

Report on an unannounced full follow-up
inspection of

HMP/YOI Moorland

3–7 December 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Glossary of terms

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

Crown copyright 2013

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary and main recommendations	9
1 Safety	19
<hr/>	
2 Respect	31
<hr/>	
3 Purposeful activity	43
<hr/>	
4 Resettlement	51
<hr/>	
5 Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	61
<hr/>	
6 Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	70
II Progress on recommendations from the last report	71
III Prison population profile	81
IV Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	84

Introduction

Moorland is a category C training prison in South Yorkshire holding up to 1,000 adult and young adult prisoners. Since we last inspected, the establishment has had to cope with considerable change, uncertainty and, to an extent, turmoil. These challenges have included the process of recovery and the restoration of over 300 places following the disturbances of late 2010; the opening of brand new accommodation in 2011, followed by the introduction of over 300 sex offenders and 250 foreign national prisoners to the population mix; the clustering of Moorland with two other South Yorkshire institutions, creating a single managed entity or lot; and, finally, the market testing of that lot.

At the time of this follow-up inspection, Moorland and the rest of the South Yorkshire lot, all currently publically run institutions, had just been informed that they had been unsuccessful in competition, and that the three prisons were likely to transfer to the management of Serco during 2013.

When inspecting other prisons engaged in the market test process we have found some that have used the process to galvanise and re-energise their management and delivery. Evidence of such benefits was harder to discern at Moorland. Overall there had been some improvements from a low base, notably in the area of respect, but also evidence of concerning regression, particularly in the provision of learning and skills.

Overall, we concluded that safety outcomes were reasonably good, despite some concerns. A significant vulnerable population was well managed, young adults were properly integrated, and recorded levels of violence were not high. Too many prisoners, however, had safety concerns, there was evidence of a bullying problem, and many arrangements to promote and ensure safety were only adequate.

The quality of respect in the prison, which had been poor, had improved to a degree. The prison environment was reasonable and staff-prisoner relationships were better than they had been, but according to our survey, prisoners at Moorland felt less respected and reported more victimisation than at similar prisons. With the exception of a few pockets of good practice, we found the promotion of diversity to be limited, and across many indicators, prisoners from minority groups had more negative perceptions of their treatment. Health service provision was improving.

Outcomes were poorest for purposeful activity, a particular concern in a training prison. Evening association was limited and we found over a third of prisoners locked up during the working day doing nothing. Activity, of which there was broadly enough to meet need, was inexcusably underused. Non-attendance, lateness and interruptions for non-work reasons were not challenged with sufficient rigour, and overall there was insufficient vocational training or accreditation of skills. The quality of learning and skills for those who did attend was often good, representing an opportunity missed by too many.

Work to help prisoners resettle was hampered by the lack of a strategic approach. Little had been done to look at how the needs of such a diverse population of adults, young adults, foreign national prisoners and sex offenders could be met. Staff engaged in offender management work often lacked training or confidence. Of particular concern was the very limited provision for the third of prisoners who were sex offenders. Many of these were in denial of their offending and were not sufficiently challenged. Work was in place to provide support across the resettlement pathways but much was uncoordinated and its effectiveness not measured.

Overall we found that Moorland was a prison that had made some progress and was dealing with considerable uncertainties. That said, the pace of progress was disappointing and there remained much to do, some of it fundamental. The need to deal with these problems, and improve outcomes for prisoners, should not be lost in the transit to the private sector.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

February 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Moorland is a category C training prison holding convicted adult and young adult male prisoners.

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

Public

Region/Department

Yorkshire and Humberside

Number held

954

Certified normal accommodation

943

Operational capacity

1,006

Date of last full inspection

December 2010

Brief history

HMP Moorland opened in 1991, with a remand and YOI function, containing the original house blocks (1 to 4). House block 5 opened in 1998 and house block 6 was added in 2011 and took the operating capacity to 1,006. In addition, 320 sex offenders from the Yorkshire and Humberside region were received into Moorland and located on house blocks 3 and 4.

In September 2002, HMP/YOI Moorland merged with HMP/YOI Hatfield, with a shared governor and senior management team.

