were planned.
- 2.22 During the previous 18 months, there had been 16 female detainees in the centre. To ameliorate feelings of exposure and isolation, women who would normally have been located in separate companies were permitted to share accommodation. A pregnant woman had been detained for the first time in the preceding year.
- 2.23 A few civilians were occasionally held at the centre and there had been 17 in the previous 18 months. These were managed appropriately, normally within the company lines if they were recent ex-service personnel, or in the Service Custody Platoon if they were family members of service personnel.
- 2.24 There was still a staff member who led on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) issues, but no specific provision was made for LGBT detainees. Welfare staff said that gay detainees were regularly held at the centre and they made no secret of their sexual orientation and that detainees were generally tolerant of different sexualities.
- 2.25 The shop catered for minority requirements, including products for women. Peer support for minority groups was limited to the generic peer supporters and there were no equality representatives.

Recommendations

- 2.26 A comprehensive equality and diversity policy should set out principles and standards for the treatment of detainees under each of the protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010, including strategies for engagement and consultation and regular surveys focussing on equality issues.
- 2.27 Detainee representatives should be appointed for the minority groups defined in the Equality Act 2010.
- 2.28 Detainees of the same nationality should be able to associate together.

Housekeeping points

- 2.29 Equality monitoring information should be used to analyse trends and develop policies.
- 2.30 Full impact assessments should be carried out each year on a sample of policies and practices on the basis of risk.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

2.31 Most detainees who declared a religion described themselves as Christian and had access to a full-time padre and a well-appointed chapel. Members of other faiths had access to a small multi-faith room and to religious leaders as required. The padre was a regular visitor to the company lines and offered support to all detainees but he did not attend meetings or reviews relating to the care of individual detainees.

2.32 At the time of the inspection, the majority of detainees who had declared a religion were Christians and just under a quarter had declared no religion. There was a full-time Church of England padre and a Roman Catholic officiating chaplain visited weekly to conduct Mass. There were no other religious leaders in regular attendance and members of minority faiths were supported by civilian chaplains to the military who either visited the centre on request or talked to detainees by telephone. A Muslim detainee had been provided for during Ramadan and facilities for a Sikh detainee had been satisfactory, including contact with the local Sikh community. In our survey, 56% of detainees said that their religious beliefs were respected against the 2008 comparator of 42%. Detainees were asked about their religion when they arrived and the padre had a regular slot in the induction programme to describe the support available to detainees. The induction guide given to detainees included information about the faith facilities, including the names and contact details for other faith leaders. The padre visited the company lines regularly and detainees could apply individually to see him or approach him informally. In our survey, 71% of detainees said they were able to speak to the padre or a chaplain of their faith in private compared with 50% in our 2008 survey.

2.33 The padre attended the weekly detainee management meeting but was not routinely consulted about other meetings at which detainees he might be working with were discussed.

2.34 The weekly Christian services took place in an attractive chapel. All detainees were welcome to attend, and services did not coincide with other activities. The chapel offered an alpha club on Sunday afternoons for members of the community and detainees to discuss spirituality and personal faith. This did not extend to outreach activities and there was no means of linking detainees to faith groups in the areas they moved to after leaving the centre. A small multi-faith room on A Company was available for use by all detainees for reflection, prayer or group worship, but we were told this was rarely used.

Recommendation

2.35 The padre should be consulted about detainees he is involved with at appropriate times, for example reviews of vulnerable detainees on observation or when sentence plans are discussed.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.36 Complaints could be made in confidence and were dealt with efficiently. Effective quality assurance was in place and our survey indicated that detainees had greater confidence that complaints were dealt with fairly.
- 2.37 Detainees were given laminated cards containing useful information on how to make complaints. Complaints procedures were advertised on notice boards and this included information about appeals and the separate process for making medical complaints. Information on complaining to the Service Complaints Commissioner was also available. Complaint forms and envelopes were freely available.
- 2.38 Complaints could be made through the chain of command, or more formally to the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB), the Service Visiting Officer (SVO) or the Commandant. Detainees selected who to address their complaint to and written complaints were placed in sealed envelopes in locked boxes which were located away from the company gate and staff sightlines which ensured a good level of confidentiality. The boxes were opened daily by a member of the welfare department and distributed appropriately. A member of headquarters staff opened the boxes in the presence of the SVO on their weekly visit to collect complaints addressed for their attention and the SVO investigated these while on site, beginning with a private interview with the detainee who had brought the complaint. Detainees could also make verbal complaints to the SVO on their weekly visit. Complainants received written responses which were quality assured by the Commandant and there was evidence of further investigation of some complaints as a result of this process (see also equality and diversity section). Those that we examined were dealt with well. Complaints were recorded on a database and were starting to be used in the trends analysis database (TAD) to identify patterns or trends. The most recent TAD report showed that between August and October 2011 there had been 12 complaints to the IMB and 13 to the SVO, with food being the most common cause for complaint. There had been no complaints directed to the Commandant in the previous 21 months. Detainees we spoke to said that they would talk to company staff if they had a complaint.
- 2.39 In our survey, nearly 70% of detainees said they had never made a complaint and of those who had, 64% said it had been dealt with fairly against 36% in 2008. Some detainees said they preferred to try to resolve issues with staff as they arose rather than use the complaints procedures.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or detention, following their arrival to the centre and on release. Detainees are supported by the centre staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

- 2.40 All detainees were well briefed about their sentence and matters relating to their detention, and had reasonable opportunities to speak to a solicitor. Detainees located on the SCP with more complex legal cases felt well supported. A high proportion of detainees on D Company were unnecessarily required to return to their units following completion of their sentence due to delay on the part of the units in completing administrative work relating to their release and this was impacting on reintegration plans for some.
- 2.41 All detainees were advised during admission and induction about matters relating to their legal status, what would happen to them when they left the centre and how the earned remission scheme operated. This information was given in a group presentation by the regimental administrative officer, in individual interviews with welfare staff and by staff based on the company lines.
- 2.42 Detainees who needed legal advice were able to attend a monthly drop-in clinic run by a local firm of solicitors.
- 2.43 Detainees could put in a request through the welfare department to make private telephone calls to their legal adviser. Detainees located on the SCP had good access to their solicitors and we observed detainees located there making telephone calls on request with no impediment. They could receive visits from their legal representatives and there was a video conference facility in the SCP, which was used two or three times a week for court related business. Detainees we spoke to on the SCP appeared satisfied with the support they received in relation to their legal rights and said they found staff helpful.
- 2.44 There was a small collection of legal books in the library, covering both military and criminal law. This information was also available electronically.
- 2.45 Staff expressed concerns to us about the high proportion of detainees located on D Company who had to return to their unit for the final administrative procedures of their discharge to be completed when there had been ample time for this to have been carried out during their detention. An analysis carried out towards the end of 2011 had shown that almost 30% of detainees in D Company had experienced this unnecessary delay and we were told of two cases where this had jeopardised offers of work for the detainees concerned.

Recommendation

- 2.46 There should be no unnecessary delay in discharging detainees from the Armed Services at the end of their sentence.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in the centre and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which detainees could expect to receive elsewhere in the Armed Services/community.

2.47 Primary health services were provided by Army Primary Health Care Service (Eastern) (APHCS) and the MCTC medical centre was included as an outpost of the medical reception station at the garrison. Clinical governance arrangements were clear, a good range of primary care services was available and staffing levels were appropriate. Smoking cessation courses were offered and there was a range of health promotion displays. Some detainees had their medications in possession following a risk assessment. Detainees were not satisfied with the dental service provision. Mental health services were responsive and well integrated into the centre. Arrangements for release were good from a health services perspective.

Governance arrangements

- 2.48 A primary care service was provided at the health centre in MCTC, with a full range of other services available at the medical reception station (MRS) or local NHS. Staff at the health centre were able to investigate the electronic clinical information system (DMCIP) to identify rates of and reasons for attendance. The health needs assessment for the previous 12 months revealed that 33% of attendances had related to musculoskeletal issues.
- 2.49 The unit was staffed by a practice manager (Sergeant) and there were clear lines of accountability for staff at the centre. The combat medical technicians (CMTs) had an induction programme and mandatory training. They provided cover at the centre from 7.30am to 6pm Monday to Friday and one technician was on call each weekend. At other times MCTC staff could obtain advice from the MRS. A practice nurse worked part time and a GP worked six sessions a week, five to provide surgeries and the other to attend meetings at MCTC. A civilian physiotherapist from the MRS delivered 20 hours a week and worked closely with the remedial instructor in the gymnasium. Mental health services were provided as needed by the Department of Community Mental Health (DCMH) which was a separate entity to APHCS.
- 2.50 All staff had a training plan and had undertaken child protection training.
- 2.51 Health services staff attended the MRS health care governance meetings at which patient incidents from the MRS and the MCTC medical centre were reported and discussed. Clinical audits and quarterly reports were also discussed and there were monthly practice meetings.
- 2.52 The medical centre was of an adequate size and fit for purpose. Infection control measures were in place. A defibrillator was stored in the treatment room and the CMT Bergen was kept by the entrance to the centre. Equipment was checked regularly and all checks were documented.
- 2.53 We observed staff interacting with patients courteously and professionally. In our survey, 68% of detainees rated the quality of health services as good or very good. Detainees were given a range of information about health services on arrival, which was reinforced during induction by a CMT. Information displayed on notice boards on the company lines included communicable

diseases, drug and alcohol misuse, obtaining an appointment at the health centre and the facility for a female detainee to request to see a female doctor. A complaints book was available in the waiting area and detainees could also submit written complaints. Some of the responses that we saw were unclear.

- 2.54 There was a range of eye-catching health promotion displays in the medical centre and elsewhere in the MCTC. Health promotion was included in gym induction and nutritional information was displayed at the serveries.
- 2.55 At the time of our inspection, several detainees with sickness and diarrhoea had been quarantined. We were impressed by the swiftness of the response to a potentially communicable disease: staff clearly knew what to do and from whom to seek advice.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.56 When detainees arrived at the MCTC, they were seen by a CMT as soon as possible in the medical department. The technician carried out an initial health assessment using a template on the DMCIP and was able to check a detainee's previous health records, which was useful. If needed or requested, detainees saw a GP the following day. If they arrived with medications, the CMT checked on DMCIP to ensure that it was prescribed and used the electronic prescription to ensure that the detainee continued to receive the medication. Detainees could be taken to the MRS for urgent issues. Detainees were seen again a week after their arrival, at which time the CMT asked detainees about their mental wellbeing and followed up the initial assessment to ensure any action required had been taken.
- 2.57 DMCIP had sophisticated built-in Caldicott guardianship arrangements: each medical centre had a Caldicott Guardian which was the practice manager at the MCTC. If a member of MCTC medical centre staff accessed the clinical records of a patient who was not at MCTC, the practice manager received a telephone call and email from the Caldicott Guardian of the unit where the patient was based.
- 2.58 If detainees wished to attend the health centre, they handed application forms to health services staff and the applications were triaged by a medic. Appointments for the nurse or doctor were usually available the next day and, whenever possible, staff made appointments that did not coincide with other activities, such as education. Detainees attending the medical centre were escorted from company lines to the reception waiting room where they were supervised.
- 2.59 Detainees could be referred to the physiotherapist by the doctor and there was no waiting list to see him. The physiotherapist provided individual treatment and worked closely with the remedial gym instructor to devise individual exercise programmes for detainees. The physiotherapist could refer detainees to their unit physiotherapist if they still required treatment at the end of their sentence.
- 2.60 Chlamydia screening was available at the centre and actively encouraged. Detainees could be referred to the local genitourinary medicine clinic if required. Condoms were available for detainees going on home leave and for members of D Company on release. All detainees were offered flu vaccination.
- 2.61 Smoking cessation courses were provided if detainees were at the centre for more than four weeks. They were given one-to-one appointments and provided with nicotine replacement therapy and support.