In July 2011, it was announced that HMP/YOI Moorland, along with its sister prison HMP/YOI Hatfield, would be subject to a market testing programme. It was placed into the 'South Yorkshire Lot', which included HMP Lindholme. The cluster was named HMP South Yorkshire and led by a single governor and senior management team, managing a population of some 2,200 prisoners.

Short description of residential units

HMP/YOI Moorland has six residential house blocks holding a mix of adults and young offenders.

House blocks 1 to 4 each hold between 155 and 170 prisoners. House blocks 3 and 4 hold only adult sex offenders.

House block 5 has 120 places and functions as a drug-free and drug recovery wing.

House block 6 is a new wing, with 180 places.

The induction unit is located in the former inpatient health care unit. It has a single landing with 23 cells, a gated cell and a Listener suite.

The segregation unit has 26 single cells and two special accommodation cells.

Name of governor/director

Marian Mahoney

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: Doncaster NHS Trust

Provider: Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust

Learning and skills providers

The Manchester College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Mike Rusling

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

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

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

HP3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison are:

Safety prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

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

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

HP5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

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

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

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

HP6 The Inspectorate conducts follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections may be announced or unannounced and are proportionate to risk. In full follow-up inspections inspectors conduct a new inspection of the establishment and also assess whether recommendations made at the previous inspection have been achieved. They also investigate areas of serious concern identified in the previous inspection, or matters of concern subsequently drawn to the attention of the Chief Inspector. Inspectors use the findings of prisoner surveys (where available), prisoner focus groups, research analysis of prison data and observation. This enables a reassessment of previous healthy prison assessments held by the Inspectorate on all establishments, and published in reports from 2004 onwards. Full follow-up reports are presented as full inspection reports with a new set of recommendations. Repeated recommendations are, however, indicated within the main report, and a list of recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved, is contained in the appendices.

Safety

HP7 Prisoners received a swift reception process, satisfactory first night care and a relevant induction. Vulnerable prisoners had been safely introduced and young adults successfully integrated into the main prison. Many prisoners felt unsafe. Recorded levels of violence were not high but there were too many incidents of bullying. Care for those at risk of self-harm was generally good but assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring processes were lacking. Dynamic security was good and security measures were proportionate. Use of force had reduced but remained too high. Segregation was used too often and not monitored. Drug availability and use were at similar levels to those at comparator prisons. Good progression routes were available for prisoners with substance misuse issues but there was insufficient psychosocial support. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP8 At the last inspection in December 2010 we found that HMP/YOI Moorland was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 32 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 15

of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and 12 had not been achieved.

- HP9 Most prisoners had short journeys to the establishment but all were handcuffed when they disembarked at the prison, without justification by a risk assessment. Reception processes were efficient and swift, and most new arrivals spent only a short time in reception. Holding rooms lacked information, were bare and had extensive graffiti. First night arrangements and support were generally good and there was some informal peer support, but night staff did not carry out enhanced observations of new arrivals.
- HP10 A comprehensive induction started on the day after arrival. Prisoners then routinely spent at least two weeks waiting for assessments before allocation to activity, and were locked up with nothing to do.
- HP11 Almost a fifth of prisoners in our survey, said that they felt unsafe.¹ This was similar to the proportion at the time of the previous inspection but worse than at similar prisons. The monthly safer custody meeting collated detailed information about violence and self-harm but this was not analysed adequately. Vulnerable prisoners had been successfully introduced and young adults had been fully integrated with the adult population. Both felt generally safe but prisoners told us that some younger prisoners were bullying older men. Recorded levels of violence were not high but there was considerably more bullying than at similar prisons. The bullying monitoring system was inadequate, with no interventions to challenge such behaviour and no structured support for victims. Too many prisoners were inappropriately located on the induction unit for their own protection, or segregated and transferred out without their concerns being addressed.
- HP12 The number of incidents of self-harm and the number of prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring procedures were in line with those at comparable establishments. The quality of ACCT documents was reasonable, although attendance at review meetings was poor and there was no consistency in case management. Prisoners subject to ACCT processes felt well supported. The trained Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) were easily accessible and well supported by the local Samaritans group. Too many prisoners subject to ACCT procedures were held in the segregation unit.
- HP13 Security was well managed and had responded appropriately to the challenges posed by the changes in the prison population. Dynamic security was good and wing staff interacted well with prisoners. Drug availability was in line with that at other category C prisons. Few suspicion tests were positive. The dissolution of the drug strategy

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

committee had resulted in a poorly coordinated approach to drug supply and demand reduction.

- HP14 The incentives and earned privileges policy was comprehensive and instructive but not always adhered to or consistently applied.
- HP15 The use of force, including use of special cell accommodation, had reduced but remained higher than at similar prisons. Incidents of use of force were reviewed at the monthly committee meeting and trends were identified but there was no analysis of the use of special accommodation and recording was poor. Too many use of force reports remained incomplete for far too long.
- HP16 The use of segregation was high and there was no analysis or monitoring of its use. Some prisoners were identified as requiring at least three officers to unlock them but such decisions were inadequately regulated. Segregation cells were mostly clean but the windows were opaque and some were damaged. The two exercise yards were bare. The regime on the unit was minimal and afforded no opportunities for association. Routine reintegration and care planning processes were generally inadequate, although there were some examples of individual good levels of support.
- HP17 Clinical and psychosocial substance misuse services were insufficiently integrated. The psychosocial team was understaffed, resulting in a reduction in drug and alcohol group work. The reduction-focused treatment strategy was developing well and prisoners could progress through to the drug recovery and drug-free wing. However, these wings were insufficiently resourced and little specialist support was provided.

Respect

- HP18 The external and internal areas were generally clean and well maintained. Access to showers was good. Mail services had improved but telephone calls were hampered by technical problems. Prisoners had little faith in the application process. Staff-prisoner relationships had improved but prisoners continued to report less favourably than at similar prisons. Diversity provision was generally poor and prisoners from minority groups were more negative about their treatment across most areas in our survey. Faith provision was good. The number of complaints submitted was relatively low but prisoners had little confidence in the system and we were not assured that all complaints were responded to. Health provision had improved overall and mental health services were particularly good. Prisoners' perception of the food was very poor. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP19 At the last inspection in December 2010 we found that HMP/YOI Moorland was performing poorly against this healthy prison test. We made 69 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 33 of the recommendations had been achieved, 10 had been partially achieved, 24 had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.

- HP20 Outside and internal areas were generally clean and well maintained but some areas were littered. The conditions of cells had improved and most were satisfactory,

² This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

although many had inadequately screened toilets. The offensive display policy was not applied. Single cells used for two prisoners were cramped and insufficiently furnished. Access to showers was good and most were in good condition.

- HP21 Mail was dealt with promptly but, in spite of the efforts of the prison, prisoner access to telephones was severely hampered by technical problems.
- HP22 Prisoners had little faith in the applications processes. Too many applications sent off the wing remained unanswered.
- HP23 Staff–prisoner relationships had improved but fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that staff treated them with respect or had a member of staff they could turn to for help. Prisoners reported relatively high levels of victimisation from staff. We saw generally respectful interactions and active engagement during association and at other times, but this was not reflected in electronic case notes. Effective prisoner consultation had been introduced and was well received by prisoners.
- HP24 Equality provision was poor. The sole diversity manager had insufficient time to develop and implement diversity across Moorland and its two sister prisons (HMPs Hatfield and Lindholme). The equality strategy was out of date and did not cover all protected characteristics. The equality meeting and action plan did not recognise and were not driven by the specific needs of the population. There were some pockets of good practice, particularly on the vulnerable prisoner house blocks, but these were not part of an overall strategy. Ethnic monitoring data on black and minority ethnic prisoners was insufficiently interrogated and no data were collected to monitor equality of access or treatment of prisoners from any minority groups. There were few formal support groups and there was little activity to support minority groups. Responses to discrimination incident report forms were generally reasonable and scrutiny was good.
- HP25 Prisoners from minority groups were more negative about their treatment across most areas in our survey. The needs of many older prisoners and those with disabilities were not properly met. Reasonable care plans were in place only for prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner house blocks, but these were not updated regularly. Paid prisoner carers provided valuable support. There were no personal emergency evacuation plans for most prisoners who required them.
- HP26 Although foreign national prisoners represented a sizeable minority, there was little understanding of their needs and many were unaware of what would happen to them on release. No independent immigration law advice was provided and there was inadequate use of professional interpreting services and translated material.
- HP27 All main faiths were catered for and prisoners reported more positively than at the time of the previous inspection about respect for their religious beliefs. There was insufficient space in the chapel for the large number of Muslim prisoners attending Friday prayers.
- HP28 The number of complaints submitted was relatively low, and they were well analysed, but we were not assured that all were responded to. Fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that complaints were dealt with fairly or quickly.