- 2.62 If a detainee became unwell overnight, staff had clear instructions which included contacting the garrison MRS for advice or taking the detainee to the local A&E department. Custodial night staff we spoke to understood these instructions.
- 2.63 Attendance at outside clinical appointments, such as the local optician, the garrison dentist and GUM clinic, were all arranged by the company clerks. Detainees requiring x-rays were taken to the local hospital which provided an enhanced reporting service for all military personnel.

Good practice

- 2.64 *The arrangements for the confidentiality of clinical records held electronically were good, as they ensured the confidentiality of clinical information. .*

Pharmacy

- 2.65 Pharmacy supplies were now obtained from the MRS pharmacy. The new arrangements worked well, with easy audit of medications prescribed to detainees. The pharmacist and pharmacy technician from the near by garrison made regular visits to the medical centre, medication issues were discussed as part of health care governance meetings, and the doctor used the tri-service formulary.
- 2.66 Prescribed medications were usually obtained on the same day. A comprehensive in-possession risk assessment was completed by the doctor. Following a patient incident, in-possession medications in original packs were given for a maximum of seven days at a time to ensure that the pharmacist could monitor prescribing. Detainees signed a compact which clearly described their responsibilities. They also completed a checklist when they took their medications, so that company lines staff and medics could check their compliance during snap inspections.
- 2.67 At meal times during the week, medications that were not allowed in possession were administered from a trolley in the dining area: detainees were called to see the medic who was located behind a screen to provide some confidentiality. At the time of the inspection, eight detainees did not have in-possession medications. All 'not in possession' medications were provided in 'venalink' packs which were handed over to custodial staff at night and weekends so that they could distribute them. The handover arrangements were robust and all custodial staff received annual training by the pharmacist on how to distribute the medications.
- 2.68 There was a clear policy for detainees to obtain paracetamol or ibuprofen from one of the custodial staff during 'silent hours' or at weekends. Detainees were required to sign to say they understood that custodial staff were unable to advise them about the medication.

Dentistry

- 2.69 Dental services were provided by Defence Dental Services (DDS) based at the garrison, a separate entity to APHCS. Detainees expressed dissatisfaction with the dental care provided, especially those on D Company. Overall, only 30% thought it was easy or very easy to see the dentist. We could find no evidence to explain the survey results: during the previous three months equal numbers of detainees from each company had attended the dentist but we were not able to identify the number of requests made to the company clerks. Detainees requiring

emergency dental care had to be at the Colchester Garrison DDS by 8am and, if they were late, they were refused treatment that day.

Recommendation

- 2.70 The reasons for detainees' apparent dissatisfaction with dental services should be explored and all detainees should have access to appropriate dental care, regardless of their length of time at the centre.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.71 Staff from the DCMH mental health team included a consultant psychiatrist, a senior mental health social worker, a team leader and six community psychiatric nurses. Detainees were usually referred to the team by the MCTC doctor with occasional referrals from other DCMH teams. All referrals were discussed by the team at weekly meetings.
- 2.72 Detainees were seen in a designated room with comfortable furniture in the medical centre. The team obtained written consent from their patients to share relevant information about them with other disciplines. In our survey, 21% of detainees said they had emotional well being/ mental health issues against 38% in 2008. Of those, 79% said they were being supported by someone within MCTC. There had been a 22% increase in MCTC referrals to the team between April 2010 to March 2011 and April 2011 to January 2012. At the time of the inspection, the team had a caseload of 12 detainees.
- 2.73 DCMH staff provided one-to-one care, but had started to provide an intensive one-week anger management course in response to identified need. Feedback from participants was positive and anecdotal information from the weekly management meetings indicated that the course was a useful addition to the services provided. Other services included eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing, cognitive behaviour therapy and solution focused therapy. The team worked closely with the drugs and alcohol counsellors in the welfare department.
- 2.74 The Armed Forces had an arrangement with South Staffordshire Mental Health Trust for any member of the service with severe and enduring mental health problems who required inpatient treatment to be admitted within four hours of the referral. We were told that the system had been used successfully once in the previous year for a detainee at the centre.
- 2.75 Detainees could also be seen by the welfare officers, who could refer them to the chaplain or drug and alcohol counsellors.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.76 Detainees had three cooked meals each day which they ate communally. Portion sizes were ample, choices reasonable and healthy options were available and identified on menu choices. Supervision of the serveries was good. Detainees were not completely satisfied with the food

on offer but our survey indicated that levels of satisfaction had improved. Kitchens and serveries were maintained hygienically.

- 2.77 Detainees were provided with three hot meals each day. In our survey, 35% of detainees described the food as good or very good compared with 17% at the last full inspection. A range of meat dishes was available at lunch and dinner. All the food seen during the inspection looked appetizing. We were told that provision for vegetarian, vegan, religious, cultural or medical diets was rarely required but they were all catered for as necessary as special diets. None was required at the time of the inspection. Contracted catering staff had not conformed properly with halal requirements, but this had been rectified. Detainees suffering from an outbreak of diarrhoea and vomiting were provided with food cooked specially for them once they were able to eat again.
- 2.78 Daily choices were clearly listed on wipe boards and a red, amber, green system was used to inform detainees of the healthiest menu choices. Menus adhered to military nutritional guidelines. Fruit was available at least once a day and was provided some evenings as a snack. Salad was available daily. The detainee consultation meeting was an effective forum for discussing food and a feedback book was available in each company.
- 2.79 Each company had its own dining room and servery and all meals were eaten communally. Lunch was served at midday and tea at 4.30pm. Detainees attended the hotplate in rotation to give them all the opportunity to have their first choice of main course and dessert. Detainees served themselves from the hotplate and portion sizes were good.
- 2.80 Hot and cold drinks were provided at each meal and tea urns were available on the company lines during the day and evening.
- 2.81 The kitchen and servery areas were clean, food was stored appropriately and staff working in kitchens and serveries were appropriately dressed. The kitchens were subject to at least annual checks by the local authority and the military. A member of company staff effectively supervised each servery at meal times.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.82 Detainees had weekly access to the on-site shop to buy items such as toiletries, tobacco, snacks and stamps. Detainees were able to discuss the range of products on offer and make suggestions for additions through the standard consultation arrangements. Prices were reasonable and detainees' allowances were reviewed each year.
- 2.83 All detainees had access to the on-site shop on Wednesdays. The shop stocked a sufficiently wide range of toiletries, tobacco, snacks and drinks, and stamps and stationery items. Prices were comparable with a local supermarket. Detainees received a weekly allowance which was determined by their level on the staging system. Allowances were reviewed annually and prices changed in line with wholesale prices. Detainees had a weekly order form, but could add to this when they got to the shop.

2.84 Detainees received a 'get you in pack' on arrival which contained sufficient toiletries, smoking materials (or snacks in the non-smoking pack) and stationery until their first visit to the shop, which took a week at most. Newspapers were provided each day to the detainees' rooms and magazines could be handed in on visits or sent in by family or friends. There was discussion of the range of products stocked by the shop at the monthly detainee consultation meetings.

Section 3: Purposeful activity

Time out of room

Expected outcomes:

All detainees are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock, and the centre offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.¹

- 3.1 The majority of detainees were out of their rooms and occupied for most of the day, although detainees in the Service Custody Platoon were more likely to have unproductive time during the day. Weekend activities had improved and there was a wide range of activities for detainees to take part in if they chose to do so.
- 3.2 Detainees had more than 10 hours out of their rooms during the week and 8.5 hours at the weekend. Daily routines were published on notice boards and were adhered to. Detainees in the Service Custody Platoon (SCP) attended activities with A Company during the week. Some SCP detainees thought the military training they undertook was irrelevant to their needs as they expected to leave the military at the end of their detention and some A Company activities which took place off the main site, such as the shooting range, were not open to them. Although they were also eligible to take part in education and some vocational training, subject to risk assessment and availability of places, they were not always actively encouraged to do so and they spent some time during the week with no purposeful activity.
- 3.3 At weekends there were a range of activities on offer, including gym, volleyball, pool, table tennis, sports and games, play station 3, DVDs, visits, chapel and alpha club. The range of activities had increased since the previous inspection but some detainees in our focus groups still complained of boredom, particularly at the weekends, and there were some activities that received little or no take up. Activities were supervised by staff and some joined in. Association took place daily, including in the secure custody platoon. Detainees on the lowest level of the staging system had two hours' association each weekday evening. Those on higher levels were able to leave their rooms and have access to telephones after stage one detainees had been locked up. Association areas were equipped with a range of table and board games and some craft kits were available. Detainees could use the exercise areas on request, although we were told they were more popular during warmer months. There was no seating, but detainees were able to take chairs outside if they wished.
- 3.4 There was much informal interaction between staff and detainees and, while military discipline was maintained, the atmosphere was relaxed and respectful. In our survey, 47% against 27% at the previous inspection said that staff spoke to them most of the time during association periods.

Recommendation

- 3.5 Detainees in the SCP should be encouraged to undertake a full timetable of purposeful activity to meet their needs.

¹ Time out of room, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time detainees are out of their rooms to associate or use communal facilities.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.6 The management of learning and skills and work at the centre was good and there were good links between sentence planning and individual learning plans. The quality of activity places and the range of courses were good, although insufficient use was made of unit accreditation. Achievements in vocational training and education were good and in some cases outstanding. The quality of teaching and learning was good as were attendance and punctuality. There was some outstanding project work in the community and very good links with local and service community groups. Detainees had reasonable access to the library and the newly introduced trolley service was well used. Recreational PE and the promotion of healthy living were good. The new self-assessment process was evaluative and accurately identified key areas for improvement. Data collection and analysis were weak.

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.7 The leadership and management of learning and skills, education and work were sound. Key areas identified for improvement at previous inspections had been improved and new courses had been added. Quality assurance arrangements were effective. Good use had been made of staff views to evaluate and improve the provision, although insufficient use had been made of detainees' views. A needs analysis had recently been carried out. Lesson observations were undertaken regularly and clearly recorded, although there was too much emphasis on teaching and not enough on learning. Self-assessment was effective, although there was insufficient use of data to support performance. The quality improvement plan accurately identified most key areas for improvement and some actions had already had a positive influence. Assessments and verification were thorough and external verification reports were positive.
- 3.8 The promotion of safeguarding of detainees, and equality and diversity were sound. Learning and skills staff were able to recognise and deal appropriately with safeguarding problems when they arose, and had received appropriate training. Equal opportunities and diversity training was given to all learning and skills staff, who were aware of the issues. Lesson plans took account of equality and diversity and there was good access to education for detainees with mobility difficulties. There were high levels of mutual respect between detainees and staff.