- HP29 A legal services officer was available but had not received up-to-date training, and had little understanding of the specialist legal advice needs of foreign national prisoners and detainees.
- HP30 The overall quality of health services had improved, although the needs analysis was inadequate and did not reflect the changing population. Partnership and clinical governance arrangements were effective. There was a wide range of clinics. Pharmacy services were reasonably good. Access to dental services was good. Too many external appointments had been cancelled because of escorting staff shortages. The use of prisoner health care representatives on house blocks 3 and 4 was effective. Access to, and the quality of, mental health services were very good.
- HP31 Prisoners were very negative about the food but the meals we sampled were adequate and menus were varied. Mealtimes were too early, particularly at weekends. Prisoners had some limited opportunities to eat out of their cells but chose not to. Service from the prison shop provision was informed by effective prisoner consultation.

Purposeful activity

- HP32 Time out of cell was reasonable for employed prisoners but very low for prisoners who were unemployed. Evening association finished far too early. Over a third of prisoners were locked up during the working day. Insufficient priority was given to learning and skills and work, the working day was routinely interrupted by recreational PE, and non-attendance was insufficiently challenged. There was too little vocational training, and opportunities to accredit work skills were missed. For those who attended, teaching and learning was generally good. Overall success rates were high. Library services were good. Recreational and vocational PE was reasonably good. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.
- HP33 At the last inspection in December 2010 we found that HMP/YOI Moorland was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 22 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.
- HP34 Time out of cell for prisoners in full-time activity was reasonably good, at just under 10 hours a day, but for the many unemployed prisoners this reduced to around three hours. We observed slippage in the published core day which reduced access to association and activities. Evening association finished too early and impacted on prisoners' ability to contact family and friends. Far too many prisoners, over 35%, were locked up during the working day.
- HP35 In spite of significant efforts by learning and skills managers to effect improvement, the prison had failed to ensure that prisoners were purposefully occupied during the core day. There were enough activity places for most of the population but they were underutilised. Attendance and punctuality were generally poor and non-attendance was not sufficiently challenged by wing staff. Prisoners were paid even when they did not attend. Too many education and vocational training classes and work activities were interrupted by other regime activities, particularly recreational gym. The

allocation process had improved but the sequencing of activities was not based on need.

- HP36 For those who attended education and training activities, teaching and learning were generally good, and learners engaged well in activities. The range of education classes was limited but used flexibly to meet need. The range of vocational training was good but there were too few places available. Some workshops developed good vocational skills but there was a lack of work ethic in too many contract workshops.
- HP37 For those who took qualifications, overall success rates were high, but this masked some areas of poorer performance. Progression opportunities were generally satisfactory. Opportunities to accredit some vocational work and record employability skills were missed. Learners in vocational training learned some good practical skills.
- HP38 The library provided a good service, with some effective promotion of literacy through a range of events, including the writer-in-residence scheme.
- HP39 PE facilities were good, with a reasonable range of recreational PE and good health promotion, but no discrete sessions for older prisoners or those with disabilities. The range of PE courses had improved and was good but too few prisoners had the opportunity to participate in them. Success rates for those who did attend were outstanding.

Resettlement

HP40 The strategic management of resettlement was poor and not informed by a needs analysis. Initial contact with offender supervisors was good but not all offender supervisors had the confidence and skills to manage the many high-risk prisoners being held. The timeliness of neither re-categorisation nor home detention curfew was monitored. Public protection measures had developed well and were very good. Links between offender management and resettlement were not strong. The resettlement services provided were adequate. With the high number of sex offenders, the lack of any sex offender treatment programmes was a serious concern. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

HP41 At the last inspection in December 2010 we found that HMP/YOI Moorland was not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved, six had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

HP42 The strategic management of resettlement was hindered by the lack of a reducing reoffending strategy and comprehensive action plan. The highly specific needs of the different groups of prisoners held at the establishment had not been aggregated or analysed to inform provision.