Housekeeping points

- 3.9 Better use should be made of detainees' views to inform self-assessment and quality improvement.
- 3.10 There should be a stronger focus on learning in lesson observations to identify and share best practice.

- 3.11 Data should be used more effectively to review and analyse the performance of all detainees during training and when they return to their unit or into civilian employment.

Provision of activities

- 3.12 Induction to learning and skills (called 'first steps') was good and detainees were fully informed of the provision available to them. All detainees were given an initial assessment of their literacy and numeracy needs if this had not already been undertaken. There were good links with the sentence planning process and the action planning process with detainees, and individual learning plans were clear and detailed with appropriate targets. A comprehensive brochure of learning and skills information was available. The allocation of detainees to activities took account of their individual needs and the length of their detention. For D Company detainees, emphasis was placed on improving or developing skills that would be of value to them on returning to the community. A Company detainees spent the majority of their time engaged in military training (which we did not inspect), but also had good access to literacy and numeracy provision if a need was identified.
- 3.13 There were sufficient purposeful activity places for all detainees who could gain skills in a good range of activities. Education courses focussed on improving literacy and numeracy skills, although information technology courses, such as the European computer driving licence (ECDL), were also available. Detainees who were at the centre for long enough were encouraged to gain level 1 in literacy and numeracy. Vocational courses included plastering, fibre moulding, tiling, plumbing, fork-lift truck driving, welding, animal husbandry and basic car repairs. Plans were well advanced to offer a range of courses, including picture framing, in the recently opened craft workshop.
- 3.14 Most training was accredited to level 1 which was appropriate for the many detainees with short or medium-term sentences who could progress to level 2, or go into employment or further education when they were released. Detainees with longer sentences were well catered for and most had the opportunity to work outside on job placements. However, insufficient use was made of unit accreditation for detainees on very short sentences to recognise the skills that they had developed. There was an outstanding range of purposeful project work in the community, where detainees developed a range of useful skills, although these were not accredited. In our survey, 47% of detainees said that they had been involved in outside work placements against the 2008 comparator of 31%.

Recommendation

- 3.15 **Better use should be made of unit accreditation to provide a wider range of qualifications which detainees on very short sentences can develop on release.**

Quality of provision

- 3.16 Assessments were thorough and well planned. Some outstanding teaching and learning was observed and there was a clear focus on independent learning. There were sufficient resources and work and vocational learning workshops were well equipped, clean and tidy. The Army Learning Centre was well managed and provided an excellent resource for detainees to learn independently.

- 3.17 Staff were well qualified and knowledgeable and many had undertaken basic teacher training. Particularly effective use was made of civilian staff with specific skills, for example on the farm, who provided continuity in the context of a quick turnaround of military instructors at the centre.
- 3.18 Detainees developed good skills, with particularly high quality work in plastering and moulding, plumbing, agriculture and animal husbandry. Many detainees participated in the local community projects which included the development of car parking, drainage and raised flower beds for wheelchair users and detainees gained basic handicraft and communication skills. Learning support for trainees was good and all trainees had to achieve level 1 in literacy and numeracy before starting a vocational qualification.
- 3.19 Partnership working was good and there were particularly effective links with local and service community groups, with many detainees and staff participating in brigade sporting events. Staff recognised the need to develop further links with external organisations to increase the opportunities for work placements.

Recommendation

- 3.20 **Links with external organisations and companies should be developed further to improve the opportunities for detainee work placements.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.21 Success rates for vocational training and education courses were high, averaging between 80 and 85%. Success rates in literacy and numeracy courses were outstanding at over 90% and commendably this had been maintained with the introduction of functional skills.² The drop-out rate was extremely low and attendance and punctuality were good. Many detainees who completed the compulsory level 1 qualifications in literacy and numeracy successfully progressed to level 2.

Library

- 3.22 The library was situated in a bright room with reasonable access for detainees. Opening hours catered well for detainees, although the library was not open during weekends. The library was used during break times and about half the detainees used the library regularly. There was a satisfactory range of fiction, non-fiction and 'quick read' books and a few books on vocational subjects. Detainees were able to request books through the military library service and these usually arrived quickly.
- 3.23 The recently introduced library trolley was a good initiative which allowed access to books when the library was closed. This was particularly useful at weekends and the service was starting to be well used. Detainees benefitted from many donations of books from staff and other sources. Daily newspapers and a wide range of military magazines were stocked. However, the range of general interest magazines was poor, which particularly affected detainees who would leave the military on release.

² Functional skills are the main elements of English, mathematics and ICT that help learners gain the most out of work, education and everyday life.

Housekeeping point

- 3.24 The range of general interest magazines in the library should be improved, particularly for detainees due to leave the military on release.

Ofsted judgements on learning and skills and work activities

- 3.25 Ofsted inspectors made the following assessments about learning and skills and work provision in the centre:

Achievements of detainees engaged in learning and skills and work	Good
Quality of learning and skills and work provision	Good
Leadership and management of learning and skills and work	Good

Physical education and health promotion

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.26 Physical education (PE) facilities were good and were used well to develop detainees' physical fitness. Success rates on the YMCA course were outstanding. Healthy living and personal fitness were effectively promoted during induction and throughout detention. A range of structured training programmes ensured that detainees returned to service life fully fit. Adventurous training was used to promote the development of new skills.
- 3.27 PE was well managed and effectively promoted. Facilities included a well maintained and fully equipped sports hall, cardiovascular, free and modular weight training facility, outdoor football pitches, a confidence course with trinasium, and external running areas. Staff were well qualified.
- 3.28 Detainees in A Company attended at least five structured PE sessions a week and could participate in recreational and adventurous training activities at weekends. Adventurous activities were used effectively to develop individual stamina and command and leadership skills. Sessions were well structured with a strong focus on ensuring that service personnel returned to operational units with improved fitness, stamina and strength. Detainees in D Company attended recreational PE sessions after work and at weekends. All activities were well supervised and managed.
- 3.29 Healthy living and the importance of improving fitness were well promoted through induction. Healthy eating promotion included clear links between theory and the labelling of food in the cookhouse. There were effective links between health care, PE and rehabilitation staff and awareness of the need to report and deal quickly with injuries, although injuries identified during training were minimal. The rehabilitation PE instructor provided good support for detainees and staff once injuries had been diagnosed.

- 3.30 Success rates on the level 2 gymnasium instructor course (YMCA) were outstanding at 100%. The course was run every six weeks and provided effective skills training, although insufficient use was made of the opportunity for qualified detainees to work in the gym. Staff and detainees participated together in a wide range of local and service community sporting events, which was impressive.

Recommendation

- 3.31 Detainees who are qualified as gym instructors should support PE staff in providing induction and other activities for detainees.

Section 4: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a detainee's return to Service or civilian life starts on their arrival at the centre. Resettlement underpins the work of the whole centre, supported by strategic partnerships in the Armed Services and the community and informed by assessment of detainee risk and need. Good planning ensures a seamless transition back into the Services or the community.

- 4.1 The resettlement policy was comprehensive and the resettlement strategy group was efficient, but better use of the available high quality data input and developing analyses was required. The different databases for recording information about detainees needed simplification.
- 4.2 There was a comprehensive, up-to-date resettlement policy which described accurately the distinctive features of MCTC. The resettlement strategy group chaired by the Commandant met quarterly. Attendance by centre staff was good and representatives from independent or community based agencies were usually, but not always, present.
- 4.3 One of the main functions of the strategy group was to review trends identified in the trends analysis database (TAD) which had been introduced in May 2010. Six reviews of the findings had been published, previously by members of the Military Provost Staff, but from October 2011, a researcher from the University Of Cambridge with a background in statistical analysis had been appointed to lead this work.
- 4.4 The TAD provided a great deal of valuable information, including detainees' perceptions of the centre on arrival and departure, although there was limited evidence that this data was being used effectively to inform and develop services. The majority of detainees held at the centre at the time of the inspection (64%) were serving sentences for being absent without leave (AWOL) and the TAD was being used to collate data about the reasons detainees gave for going AWOL. Efforts were also being made to obtain information about the progress of detainees returning to their units, although the return rates from units were low at between 20 and 30%. There were some basic omissions in the information collected, for example the range of work carried out by the welfare department, however, efforts were being made to address these weaknesses. The work that was ongoing with the Regular Forces Employment Association led by the Senior Education Officer to match courses and qualifications with employment prospects looked promising. A number of databases were used in the centre, including detainees' assessment records (DARs) and the new Fletcher system, but they were not yet sufficiently well linked or properly coordinated.

Recommendation

- 4.5 The trends analysis database should be used to collect all relevant data about detainees and their resettlement needs in order to produce regular needs analyses to inform the ongoing review and revision of the resettlement policy.

Sentence management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.6 The sentence planning process was beginning to improve and detainees seemed confident in the developing arrangements. The new arrangements ensured that all detainees had a sentence plan but the quality needed improvement. Links between sentence planning and the learning and skills department were strong but links with the welfare department and health services were poor.
- 4.7 Sentence planning had previously been managed by non-specialist military staff with additional duties, which had led to some inconsistency. A civilian member of staff with an appropriate background, including risk assessment, had recently been appointed as a sentence planning coordinator with a view to improving consistency and ongoing development of the sentence planning process. Early results were promising and, in our survey, 83% of sentenced detainees said they had a sentence plan against 24% at the previous inspection. More significantly, detainees whom we spoke to said that their sentence plans were important and mattered to them.
- 4.8 All sentenced detainees now had a sentence plan: the sentence planning coordinator carried out an assessment of detainees in A Company based solely on the contents of the DAR; the plans for detainees in D Company also used the DAR, but included an interview between the detainee and the coordinator. Sentence plans held on D Company detainees were reviewed after three months. All the plans were basic, consisting of a timetable with completion dates for relevant courses. Nevertheless, all detainees whom we spoke to were familiar with the contents of their plan and found them helpful. D Company detainees appreciated their reviews with the sentence planning coordinator and their involvement in formulating their plan.
- 4.9 Links between the sentence planning coordinator and the learning and skills department were good and there were frequent helpful email exchanges about scheduling access to courses. The sentence planning coordinator was the main source of referral for the thinking skills programme and this arrangement, based on risk and need, also appeared to work well. There were no formal links between the sentence planning arrangements and the welfare department or health services, which was a significant weakness. Work carried out in these areas, including significantly housing problems, was not properly coordinated and it was unclear if related targets in sentence plans had been completed.
- 4.10 There was no quality assurance to ensure that sentence plans were of a consistently good standard.

Recommendations

- 4.11 All disciplinary procedures, including the staging system, should be monitored routinely to ensure that they are applied consistently and fairly. Monitoring should include all protected characteristics and identification of any patterns or trends which should be acted on as necessary.

- 4.12 Sentence plans should be based on a full assessment of risks and needs which is undertaken with the detainee and informed by contributions from all relevant departments in the centre. The sentence plan should contain outcome focused objectives identifying relevant and timely interventions and be subject to ongoing review.

Housekeeping point

- 4.13 Sentence plans should be quality assured to ensure that they are of a consistently high standard.

Public protection

- 4.14 From time to time the centre continued to hold a small number of individuals who had been convicted of serious offences. The combination of military and civilian law made the application of public protection arrangements complex and it was not clear if detainees who posed a public protection risk were always identified correctly or that the necessary restrictions were being imposed.
- 4.15 All detainees had their current and previous offences checked by administrative staff on arrival. Details of detainees identified as meeting the criteria for a MAPPAs (multi-agency public protection arrangements) referral were passed to the county MAPPAs manager by telephone, followed by a detailed email.
- 4.16 The MAPPAs manager was an experienced former police officer employed by Essex Probation and Police who told us that he typically received two or three telephone calls a month from staff at the centre, relating to public protection. New public protection referrals were checked on the police national computer and the dangerous persons' database which gave him all relevant details about detainees who had been referred. If necessary, he gave advice to the centre on how the detainee should be managed. The MAPPAs manager was concerned that not all individuals subject to MAPPAs requirements were being identified. He felt this was because staff at the centre found it difficult to determine whether detainees subject to military law met the criteria, which had been designed for civilian prisoners.
- 4.17 Detainees identified as meeting MAPPAs criteria were highlighted on a weekly list which was published electronically and available to all staff. At the time of the inspection, five detainees had been identified, all of whom had been registered as being within a 'nil risk' category, although there were no accompanying detailed risk assessments to support this.
- 4.18 We were told that staff were familiar with the circumstances of all these detainees, but we were not provided with evidence that the risk they posed to the public while in custody had been properly assessed so that they could be formally monitored and reviewed and appropriate restrictions applied (see main recommendation HE.43).

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Detainees' resettlement needs are addressed prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual detainee in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration back into the Armed Services or into the community.

4.19 There were good arrangements to provide detainees with pre-release support, including input from a range of specialist community agencies, and most detainees we spoke to said they felt well supported in relation to preparing for their release. They received clear advice about all available support services, particularly military charities.

4.20 All detainees were interviewed by a member of the welfare department on the first working day after their admission and an initial assessment was carried out to determine their needs. Each detainee was issued with a pack of general information about support available on release, including specific advice for service leavers. Welfare staff recorded notes of these meetings in their own files which had strictly limited access. We examined 10% of the welfare files and found that detainees were receiving active support in a number of areas to help with their reintegration but this was not being shared with the sentence planning coordinator and did not form part of the detainees' sentence plans (see section on sentence planning).

4.21 Detainees retained personal clothing which they could launder and wear on their release. Detainees who did not have suitable clothing for their release could supplement this from a store of free clothing.

4.22 Detainees were routinely interviewed by a member of welfare staff approximately two weeks before discharge to check that they had been offered practical help to meet the needs that had been identified on admission.

4.23 Most of the detainees we spoke to in our discussion group were content with the help they had received prior to release. We interviewed two detainees on the day of their discharge who spoke positively of support they had received to help obtain accommodation and employment. In our survey, 40% of detainees believed that a member of staff had helped them to prepare for release against 22% at the previous inspection.

4.24 Good use continued to be made of reintegration leave, which enabled detainees to visit their families and attend interviews prior to discharge. In the past 12 months, 29 detainees in D Company had benefitted from this opportunity.

HARDFACTS: Health

4.25 The various components of the resettlement strategy were grouped under the HARDFACTS' headings: Health, Accommodation, Relocation, Drugs and alcohol, Finance, benefit and debt, Attitudes, thinking and behaviour, Children, families and contact with the outside world, Training, education and employment and Support.

4.26 Detainees were seen for a clinical examination one to two days before they left the centre. Information was filed on DMCIP for detainees returning to their units. Detainees leaving the service were given a letter for their GP explaining how a copy of their clinical records could be obtained. A display in the medical centre waiting room provided advice about health services

as a civilian and detainees were given assistance to register with health and social services as required.

- 4.27 Detainees from D Company under the care of the mental health team could continue to use the services of the team for at least six months after discharge to ensure continuity of care, which was commendable.
- 4.28 All detainees leaving MCTC were weighed on the day they left.

Housekeeping point

- 4.29 The practice of weighing detainees on the day they leave should cease, but detainees should be subject to appropriate clinical assessment before discharge from the centre.

HARDFACTS: Accommodation

- 4.30 A comprehensive, housing advice service helped detainees with housing difficulties to obtain emergency short-term accommodation, as well as longer-term placements.
- 4.31 Detainees received a group presentation during induction from the housing adviser, who was based full time at the centre. She gave information about housing benefits and housing options in the public and private sector and specialist housing for ex-service men and women, and invited detainees with accommodation problems to make an appointment to see her. The housing adviser had a caseload of between 20 and 30 detainees at a time. She encouraged detainees to contact housing departments themselves and they could search on line for rented accommodation.
- 4.32 Over the previous 12 months, 12 detainees had been placed in supported accommodation on leaving the centre. A few detainees who presented as homeless were funded by the centre and placed in short-term bed and breakfast accommodation following discharge. All detainees in contact with the housing officer were given a free telephone number to seek follow-up advice for six months after their release, but this seldom happened.

HARDFACTS: Relocation

- 4.33 There had been little reference to relocation during resettlement strategy meetings since the previous inspection, and there was considerable resentment among foreign and commonwealth detainees who we spoke to who believed that they would be entirely dependent on their own resources on discharge, facing the cost of a flight to their country of origin or paying almost £900 to apply for leave to remain. We were assured detainees were incorrect in believing they had to pay for their own relocation costs. In a recent survey by the centre, 5% of detainees said they had not received sufficient help to resolve relocation issues.
- 4.34 Nevertheless, the welfare staff gave practical, well-informed help, assisting foreign nationals to seek help from the Citizen's Advice Bureau (CAB) and service charities. Contact with the UK Border Agency (UKBA) had recently improved, with a single point of contact now in place.
- 4.35 The British Army guide to supporting foreign and commonwealth citizens and their families was well advertised and readily available: contact numbers were displayed for the UKBA

immigration enquiry bureau and other agencies. Detainees could access further information on the internet through the regular e-clinics.

Recommendation

- 4.36 The relocation needs of foreign national detainees should be kept in focus, and reflected in regular discussion at the equality and diversity meetings.

HARDFACTS: Drugs and alcohol

- 4.37 Detainees were given a drug and alcohol awareness talk during induction, which was repeated before they left the centre. If they were being seen by a drug or alcohol counsellor, they were referred to community services as required.

HARDFACTS: Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.38 Detainees were given information and advice about how their detention would affect their pay and were asked if they had any financial difficulties during the initial assessment conducted by welfare staff. It was clear from the sample of files that we examined that detainees were commonly given help with low-level financial problems, such as writing letters to close accounts or to defer payments for outstanding bills. Welfare staff told us that problems with debt were becoming more serious and they believed the ease with which detainees could secure high interest loans through the internet was the main reason for this. Although information about a detainee's financial situation was recorded in his welfare file, it was not aggregated and it was not possible to determine accurately the overall nature and scale of the problem.
- 4.39 The CAB delivered a monthly presentation to new detainees on finance and debt management. Detainees could speak to a CAB representative at this session and, if they had a serious debt problem, could be referred to a visiting specialist. This service was used infrequently, but we were told of at least two cases over the past year where detainees had been given advice on filing for bankruptcy.
- 4.40 The regimental administrative officer delivered a weekly session during induction on the administration of pay and pensions. Detainees could raise queries on such matters using the application process on the company lines, and many did.
- 4.41 There were a number of different leaflets available in the centre about sources of help for those with financial problems which included self help guides and details of relevant charities. Service-based charities were often used to help detainees obtain financial assistance for accommodation for themselves and sometimes their families.

HARDFACTS: Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.42 The accredited thinking skills programme (TSP) delivered by staff from Essex Probation was on the point of being introduced at the time of the last inspection and was now well established. Probation staff usually attended three times a week to deliver the course. They had their own office space and indicated that centre staff fully supported them in delivering the programme.

- 4.43 The TSP was a problem-solving course suitable for most detainees. Allocation to the course was based on need and risk, and referrals were made through the sentence planning co-ordinator following her initial assessment of detainees. Detainees convicted of more serious offences were prioritised to attend the course. Since June 2010, 155 detainees had completed the programme. Detainees who had participated spoke positively about the benefits of the TSP programme.
- 4.44 Essex Probation staff carried out individual work with a few detainees who had been convicted of a sexual offence. However not all detainees convicted of a sexual offence were referred for assessment to ascertain whether they needed specialist intervention relating to their particular offence.
- 4.45 Staff from the Open Road project carried out one-to-one anger management work with detainees, 25 of whom had taken part during the most recent quarter.
- 4.46 In our survey, 65% of detainees who had attended an offending behaviour programme felt it would help them on release against 13% in the previous survey.

Recommendation

- 4.47 **All detainees convicted of a sexual offence should be assessed to determine if they need specialist intervention.**

HARDFACTS: Children, families and contact with the outside world

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are enabled to re-establish or maintain relationships with their children and families, and can regularly communicate with the outside world.

4.48 Visits entitlements were good for all detainees, and it was easy to book a visit. Most detainees were more than 100 miles from home and only a small proportion said it was easy for their family/friends to visit. The availability of accumulated visits was helpful in this regard. The visitors' centre and the area that was used for visits were comfortable and visits staff were helpful, vigilant to security issues but not over intrusive. Family days and child's play days took place every other month. A parenting course had received favourable feedback from detainees. There were opportunities for visitors to raise any concerns about detainees and also to provide feedback on the visits experience. Detainees were positive about the support they had received to maintain contact with family and friends.

4.49 Visits took place on Saturday and Sunday morning and afternoon. Each detainee was entitled to one two-hour visit a week, with the option to have two or more visits over one weekend if they preferred. Family days took place six times a year and were well advertised around the centre and in the visitors' waiting room. Take up was improving and feedback had been positive. Visits arrangements were efficient. During their initial welfare interview, information was sought from detainees about their families and who should be sent information packs about visits which included everything that visitors needed to know. Subsequent visits could be applied for by post or while at the centre. In our survey, only 18% of detainees said they lived within 100 miles of the centre and only 12% that it was easy or very easy for their family/friends to get to the centre. Visitors could use a comfortable visitors' centre at the rear of

the main gate on arrival which had a toilet with access for people with disabilities, a baby changing facility and a vending machine. No hot drinks were available in the visitors' centre but they were available in the visits hall. Useful information was provided, including how to raise concerns about a detainee. Visitors were not routinely searched, although a drugs dog was sometimes present during the briefing given to visitors before they entered the visits room.