HP43 All prisoners had an offender supervisor, with whom initial contact was timely, but large caseloads reduced the amount of contact that prisoners received. The confidence and skills of offender supervisors in assessing and managing the risk of harm for the many high-risk prisoners were too variable. Many sex offenders were not required to address their behaviour or attitudes to offending.

- HP44 The number of prisoners released on home detention curfew was relatively low and the timeliness of their release was not routinely monitored. The use of release on temporary licence, although low, had increased and was purposeful.
- HP45 The number of prisoners subject to public protection arrangements was extremely high, processes to protect victims were thorough, and restrictions were appropriately applied and monitored. The violent and sexual offenders register (ViSOR) was well used and contributions to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were appropriate.
- HP46 Recategorisation decisions were defensible but not always completed on time. Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners received timely first contact from their offender supervisor but little offence-focused work.
- HP47 Resettlement needs were identified through offender assessment system (OASys) assessments and referrals made to services where needed. Links between the offender management unit and the resettlement unit were not fully developed and there was poor information exchange between the two.
- HP48 Shelter staff saw a large number of prisoners with accommodation needs each month and offered a wide range of help and advice. Outcomes were not monitored but few were identified as homeless on release.
- HP49 Formal employment, training and education advice for those being released was confused. Too few prisoners received help and many failed to attend appointments with the National Careers Service. There was an effective pre-release employability course and job search opportunities were available. Links with local employers were underdeveloped.
- HP50 Health care discharge planning was reasonable. For those with mental health concerns, transfers to secure mental health facilities were swift and there were good links with community services. Links with local drug intervention programme teams were good for those requiring substance use support.
- HP51 Some limited debt advice was provided by Shelter staff but there was no money management course. Savings accounts were available and a large number had been arranged.
- HP52 Work with children and families of offenders was underdeveloped, although there was a good Storytime Dads project and a parenting course. Staff in the visitors centre were friendly and booking arrangements had improved. We saw delays to the start of visits, but visitors were positive about their treatment, and good consultation arrangements had resulted in recent improvements to visits facilities. High-quality family visits were available but there were insufficient to meet demand.
- HP53 Although a third of the population were sex offenders, no sex offender treatment programmes (SOTPs) were delivered, hindering prisoners' progress. A significant proportion of those currently waiting to do an SOTP would be released without having a chance to complete it and have their offending behaviour addressed. Some interesting new initiatives were developing, including the ad hoc use of the A-to-Z programme for sex offenders in denial, but they did not form part of any formal strategy.

Main concerns and recommendations

HP54 Concern: Levels of victimisation and bullying among prisoners were high. Too many prisoners were inappropriately located on the induction unit for their own protection, or segregated and transferred out without their concerns being addressed. The bullying monitoring system was inadequate, with no interventions to challenge bullying behaviour and no structured support provided for victims.

Recommendation: All data on bullying should be analysed to identify trends and direct action. A clear policy should be introduced for the management and transfer of prisoners in the segregation and induction units and should include how problem or vulnerable behaviour and underlying causes will be investigated, how individual needs will be met and options for reintegration or transfer. Interventions should be introduced to challenge bullying behaviour and support victims.

HP55 Concern: Prisoners continued to report negatively about staff, and fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that staff treated them with respect or that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help. Prisoners reported high levels of victimisation by staff.

Recommendation: Prisoners' perceptions of poor staff-prisoner relationships and victimisation should be explored and findings acted on.

HP56 Concern: Equality and diversity provision was poor. In our survey, prisoners from minority groups reported considerably less favourably than their mainstream counterparts across a wide range of areas. There was evidence that the needs of many prisoners from minority groups were not being identified or met. No data were collected to monitor equality of access or treatment of prisoners from any minority groups.

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

HP57 Concern: Learning and skills and work were afforded insufficient priority. In spite of broadly adequate activity places, too many prisoners (35–40%) were unemployed or failed to attend their place of work or learning. The working day was routinely disrupted by other activities, including PE. This was of particular concern for a training prison.