- 4.50 Visits took place in the reception area which was a suitably comfortable venue for detainees to spend time with their visitors. Tables and sufficient chairs to accommodate each detainee's visitors had been placed far enough apart for conversations to take place in private. The highest number of visits that we observed at one time was five and, if significantly more detainees took up their visits entitlement, privacy could have been compromised. Several detainees told us they preferred not to have visits and used the telephone instead to maintain relationships with family and friends. Supervision of visits was effective but low key unless intelligence required staff to pay extra attention to a detainee. There was an additional room furnished with soft chairs which could be used by detainees and visitors with bad news to share.
- 4.51 The visits that we observed started on time and visitors who were delayed en route to the centre were given extra time at the end of the session. Staff dealt with delayed visits sensitively by trying to contact visitors who had not arrived on time and reassuring detainees. Visitors and detainees were asked to complete feedback forms at the end of each session. All comments on the feedback forms were followed up by the welfare department and the forms annotated with the action taken. Feedback from one visitor that one session had started late resulted in a reminder to staff of the importance of sessions starting on time.
- 4.52 Visitors could hand in photographs and two magazines for detainees and, with prior approval, underwear and socks. Civilian clothing could be handed in to be put into property for when the detainee needed it.
- 4.53 Visitors had free access to toilets in the visits room and detainees had access with a staff escort. Visitors could buy hot and cold drinks and cold snacks from vending machines in the visits room which detainees had to consume before they finished their visit. There were toys but no play area, although one was planned. A parenting course 'Incredible Years' had been delivered twice in 2011 by trained centre staff with positive feedback from participants.
- 4.54 There were no qualified family support workers at the centre, but the welfare department helped detainees to maintain contact with their families through additional telephone calls or emails. The monthly legal clinic often included a representative from the family division. In our survey, 70% of detainees said staff had supported them to maintain contact with family/friends against 45% at the previous inspection.

HARDFACTS: Training, education and employment

- 4.55 Detainees had good access to a particularly purposeful and effective employability programme. They were supported to develop their CVs and improve their interview skills. Links with a range of employers were being developed (see section on quality of provision) and a few detainees had secured external work placements and employment. In our survey, 50% of detainees who had been on outside work placements said they thought this would help them on release against the 2008 comparator of 16%.
- 4.56 Detainees made good use of an online job search facility to apply for jobs, and Jobcentre Plus provided effective advice to identify employment opportunities. However, there was insufficient

guidance, particularly for D Company detainees, to help them identify their experience, knowledge and employability skills.

Recommendation

- 4.57 A systematic approach should be developed to help detainees, particularly in D Company, to identify their previous experience, knowledge and employability skills.

HARDFACTS: Support

- 4.58 The centre maintained proactive working relationships with a number of relevant external support agencies and charities. There was evidence in records that we examined that welfare staff promoted to detainees the services provided by a range of external support agencies, including the Royal British Legion, Veterans' Welfare Service and the confidential 'forces line'. During the inspection, both companies received a talk from the Royal British Legion, which took place every four months.

Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

Main recommendation

To the Commandant

- 5.1 A review of public protection procedures should be carried out jointly with the local MAPPA manager to ensure that risks to the public are being correctly identified and managed, both within the centre and on release. (HE.43)

Recommendation

To the Ministry of Defence

Legal rights

- 5.2 There should be no unnecessary delay in discharging detainees from the Armed Services at the end of their sentence. (2.46)

Recommendations

To the Commandant

Early days in detention

- 5.3 Appropriate training and ongoing support should be provided to detainees acting as befrienders. (1.12)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.4 Care plans should be regularly reviewed with input from the detainee as well as appropriate staff. (1.25)

Equality and diversity

- 5.5 A comprehensive equality and diversity policy should set out principles and standards for the treatment of detainees under each of the protected characteristics defined in the Equality Act 2010, including strategies for engagement and consultation and regular surveys focussing on equality issues. (2.26)
- 5.6 Detainee representatives should be appointed for the minority groups defined in the Equality Act 2010. (2.27)
- 5.7 Detainees of the same nationality should be able to associate together. (2.28)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.8 The padre should be consulted about detainees he is involved with at appropriate times, for example reviews of vulnerable detainees on observation or when sentence plans are discussed. (2.35)

Health services

- 5.9 The reasons for detainees' apparent dissatisfaction with dental services should be explored and all detainees should have access to appropriate dental care, regardless of their length of time at the centre. (2.70)

Time out of room

- 5.10 Detainees in the SCP should be encouraged to undertake a full timetable of purposeful activity to meet their needs. (3.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.11 Better use should be made of unit accreditation to provide a wider range of qualifications which detainees on very short sentences can develop on release. (3.15)
- 5.12 Links with external organisations and companies should be developed further to improve the opportunities for detainee work placements. (3.20)

Physical education and health promotion

- 5.13 Detainees who are qualified as gym instructors should support PE staff in providing induction and other activities for detainees. (3.31)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.14 The trends analysis database should be used to collect all relevant data about detainees and their resettlement needs in order to produce regular needs analyses to inform the ongoing review and revision of the resettlement policy. (4.5)

Sentence management and planning

- 5.15 All disciplinary procedures, including the staging system, should be monitored routinely to ensure that they are applied consistently and fairly. Monitoring should include all protected characteristics and identification of any patterns or trends which should be acted on as necessary. (4.11)
- 5.16 Sentence plans should be based on a full assessment of risks and needs which is undertaken with the detainee and informed by contributions from all relevant departments in the centre. The sentence plan should contain outcome focused objectives identifying relevant and timely interventions and be subject to ongoing review. (4.12)

HARDFACTS: Relocation

- 5.17 The relocation needs of foreign national detainees should be kept in focus, and reflected in regular discussion at the equality and diversity meetings. (4.36)

HARDFACTS: Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 5.18 All detainees convicted of a sexual offence should be assessed to determine if they need specialist intervention. (4.47)

HARDFACTS: Training, education and employment

- 5.19 A systematic approach should be developed to help detainees, particularly in D Company, to identify their previous experience, knowledge and employability skills. (4.57)

Housekeeping points

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.20 The use of anti-ligature clothing and the special observation rooms should be monitored. (1.26)
- 5.21 Staff observations should include frequent and good quality entries which demonstrate a good level of interaction and engagement with detainees. (1.27)

Security

- 5.22 The cultural sensitivities of searching detainees should be made explicit in staff training. (1.38)

Segregation and the Service Custody Platoon

- 5.23 Records for segregated detainees should include a daily record of all contacts made with them, the activities they have engaged in and risk assessments leading to decisions made about them. (1.55)

Equality and diversity

- 5.24 Equality monitoring information should be used to analyse trends and develop policies. (2.29)
- 5.25 Full impact assessments should be carried out each year on a sample of policies and practices on the basis of risk. (2.30)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.26 Better use should be made of detainees' views to inform self-assessment and quality improvement. (3.9)

- 5.27 There should be a stronger focus on learning in lesson observations to identify and share best practice. (3.10)
- 5.28 Data should be used more effectively to review and analyse the performance of all detainees during training and when they return to their unit or into civilian employment. (3.11)
- 5.29 The range of general interest magazines in the library should be improved, particularly for detainees due to leave the military on release. (3.24)

Sentence management and planning

- 5.30 Sentence plans should be quality assured to ensure that they are of a consistently high standard. (4.13)

HARDFACTS: Health

- 5.31 The practice of weighing detainees on the day they leave should cease, but detainees should be subject to appropriate clinical assessment before discharge from the centre. (4.29)

Good practice

Health services

- 5.32 The arrangements for the confidentiality of clinical records held electronically were good, as they ensured the confidentiality of clinical information. (2.64)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Fay Deadman	Team leader
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Inspector
Ian Thomson	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Gary Boughen	Inspector
Specialist inspectors	
Elizabeth Tysoe	Health services and drugs inspector
Neil Edwards	Ofsted inspector
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Rhowbotham	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Detainee population profile

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

Gender	Number of detainees	%
Male	87	100
Female	0	0
Total	87	100

Service background	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
Army	80	91.95		
Royal Navy	5	5.7		
Royal Marines				
Royal Air Force	2	2.3		
Civilian				
Total	87	100		

Status	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
Sentenced	83	95.4		
Unsentenced	4	4.6		
Civilian				
Total	87	100		

Sentence	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
Not Sentenced	4	4.6		
7 days or less				
8 to 14 days				
15 to 21 days	2	2.3		
22 to 28 days	6	6.9		
29 to 60 days	8	9.2		
61 to 90 days	15	17.2		
3 to 6 months	18	20.7		
6 months to 1 year	20	23		
1 to 2 years	12	13.8		
2 years or more	2	2.3		
Total	87	100		

Length of stay	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	13	14.95		
1 month to 3 months	22	25.3		
3 months to 6 months	26	29.9		
6 months to 1 year	17	19.5		
1 year to 2 years	5	5.75		

2 years or more				
Variable length of stay (awaiting DCM)	4	4.6		
Total	87	100		

Main offences	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
AWOL	56	64.4		
Dishonesty				
Disobedience				
Drugs				
Drunkenness				
Indecency	4	4.6		
Duty	3	3.45		
Violence	10	11.45		
Under investigation	4	4.6		
Misc military offences	3	3.45		
Misc civilian offences	3	3.45		
Total	87	100		

Age	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
16 years				
17 years				
18 years				
19 to 21 years	31	35.6		
22 to 29 years	45	51.7		
30 to 39 years	10	11.5		
40 years or more	1	1.2		
Total	87	100		

Home address	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
Within 50 miles of the MCTC				
Between 50 and 100 miles of the MCTC	6	6.9		
Over 100 miles from the MCTC	74	85.05		
Overseas	7	8.05		
NFA				
Total	87	100		

Nationality	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
British	79	90.8		
Foreign nationals	8	9.2		
Total	87	100		

Ethnicity	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
<i>White</i>				
British	78	89.7		
Irish				

Other white	1	1.15		
<i>Mixed</i>				
White and black Caribbean	1	1.15		
White and black African				
White and Asian				
Other mixed				
<i>Asian or Asian black</i>				
Indian	1	1.15		
Pakistani				
Bangladeshi				
Other Asian				
<i>Black or black British</i>				
Caribbean	1	1.15		
African				
Other black	5	5.7		
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>				
Chinese				
Other ethnic group				
Total	87	100		

Religion	Male		Female	
	Number	%	Number	%
Baptist	1	1.15		
Church of England	33	37.95		
Roman Catholic	11	12.65		
Other Christian denominations	18	20.7		
Muslim				
Sikh	1	1.15		
Hindu				
Buddhist				
Jewish				
Other	2	2.3		
No religion	21	24.1		
Total	87	100		

Appendix III: Summary of detainee questionnaires and interviews

Detainee survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the detainee 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

At the time of the survey on the 15 December 2011 the detainee population at MCTC was 114. A survey was offered to every detainee available at that time in the centre.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. There were no refusals. 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 hand their questionnaire back to a member of the inspection team on completion. Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire.

Response rates

In total, 110 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 96% of the detainee population.

Comparisons

The following details the results from the survey. Data from each set of survey responses have been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled for every inspection.

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 the responses of detainees surveyed at MCTC in 2008.

- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of A Company detainees and D Company detainees.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between the responses of white detainees 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.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Survey responses

Section 1: About you

Q1.1	What company line are you from?	
	<i>A Company</i>	48 (44%)
	<i>D Company</i>	59 (54%)
	<i>SCP (Service Custody Platoon)</i>	3 (3%)
Q1.2	Are you male or female?	
	<i>Male</i>	110 (100%)
	<i>Female</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.3	Which service are you from?	
	<i>Army</i>	100 (91%)
	<i>Royal Navy</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Royal Marines</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Royal Air Force</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Civilian</i>	2 (2%)
Q1.4	How old are you?	
	<i>17 and under</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>18</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>19 - 21</i>	37 (34%)
	<i>22 - 29</i>	60 (55%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	11 (10%)
	<i>40 and over</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	106 (96%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial/under investigation</i>	4 (4%)
Q1.6	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>7 days or under</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>8 to 14 days</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>15 to 21 days</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>22 to 28 days</i>	13 (12%)
	<i>29 to 60 days</i>	10 (9%)
	<i>61 to 90 days</i>	14 (13%)
	<i>3 months to less than 6 months</i>	23 (21%)
	<i>6 months to less than a year</i>	19 (17%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	17 (15%)
	<i>2 years or more</i>	3 (3%)
Q1.7	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)	
	<i>Yes</i>	12 (11%)
	<i>No</i>	97 (89%)
Q1.8	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	104 (96%)
	<i>No</i>	4 (4%)

Q1.9	Do you understand written English?		
	Yes	105 (99%)	
	No	1 (1%)	
Q1.10	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	89 (82%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>
	<i>White - other</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	5 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Arab</i>
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.11	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?		
	Yes	2 (2%)	
	No	106 (98%)	
Q1.12	What is your religion?		
	<i>None</i>	30 (28%)	<i>Hindu</i>
	<i>Church of England</i>	42 (39%)	<i>Jewish</i>
	<i>Catholic</i>	16 (15%)	<i>Muslim</i>
	<i>Protestant</i>	5 (5%)	<i>Sikh</i>
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	11 (10%)	<i>Other</i>
	<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.13	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	107 (98%)	
	<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	1 (1%)	
	<i>Bisexual</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.14	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?		
	Yes	5 (5%)	
	No	104 (95%)	
Q1.15	Is this your first time in the MCTC?		
	Yes	83 (75%)	
	No	27 (25%)	
Q1.16	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes	41 (38%)	
	No	67 (62%)	

Section 2: Reception, first night and induction

Q2.1	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	78 (71%)

Yes, I received written information.....	16 (15%)
No, I was not told anything.....	21 (19%)
Don't remember	2 (2%)

Q2.2 How long were you in reception?

Less than 2 hours	69 (63%)
2 hours or longer.....	32 (29%)
Don't remember	9 (8%)

Q2.3 Did you have a risk assessment?

Yes.....	92 (84%)
No.....	9 (8%)
Don't know/don't remember	9 (8%)

Q2.4 Overall, how were you treated in reception?

Very well.....	37 (34%)
Well.....	50 (45%)
Neither.....	19 (17%)
Badly.....	2 (2%)
Very badly.....	1 (1%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

Q2.5 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Loss of property	9 (8%)	Physical health	4 (4%)
Housing problems.....	15 (14%)	Mental health.....	14 (13%)
Contacting employers	3 (3%)	Needing protection from other detainees.....	1 (1%)
Contacting family	18 (17%)	Getting phone numbers.....	10 (9%)
Childcare.....	6 (6%)	Other.....	3 (3%)
Money worries.....	47 (43%)	Did not have any problems	46 (42%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	18 (17%)		

Q2.6 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?

Yes.....	51 (47%)
No.....	12 (11%)
Did not have any problems	46 (42%)

Q2.7 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

A reception/'get you in' pack.....	104 (95%)
A shower	65 (59%)
A free telephone call.....	92 (84%)
Something to eat.....	76 (69%)
Did not receive anything	0 (0%)

Q2.8 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Chaplain	38 (36%)
Someone from health services.....	57 (54%)
Someone from the welfare department.....	71 (67%)
A 'befriender'/Samaritans	31 (29%)
MCTC shop/canteen	31 (29%)

Did not have access to any of these 27 (25%)

Q2.9 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

What was going to happen to you..... 76 (71%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal..... 69 (64%)
How to make routine requests (applications) 77 (72%)
Your entitlement to visits..... 71 (66%)
Health services 70 (65%)
Chaplaincy 57 (53%)
Not offered any information..... 16 (15%)

Q2.10 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes 98 (90%)
No..... 7 (6%)
Don't remember..... 4 (4%)

Q2.11 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course..... 11 (10%)
Within the first week 66 (61%)
More than a week 27 (25%)
Don't remember 4 (4%)

Q2.12 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the MCTC?

Have not been on an induction course..... 11 (10%)
Yes 64 (61%)
No..... 20 (19%)
Don't remember 10 (10%)

Section 3: Rights & respectful custody

Q3.1 Please answer the following questions about the company line you are currently living in:

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	101 (94%)	7 (6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	109 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	104 (96%)	1 (1%)	3 (3%)
<i>Do you normally get room cleaning materials every week?</i>	77 (71%)	25 (23%)	6 (6%)
<i>Is your room call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	38 (35%)	13 (12%)	57 (53%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your room at night time?</i>	91 (84%)	15 (14%)	2 (2%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	70 (65%)	16 (15%)	22 (20%)

Q3.2 What is the food like here?

Very good..... 7 (6%)
Good 31 (28%)
Neither 28 (26%)
Bad..... 27 (25%)
Very bad 16 (15%)

Q3.3	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/don't know</i>	8 (7%)
	Yes	60 (56%)
	No	40 (37%)
Q3.4	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	61 (56%)
	No	4 (4%)
	Don't know/N/A	44 (40%)
Q3.5	Are you able to speak to the Padre/or a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	78 (72%)
	No	1 (1%)
	Don't know/N/A	30 (28%)
Q3.6	Can you speak to a 'befriender' at any time if you want to?	
	Yes	48 (44%)
	No	3 (3%)
	Don't know	57 (53%)
Q3.7	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	34 (31%)
	Very easy	24 (22%)
	Easy	24 (22%)
	Neither	4 (4%)
	Difficult	2 (2%)
	Very difficult	0 (0%)
	Don't know	20 (19%)

Section 4: Applications and complaints

Q4.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes	95 (89%)		
	No	2 (2%)		
	Don't know	10 (9%)		
Q4.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	23 (21%)	76 (70%)	10 (9%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	23 (22%)	73 (70%)	9 (9%)
Q4.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes		74 (69%)	
	No		7 (7%)	
	Don't know		26 (24%)	
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints:			
	<i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	73 (68%)	22 (20%)	13 (12%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	73 (70%)	21 (20%)	11 (10%)

Q4.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes.....	4 (4%)
	No.....	96 (96%)
Q4.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	42 (39%)
	Very easy.....	20 (19%)
	Easy.....	32 (30%)
	Neither.....	12 (11%)
	Difficult.....	1 (1%)
	Very difficult.....	1 (1%)

Section 5: Staging system

Q5.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the staging system?	This refers to stages 1, 2 (enhanced) to stage 3 (trustee level).
	<i>Don't know what the staging system is</i>	6 (6%)
	Yes.....	76 (70%)
	No.....	15 (14%)
	Don't know.....	12 (11%)
Q5.2	Do the different levels of the staging system encourage you to change your behaviour?	
	<i>Don't know what the staging system is</i>	6 (6%)
	Yes.....	59 (54%)
	No.....	34 (31%)
	Don't know.....	10 (9%)
Q5.3	Have you been physically restrained (C&R) by members of the staff at the MCTC?	
	Yes.....	2 (2%)
	No.....	107 (98%)
Q5.4	If you have spent a night in the Service Custody Platoon (SCP), how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to the SCP</i>	83 (81%)
	Very well.....	14 (14%)
	Well.....	5 (5%)
	Neither.....	1 (1%)
	Badly.....	0 (0%)
	Very badly.....	0 (0%)

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	92 (86%)
	No.....	15 (14%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	103 (95%)
	No.....	5 (5%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	61 (56%)

No..... 47 (44%)

Q6.4 How often do staff normally speak to you during your evening association/free time?
Do not use association/free time..... 4 (4%)
 Never 4 (4%)
 Rarely 12 (11%)
 Some of the time..... 37 (35%)
 Most of the time..... 44 (41%)
 All of the time..... 6 (6%)

Q6.5 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?
I have not met him/her..... 79 (77%)
 In the first week..... 13 (13%)
 More than a week 2 (2%)
 Don't remember 9 (9%)

Q6.6 How helpful is your personal (named) officer?
Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her 79 (81%)
 Very helpful..... 9 (9%)
 Helpful..... 7 (7%)
 Neither..... 2 (2%)
 Not very helpful..... 0 (0%)
 Not at all helpful 0 (0%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?
 Yes 7 (6%)
 No..... 102 (94%)

Q7.2 Do you feel unsafe now?
 Yes 5 (5%)
 No..... 104 (95%)

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

Never felt unsafe 102 (94%)	<i>At meal times</i> 0 (0%)
<i>Everywhere</i> 2 (2%)	<i>At health services</i> 0 (0%)
<i>SCP</i> 0 (0%)	<i>Visits area</i> 0 (0%)
<i>Association/communal areas</i> 0 (0%)	<i>In dorm/room showers</i> 1 (1%)
<i>Reception area</i> 0 (0%)	<i>In gym showers</i> 1 (1%)
<i>At the gym</i> 0 (0%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> 0 (0%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i> 1 (1%)	<i>In your company line</i> 4 (4%)
<i>At work</i> 0 (0%)	<i>In your dorm/room</i> 3 (3%)
<i>During movement</i> 0 (0%)	<i>At religious services</i> 0 (0%)
<i>At education</i> 1 (1%)	

Q7.4 Have you been victimised by other detainees here?
 Yes 8 (7%)
 No..... 101 (93%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your parent service</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (2%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your offence/charge</i>	1 (1%)

Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	8 (7%)
No.....	100 (93%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your parent service</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You were new here</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your offence/charge</i>	1 (1%)

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

Not been victimised	94(90%)
Yes.....	3 (3%)
No.....	8 (8%)

Section 8: Health services

Q8.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor		10 (9%)	27 (25%)	53 (49%)	10 (9%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
The nurse		13 (12%)	26 (24%)	54 (50%)	10 (9%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
The dentist		37 (34%)	14 (13%)	18 (17%)	5 (5%)	16 (15%)	18 (17%)
Q8.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor		17 (16%)	20 (19%)	26 (24%)	15 (14%)	14 (13%)	15 (14%)
The nurse		18 (17%)	29 (27%)	44 (41%)	12 (11%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)
The dentist		66 (63%)	6 (6%)	14 (13%)	5 (5%)	6 (6%)	8 (8%)
Q8.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
		<i>Not been</i>					
						12 (11%)
		<i>Very good</i>					
						14 (13%)
		<i>Good</i>					
						51 (47%)
		<i>Neither</i>					
						15 (14%)
		<i>Bad</i>					
						13 (12%)
		<i>Very bad</i>					
						3 (3%)
Q8.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
		Yes					25 (23%)
		No					83 (77%)
Q8.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?						
		<i>Not taking medication</i>					83 (77%)
		Yes, all my meds					15 (14%)
		Yes, some of my meds					3 (3%)
		No					7 (6%)
Q8.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
		Yes					23 (21%)
		No					85 (79%)
Q8.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in the MCTC? (E.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)						
		<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>					85 (79%)
		Yes					18 (17%)
		No					5 (5%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into the MCTC?		
		Yes	7 (6%)
		No	102 (94%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into the MCTC?		
		Yes	19 (18%)
		No	89 (82%)
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in the MCTC?		
		Very easy	7 (7%)

Easy.....	5 (5%)
Neither.....	2 (2%)
Difficult.....	4 (4%)
Very difficult.....	5 (5%)
Don't know.....	84 (79%)

Q9.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in the MCTC?