Recommendation: Attendance at learning and skills and work should be prioritised. The number of unemployed prisoners should be reduced and staff should monitor and challenge non-attendance. Other activities, including recreational PE, should be timetabled so that they do not disrupt the working day.

HP58 Concern: Over a third of the population were sex offenders, yet the prison did not run any sex offender treatment programmes, and too many prisoners serving sentences for sex offences remained unchallenged in their attitude to their offence.

Recommendation: Attitudes, thinking and behaviour programmes to address sexual offending and sex offenders in denial should be provided.

Section 1: Safety

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Most prisoners had short journeys to the establishment and were treated well by escort staff. There were delays in disembarkation and all prisoners were handcuffed.
- 1.2 Most prisoners had short journeys to the establishment, with only 24% of respondents to our survey saying that they had undergone journeys of more than two hours, which was better than the comparator and than at the time of the previous inspection (45% and 34%, respectively). More prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had been treated well by escort staff (70% versus 60%).
- 1.3 Prisoners were not always disembarked promptly from cellular vans. Reception closed at lunchtime and we observed an arriving van waiting for more than an hour in the prison yard for staff to return before disembarkation began.
- 1.4 Prisoners were handcuffed between the van and reception without the justification of a risk assessment.

Recommendation

- 1.5 Prisoners should be disembarked promptly and handcuffs should not be used to restrain prisoners between escort vans and reception, except when justified by a risk assessment.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.6 The physical condition of reception was poor but prisoners were treated well and most moved quickly to the induction wing. First night conditions were reasonable but there were no enhanced observations of new prisoners. Induction started on the day after arrival and was comprehensive but the full process took too long, delaying prisoners' start to work. The induction wing was also used for prisoners who were not new arrivals.

- 1.7 The reception area was drab, holding rooms were dirty, with little information displayed, and there was extensive graffiti. Although this was mitigated for most new arrivals, who were taken swiftly to the induction wing after being identified, we saw some vulnerable prisoners waiting more than an hour in reception and those waiting for transport for transfers also experienced long waits.
- 1.8 We saw polite, efficient and respectful treatment of prisoners in reception. In our survey, more prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had been searched respectfully and treated well in reception.
- 1.9 On the induction wing, individual interviews were completed and prisoners were provided with a wide range of information. Welcoming procedures, including the offer of showers, telephone credit and toiletries, were mostly sound but some prisoners waited too long for something to eat or drink. Only 62% (against the 69% comparator) said that they had been offered something to eat on arrival, and we spoke to prisoners who had been waiting on the induction unit for more than two hours without being offered a drink.
- 1.10 First night cells were clean and fully equipped but night duty staff did not carry out enhanced observations of new arrivals and did not carry anti-ligature knives. However, prisoner perceptions were positive, with 82% in our survey saying that they had felt safe on their first night, which was in line with the comparator and better than at the time of the previous inspection.
- 1.11 A Listener (a prisoner trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) worked as an orderly in reception and on the induction unit. Newly arrived prisoners told us that they had met him and that he was helpful, but he did not have a formal role in greeting prisoners or delivering induction.
- 1.12 Induction started on the day after arrival. It included a general information session, talks from learning and skills and resettlement staff, and individual meetings with offender supervisors. The comprehensive written material provided was available in a range of languages. Prisoners stayed on the induction unit for two to three days, until a suitable place became available on a residential wing, but induction was not complete until gym induction, education and work assessments, and security assessments had been completed. The full process took too long and prisoners were usually unemployed for two weeks after arrival, spending more than 20 hours a day locked up.
- 1.13 The induction unit was well managed. Vulnerable prisoners were kept apart from the other residents but received the same level of service. However, the unit was also used inappropriately to accommodate some prisoners seeking protection or who had been previously segregated and were waiting for transfer. During the inspection this had reduced to three prisoners but had been as high as 10 in the previous week.

Recommendations

- 1.14 Reception holding rooms should be clean, free of graffiti and display relevant information about the prison.
- 1.15 Prisoners with a formal role in providing advice and support should be available on the induction unit.

- 1.16 Induction procedures should be completed promptly so that prisoners can be employed within a week of arrival.
- 1.17 Prisoners who are not new arrivals should not be located on the induction unit unless they have a specific role in induction.