Very easy.....	6 (6%)
Easy.....	3 (3%)
Neither.....	2 (2%)
Difficult.....	1 (1%)
Very difficult.....	11 (10%)
Don't know.....	85 (79%)

Q9.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in the MCTC?

Yes.....	6 (6%)
No.....	102 (94%)

Q9.6 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in the MCTC?

Did not/do not have a drug problem.....	99 (91%)
Yes.....	6 (6%)
No.....	4 (4%)

Q9.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in the MCTC?

Did not/do not have an alcohol problem.....	88 (81%)
Yes.....	14 (13%)
No.....	6 (6%)

Q9.8 Was the support or help you received, while in MCTC, helpful?

Did not have a problem/did not receive help.....	88 (81%)
Yes.....	16 (15%)
No.....	4 (4%)

Section 10: Activities

Q10.1 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Military training programme.....	40 (38%)
Vocational or skills training.....	22 (21%)
Education (including basic skills).....	43 (41%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	12 (11%)
Estates (farm).....	18 (17%)
Outside work projects.....	8 (8%)
Other projects e.g. charity work.....	4 (4%)
Not involved in any of these.....	14 (13%)

Q10.2 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in the MCTC, do you think they will help you on release?

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Military training programme	34 (38%)	36 (40%)	15 (17%)	4 (4%)
Vocational or skills training	40 (50%)	31 (39%)	5 (6%)	4 (5%)
Education (including basic skills)	29 (32%)	54 (60%)	6 (7%)	1 (1%)

Offending behaviour programmes	47 (61%)	19 (25%)	6 (8%)	5 (6%)
Estates (farm)	32 (43%)	14 (19%)	23 (31%)	5 (7%)
Outside work projects	38 (53%)	17 (24%)	11 (15%)	6 (8%)
Other projects e.g. charity work	43 (62%)	13 (19%)	8 (12%)	5 (7%)

Q10.3 How often do you usually go to the library?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	22 (20%)
<i>Never</i>	23 (21%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	23 (21%)
<i>About once a week</i>	33 (31%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	7 (6%)

Q10.4 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

<i>Don't use it</i>	46 (42%)
<i>Yes</i>	44 (40%)
<i>No</i>	20 (18%)

Q10.5 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	7 (6%)
<i>0</i>	4 (4%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	9 (8%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	35 (32%)
<i>More than 5</i>	54 (50%)

Q10.6 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	7 (7%)
<i>0</i>	38 (36%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	16 (15%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	26 (25%)
<i>More than 5</i>	18 (17%)

Q10.7 How many times do you usually have association each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	20 (20%)
<i>0</i>	27 (27%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	13 (13%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	12 (12%)
<i>More than 5</i>	27 (27%)

Q10.8 How many hours do you usually spend out of your room on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, training etc.)

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	2 (2%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	5 (5%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	21 (20%)
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	22 (21%)
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	12 (11%)
<i>10 hours or more</i>	28 (26%)
<i>Don't know</i>	17 (16%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in the MCTC?

<i>Yes</i>	75 (70%)
<i>No</i>	32 (30%)

Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes.....	26 (24%)
	No.....	81 (76%)
Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes.....	22 (20%)
	No.....	86 (80%)
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	27 (25%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i>	9 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (11%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	11 (10%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	32 (30%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (11%)
Q11.5	How far are you from family/friends?	
	<i>Less than 50 miles</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>50 to 100 miles</i>	13 (12%)
	<i>Over 100 miles</i>	71 (67%)
	<i>Overseas</i>	16 (15%)

Section 12: Preparation for release (both back into the community and the Armed Services)

Q12.1	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	4 (4%)
	Yes.....	83 (80%)
	No.....	17 (16%)
Q12.2	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	21 (20%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	19 (18%)
	<i>Involved</i>	22 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	15 (14%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	17 (16%)
Q12.3	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	21 (25%)
	<i>Company & Platoon commanders</i>	28 (34%)
	<i>Personal/named officer</i>	10 (12%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	35 (42%)
Q12.4	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the MCTC?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	21 (20%)
	Yes.....	57 (55%)
	No.....	9 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (16%)
Q12.5	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets elsewhere?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	21 (20%)

Yes, on return to my parent service..... 10 (10%)
 Yes, in the community..... 3 (3%)
 No plans 41 (40%)
 Don't know 28 (27%)

Q12.6 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?
 Yes..... 41 (41%)
 No..... 60 (59%)

**Q12.7 Do you know of anyone in the MCTC who can help you with the following on release?
 (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	45 (44%)	29 (28%)	28 (27%)
Resettling back into your unit/platoon/ship/squadron	47 (48%)	21 (21%)	30 (31%)
Accommodation	42 (42%)	42 (42%)	16 (16%)
Benefits	42 (43%)	34 (35%)	21 (22%)
Finances	36 (37%)	38 (39%)	24 (24%)
Education	39 (39%)	36 (36%)	25 (25%)
Drugs and alcohol	47 (48%)	29 (30%)	21 (22%)
Maintaining contact with family/friends	44 (45%)	32 (33%)	21 (22%)



Detainee Survey Responses 2012

Detainee 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

		2012 MCTC	2008 MCTC	A Company	D Company
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		110	115	48	59
SECTION 1: General information					
2	Are you male?	100%	98%	100%	100%
3	Are you in the army?	91%	85%	92%	90%
4	Are you under 21 years of age?	35%	36%	33%	38%
5	Are you sentenced?	97%	95%	98%	100%
6	Is your sentence less than 2 weeks?	2%	0%	4%	0%
7	Are you a foreign national?	11%	6%	14%	7%
8	Can you understand spoken English?	96%		100%	93%
9	Can you understand written English?	99%		100%	98%
10	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	14%	8%	21%	8%
11	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%		0%	3%
12	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%	0%	0%
13	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	1%	0%	3%
14	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	5%	3%	4%	3%
15	Is this your first time in the MCTC?	75%	76%	84%	69%
16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	38%	35%	30%	43%
SECTION 2: Reception, first night and induction					
1	Before you arrived here did someone tell you you were coming here?	71%		78%	66%
1a	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information?	14%		22%	8%
2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in reception?	29%		33%	27%
3	Did you have a risk assessment?	83%	79%	92%	78%
4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79%	54%	92%	67%
5	When you first arrived:				
5a	Did you have any problems?	58%	76%	56%	58%
5b	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	10%	2%	13%
	Did you have any problems with housing?	13%	23%	2%	24%
5c	Did you have any problems contacting family?	17%	27%	10%	22%
5d	Did you have any problems with child care arrangements?	5%	22%	4%	7%
5e	Did you have any money worries?	43%	47%	44%	43%
5f	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	17%	19%	10%	19%
5g	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%		4%	3%

Key to tables

		2012 MCTC	2008 MCTC	A Company	D Company
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
5h	Did you have any mental health problems?	13%		8%	13%
5i	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other detainees?	1%	0%	0%	2%
5j	Did you have any problems getting phone numbers?	9%	18%	6%	10%
6	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with any of these problems?	82%		93%	72%
7	On your day of arrival, were you offered any of the following:				
7a	A reception pack/'get you in' pack?	95%	93%	96%	93%
7b	A shower?	59%	64%	71%	48%
7c	A free telephone call?	83%	80%	90%	78%
7d	Something to eat?	69%	53%	78%	61%
8	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services:				
8a	A Chaplain?	36%		43%	33%
8b	Someone from health services?	54%		59%	47%
8c	Someone from the welfare department?	67%		67%	66%
8d	A 'befriender'/Samaritans?	29%		33%	25%
8e	MCTC shop/canteen?	29%	38%	37%	21%
9	When you first arrived here, were offered any of the following:				
9a	Information about what was going to happen to you?	71%	43%	82%	62%
9b	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	65%	45%	74%	57%
9c	How to make routine requests?	72%	50%	80%	64%
9d	Your entitlement to visits?	66%	69%	74%	59%
9e	Health services?	66%	52%	76%	57%
9f	Chaplaincy?	53%	52%	71%	40%
10	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	90%	83%	94%	88%
11	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	72%	88%	93%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
12	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the MCTC?	68%	48%	73%	63%

Key to tables

		2012 MCTC	2008 MCTC	A Company	D Company
■	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
■	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
■	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
■	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Rights and Respectful Custody					
3	On the company line you are currently living in:				
3a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	94%	89%	94%	93%
3b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%	100%	100%
3c	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	96%	95%	96%	97%
3d	Do you normally get cleaning materials for your room every week?	71%	90%	82%	61%
3e	Is your room call bell normally answered within five minutes?	35%	31%	36%	37%
3f	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your room at night time?	84%	78%	90%	79%
3g	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	65%	51%	67%	63%
2	Is the food in the MCTC good/very good?	35%	17%	56%	15%
3	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	56%	46%	59%	52%
4	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	56%	42%	60%	52%
5	Are you able to speak to the Padre/a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	71%	50%	74%	68%
6	Are you able to speak to a 'befriender' at any time if you want to?	44%	28%	51%	38%
7	Is it easy/ very easy for you to attend religious services?	44%		44%	44%
SECTION 4: Applications and complaints					
1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	58%	86%	91%
For those who have made an application:					
2a	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	89%	84%	97%	83%
2b	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly? (Within 7 days)	89%	69%	93%	87%
3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	69%	76%	57%	79%
For those who have made a complaint:					
4a	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	64%	36%	80%	61%
4b	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly? (Within 7 days)	67%	53%	75%	66%
5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	4%		0%	7%
6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	48%	45%	40%	54%

Key to tables

Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better		2012 MCTC	2008 MCTC	A Company	D Company
Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 5: Staging system					
1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the staging system?	70%		82%	60%
2	Do the different levels of the staging system encourage you to change your behaviour?	54%		64%	48%
3	Have you been physically restrained by staff at the MCTC?	2%		2%	2%
4	If you have spent a night in the SCP, were you treated well/very well by staff?	19%		4%	26%
SECTION 6 : Relationships with staff					
1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	86%	71%	98%	75%
2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	96%	84%	96%	95%
3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	57%		54%	56%
4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	47%	27%	42%	52%
5	Do you have a personal officer?	24%	34%	29%	17%
For those with a personal officer:					
6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	89%	49%	92%	80%
SECTION 7: Safety					
1	Have you ever felt unsafe at MCTC?	6%	22%	4%	8%
2	Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	8%	2%	7%
4	Have you been victimised by other detainees here?	7%	16%	4%	10%
5	If yes, what did this involve:				
5a	Insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	4%	12%	2%	5%
5b	Physical abuse?	2%	6%	0%	3%
5c	Sexual abuse?	0%	2%	0%	0%
5d	Feeling threatened or intimidated?	2%		2%	2%
5e	Having your canteen/property taken?	1%	2%	0%	2%
5f	Medication?	0%	0%	0%	0%
5g	Debt?	1%		2%	0%
5h	Drugs?	0%	1%	0%	0%
5i	Your parent service?	2%		2%	2%
5j	Your race or ethnic origin?	4%	0%	2%	5%
5k	Your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	2%	5%
5l	Your nationality?	2%		0%	3%
5m	Your from a different part of the country?	2%	2%	2%	2%
5n	Your from a traveller community?	0%		0%	0%
5o	Your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
5p	Your age?	1%		2%	0%
5q	You have a disability?	1%	0%	2%	0%
5r	You were new here?	0%	2%	0%	0%
5s	Your offence/charge?	1%	6%	2%	0%
6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	7%	17%	2%	12%
7	If yes, what did this involve:				
7a	Insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends?	3%	9%	2%	3%
7b	Physical abuse?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7c	Sexual abuse?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7d	Feeling threatened or intimidated?	3%		0%	5%
7e	Medication?	1%		0%	2%

Key to tables

		2012 MCTC	2008 MCTC	A Company	D Company
■	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
■	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
■	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
■	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7f	Debt?	1%		0%	2%
7g	Drugs?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7h	Your parent service?	2%		2%	2%
7i	Your race or ethnic origin?	1%	1%	0%	2%
7j	Your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%	0%	0%
7k	Your nationality?	1%		0%	2%
7l	Your from a different part of the country?	0%	3%	0%	0%
7m	Your from a traveller community?	0%		0%	0%
7n	Your sexual orientation?	0%	4%	0%	0%
7o	Your age?	0%		0%	0%
7p	You have a disability?	0%	0%	0%	0%
7q	You were new here?	1%	3%	0%	2%
7r	Your offence/charge?	1%	4%	0%	2%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other detainees:					
8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	27%	53%	0%	38%
SECTION 8: Health care					
1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	74%	64%	83%	65%
1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	75%	78%	79%	70%
1c	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	30%	23%	43%	20%
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:					
2a	The doctor?	51%	63%	80%	27%
2b	The nurse?	82%	81%	87%	78%

Key to tables

		2012 MCTC	2008 MCTC	A Company	D Company
■	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
■	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
■	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
■	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
2c	The dentist?	51%	55%	92%	27%
3	The overall quality of health services?	68%	62%	83%	54%
4	Are you currently taking medication?	23%	37%	15%	27%
For those currently taking medication:					
5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some/all of your medication in your own room?	73%		100%	63%
6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	21%	38%	17%	22%
7	For those with emotional/mental health problems, are you being/ supported by anyone in at the MCTC?	79%		75%	77%
Section 9: Drugs and alcohol					
1	Did you have a drug problem when you came into the MCTC?	6%	15%	4%	7%
2	Did you have an alcohol problem when you came into the MCTC?	18%	28%	21%	12%
3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in the MCTC?	11%	16%	10%	12%
4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in the MCTC?	8%		6%	10%
5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in the MCTC?	5%	1%	2%	8%
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
6	Have you received anysupport or help for your drug problem, while in the MCTC?	60%		67%	50%
7	Have you received anysupport or help for your alcohol problem, while in the MCTC?	70%		78%	56%
For those who have received help:					
8	Was the support or help you received helpful?	80%	68%	100%	60%
SECTION 10: Activities					
10	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
1a	A Military training programme	38%	50%	81%	2%
1b	Vocational or skills training?	21%	18%	17%	25%
1c	Education (including basic skills)?	41%	39%	21%	59%
1d	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	2%	19%	5%
1e	Estates (farm)	17%	13%	0%	31%
1f	Outside work placements	7%	5%	2%	12%
1g	Other projects (e.g. charity work)	4%	6%	0%	7%
2a	Have you been involved in a military training programme in the MCTC?	62%	75%	87%	35%
For those who have been in a military training programme while in the MCTC:					
2ai	Do you feel the military training programme will help you on release?	65%	56%	80%	27%
2b	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in the MCTC?	50%	48%	36%	62%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in the MCTC:					
2bi	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	78%	58%	75%	79%
2c	Have you been involved in education while in the MCTC?	68%	61%	42%	89%
For those who have been involved in education while in the MCTC:					

Key to tables

		2012 MCTC	2008 MCTC	A Company	D Company
■	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
■	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
■	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
2ci	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	89%	75%	100%	85%
2e	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in the MCTC?	39%	30%	37%	43%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in the MCTC:					
2ei	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	65%	13%	85%	47%
2f	Have you been involved in the estates while in the MCTC?	57%	41%	15%	80%
For those who have been involved in the estates while in the MCTC:					
2fi	Do you feel the estates will help you on release?	33%	25%	75%	27%
2g	Have you been involved in outside work placements while in the MCTC?	47%	31%	18%	70%
For those who have been involved in outside work placements while in the MCTC:					
2gi	Do you feel the outside work placements will help you on release?	50%	16%	60%	48%
2h	Have you been involved in projects in the MCTC?	38%	30%	15%	55%
For those who have been involved in projects while in the MCTC:					
2hi	Do you feel the projects will help you on release?	50%	32%	50%	50%
3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	37%	47%	40%	37%
4	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	40%		38%	44%
5	Do you usually go to the gym more than twice a week?	81%	58%	88%	76%
6	Do you usually go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	42%	41%	62%	28%
7	Do you usually have association more than five times each week?	28%	23%	31%	23%
8	Do you usually spend ten or more hours out of your room on a weekday?	26%	23%	21%	31%
SECTION 11: Contact with family & friends					
1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in the MCTC?	70%	45%	77%	64%
2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	25%	36%	11%	33%
3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	21%	44%	10%	30%
4	Is it very easy/ easy for your friends or family to get here?	12%		15%	10%
5	Do you live more than 50 miles from your family/friends?	95%	95%	96%	93%
Section 12: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
1	Do you have a sentence plan?	83%	24%	71%	93%
For those with a sentence plan:					
2	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	49%	44%	31%	59%
For those with a sentence plan who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan:					
3a	Company and Platoon Commanders?	45%		65%	35%
3b	Personal/ named custody officers?	16%		14%	16%
3c	Staff from other departments?	56%		30%	70%
4	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the MCTC?	69%		59%	76%
5	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets elsewhere (on return to the Armed Services/in the community)?	16%		19%	14%
6	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	40%	22%	34%	44%
7	Do you know of anyone in the MCTC who can help you with the following:				
7a	Employment?	29%		11%	42%
7b	Resettling back into unit/ship/squadron?	22%		23%	19%
7c	Accommodation	42%		18%	59%
7d	Benefits	35%		14%	51%
7e	Finances	39%		23%	50%
7f	Education	36%		23%	45%
7g	Drugs and alcohol	30%		18%	38%
7h	Maintaining contact with family/friends?	33%		18%	43%



Detainee survey responses: key questions (ethnicity and nationality) MCTC 2012

Detainee 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

Key to tables		Black and minority ethnic detainees	White detainees	Foreign national detainees	British national detainees
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	93	12	97
3	Are you in the army?	88%	92%	75%	93%
5	Are you sentenced?	94%	97%	92%	97%
7	Are you a foreign national?	50%	4%		
8	Can you understand spoken English?	100%	96%	100%	97%
9	Can you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
10	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			67%	8%
11	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	6%	1%	0%	2%
12	Are you Muslim?	0%	0%	0%	0%
14	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	5%	9%	4%
15	Is this your first time in the MCTC?	69%	76%	83%	74%
16	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	50%	36%	25%	39%
2.1a	Before you arrived here did someone tell you you were coming here?	63%	72%	92%	69%
2.1b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information?	31%	12%	25%	13%
2.2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in reception?	25%	29%	25%	29%
2.4	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	88%	77%	83%	79%
2.5	When you first arrived:				
2.5a	Did you have any problems?	75%	54%	67%	57%
2.8	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services:				
2.8b	Someone from health services?	69%	51%	46%	56%
2.8c	Someone from the welfare department?	94%	63%	82%	66%
2.1	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%	90%	75%	92%
2.11	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	90%	100%	89%
3	On the company line you are currently living in:				
3.1a	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	100%	93%	100%	93%
3.1b	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%	100%	100%
3.1e	Is your room call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	34%	17%	38%
3.2	Is the food in the MCTC good/very good?	69%	28%	50%	33%
3.4	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	88%	51%	58%	57%
3.5	Are you able to speak to the Padre/a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	94%	67%	83%	71%
3.6	Are you able to speak to a 'befriender' at any time if you want to?	67%	41%	42%	45%
4.1	Is it easy to make an application?	94%	88%	83%	90%
4.2	Is it easy to make a complaint?	87%	66%	82%	67%

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic detainees	White detainees	Foreign national detainees	British national detainees
	Any percent highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percent highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percent highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in detainees' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
5.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the staging system?	88%	67%	92%	68%
5.2	Do the different levels of the staging system encourage you to change your behaviour?	69%	51%	67%	54%
5.3	Have you been physically restrained by staff at the MCTC?	6%	1%	8%	1%
6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	88%	86%	100%	84%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	100%	95%	100%	95%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	31%	23%	42%	22%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe at MCTC?	6%	6%	8%	6%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	4%	8%	4%
7.4	Have you been victimised by other detainees here?	6%	6%	8%	7%
7.5	If yes, what did this involve:				
7.5d	Feeling threatened or intimidated?	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.5i	Your parent service?	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.5j	Your race or ethnic origin?	6%	2%	8%	3%
7.5i	Your nationality?	6%	1%	8%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	6%	7%	8%	7%
7.7	If yes, what did this involve:				
7d	Feeling threatened or intimidated?	0%	3%	0%	3%
7h	Your parent service?	0%	2%	0%	2%
7i	Your race or ethnic origin?	6%	0%	8%	0%
7k	Your nationality?	6%	0%	8%	0%
8.1a	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	81%	72%	83%	74%
8.1b	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	88%	72%	92%	73%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	31%	22%	33%	21%
8.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	38%	19%	42%	18%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in the MCTC?	13%	10%	17%	10%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in the MCTC?	13%	7%	17%	7%
10	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.1a	A military training programme	67%	33%	58%	36%
10.1b	Vocational or skills training?	20%	22%	17%	22%
10.1c	Education (including basic skills)?	47%	40%	50%	39%
10.1d	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	7%	12%	8%	12%
10.1e	Estates (farm)	7%	20%	0%	20%
10.1f	Outside work placements	0%	9%	0%	8%
10.1g	Other projects (e.g. charity work)	0%	4%	0%	4%
10.3	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	35%	58%	35%
10.5	Do you usually go to the gym more than twice a week?	94%	79%	92%	81%
10.6	Do you usually go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	60%	39%	42%	42%
10.7	Do you usually have association more than five times each week?	36%	26%	20%	28%
10.8	Do you usually spend ten or more hours out of your room on a weekday?	20%	27%	25%	27%
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in the MCTC?	67%	70%	75%	69%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	21%	25%	8%	26%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	23%	0%	24%
11.5	Do you live more than 50 miles from your family/friends?	93%	95%	92%	95%