Housekeeping points

- 1.18 Newly arrived prisoners should be offered refreshments.
- 1.19 Night staff on the induction unit should carry out enhanced observations of new arrivals and carry anti-ligature knives.

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

- 1.20 Prisoners reported high levels of victimisation by staff and prisoners but the level of assaults was not high. The safer custody committee was not effective and there was no local safer custody policy. Anti-bullying monitoring was poor, there were no interventions for persistent bullies and there was no support for victims. The introduction of vulnerable prisoners and integration of young offenders had been managed safely.
- 1.21 There was no local policy to guide the management of safer custody.
- 1.22 There were high levels of victimisation among prisoners and many felt unsafe. In our survey, 18% said that they currently felt unsafe, against the comparator of 13%, and 26% that they had been victimised by other prisoners, which was worse than the comparator (20%) and than at the time of the previous inspection (16%). The prison had recorded 139 bullying incidents in the six months before the inspection, equating to 14 per 100 prisoners, compared with an average for comparable prisons of nine per 100. However, in our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments said that they had been assaulted by another prisoner, and the number of assaults per 100 was lower than the average (2.4 versus 2.9).
- 1.23 Victimisation by staff was also a concern. In our survey, this was reported by 30% of prisoners, which was higher than at comparator establishments (25%) and than at the time of the previous inspection (27%) (see also section on protected characteristics). Five per cent said that they had been assaulted by staff, against the 2% comparator. Only 30% had reported the victimisation, which was lower than the comparator (38%) and than at the time of the previous inspection (43%), indicating a lack of confidence in staff and managers (see main recommendation HP55).
- 1.24 A wide range of information on bullying, assaults and self-harm was collected and reported to the monthly safer custody meeting. However, this information was not used to identify trends, areas of concern or action that could make prisoners safer (see main recommendation HP54).

- 1.25 There was no direct consultation with prisoners about violence reduction. A general survey and an exit survey addressed safer custody, and indicated that a major cause of bullying was debt. Some action was planned to address the needs of prisoners transferred in without money but this was limited.
- 1.26 There was a two-stage bully monitoring system. It was restricted to observation, and many examples we saw had been poorly completed. There were no interventions with persistent bullies, although the 'Men Talking' programme (see also section on reintegration planning) had been identified as a possible resource. No structured support was provided for victims and too many were segregated or placed on the induction unit and transferred out without their concerns being addressed (see main recommendation HP54).
- 1.27 Since the previous inspection, a population of vulnerable prisoners had been introduced and young offenders had been integrated into the main population. Vulnerable prisoners told us that they were kept safe but that their regime was limited. Some prisoners told us that groups of young offenders were bullying older men but evidence from our survey and from a sample of bullying incidents did not support this impression.

Recommendation

- 1.28 **A violence reduction survey for prisoners should be carried out and used to inform the violence reduction strategy. It should explore reasons for prisoners' perceptions of staff intimidation and take action accordingly.** (Repeated recommendation 3.10)

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.29 Prisoners at risk of self-harm were well cared for but assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring procedures were inadequate. Too many prisoners subject to these procedures were held in segregation. There was a trained group of Listeners (prisoners trained to support those at risk of self-harm), and access to them was good.
- 1.30 There had been 73 incidents of self-harm in the six months before the inspection, which was in line with the average for similar establishments. In the same period 138 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents had been opened, which was slightly fewer than at comparator establishments. Since the previous inspection there had been no self-inflicted deaths in custody.
- 1.31 At the time of the inspection 16 prisoners were subject to ACCT procedures, including some with complex needs who were subject to constant observation. The level of care we observed was good and prisoners were complimentary about their experience. Too many prisoners (28 in the year to date) subject to ACCT procedures had been located in the segregation unit.

- 1.32 ACCT documentation showed good assessment and interaction but review meetings were poorly attended and there was no consistency in case management. Regular management checks were often not recorded and did not provide feedback on the quality of care.
- 1.33 Training records showed that only 18 members of staff had received up-to-date ACCT awareness training.
- 1.34 There was a group of trained Listeners, with separate provision for vulnerable prisoners, and there were Samaritans telephones on each house block. They were well supported by the local Samaritans group, and prisoners had reasonable access to them. A well-appointed Listeners suite was located on the induction unit.

Recommendations

- 1.35 Prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring procedures should only be held in segregation under exceptional circumstances.
- 1.36 Regular management reviews of support plans should ensure they are of a consistently high quality. (Repeated recommendation 3.20)
- 1.37 Case reviews of prisoners on open ACCT documents should be better attended by representatives from all departments that have regular dealings with the prisoner. (Repeated recommendation 3.21)

Housekeeping point

- 1.38 All staff in contact with prisoners should be trained in ACCT procedures.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.³

- 1.39 There was no formal adult safeguarding policy and staff were not aware of their responsibilities in this respect.
- 1.40 The prison did not have a formal adult safeguarding policy and staff were not aware of their responsibilities for notifying local authorities when they had concerns for a prisoner's vulnerability.
- 1.41 Links had been made with Doncaster local authority and housing associations on behalf of vulnerable prisoners but no formal protocol had been developed.

³ We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

Recommendation

- 1.42 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes.

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

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

- 1.43 Security was well managed and procedures were generally proportionate. The availability of drugs was similar to that at comparator prisons. The flow of security information was used effectively. There was a good drug supply-reduction plan but no drug strategy meeting to oversee and coordinate supply and demand reduction.
- 1.44 Physical security arrangements were proportionate. Prisoners had reasonable movement around the prison and the risk of contraband being thrown over the wall and coming in through visits was well managed. Dynamic security was good and we observed reasonable levels of interaction between staff and prisoners. A weekly meeting between security and wing managers highlighted emerging issues and also developed information sharing.
- 1.45 The monthly security meeting was well attended, had responded to the changes in the prison's population and regularly considered a wide range of security information drawn from around 500 security intelligence reports (SIRs) every month. Objectives were set at each meeting to meet emerging threats but we were not confident that these were adequately communicated to the other staff. Integral to the meeting was reviews of the well-constructed, dynamic drug-supply action plan. Significant progress had been made, in cooperation with the local police, in responding to intelligence about people throwing drugs over the wall, and to arrests made before and during visits. There was no specific drug strategy meeting so the opportunity effectively to coordinate supply reduction and treatment (demand) strategies was missed (see section on substance use).
- 1.46 Our survey results indicated that the availability of drugs and alcohol was similar to that at comparator prisons. The random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate was 5.45% for the six months from May to October 2012; this was below the target of 6%. Random testing targets were regularly achieved and the MDT suite and holding room were clean, tidy and appropriately equipped.
- 1.47 The security department considered available intelligence and had requested 41 suspicion drug tests between May and October 2012. However, six of these tests had not been completed because of staffing issues and only a quarter of them had been positive.
- 1.48 The searching strategy indicated, and we were assured, that strip-searching was not routinely carried out and was subject to risk assessments. However, there was no central log of such searches and we were unable to ascertain how many had been conducted or who had authorised them.

- 1.49 All prisoners were eligible to be employed in any of the low-risk activities. Enhanced assessments were requested when prisoners applied for other, higher-risk positions and we were satisfied that assessments were proportionate and expedient.

Recommendation

- 1.50 A log should be kept of every strip-search and squat-search. (Repeated recommendation 7.17)

Housekeeping points

- 1.51 Monthly security objectives should be properly communicated to all staff.
- 1.52 All requested suspicion tests should be completed within set timescales.

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.53 More prisoners than at comparator establishments said that the incentives and earned privileges scheme was fair. Application of the system was, however, inconsistent. The monitoring of those on the basic level was poor.
- 1.54 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was comprehensive and outlined the benefits of achieving the higher grade and the consequences of not achieving expected levels of behaviour. More prisoners in our survey than at comparator establishments said that the IEP system was fair but application of the system was inconsistent across the prison and there was evidence of arbitrary demotions from enhanced to basic levels.
- 1.55 Prisoners normally remained on basic for at least 28 days. Individual improvement targets were not set, daily recording was poor and weekly manager's reviews were not consistently carried out.
- 1.56 The differentials between the levels of the scheme were substantial in a number of areas, including the number of visits allowed and the amount of money that could be spent, but the differing levels of pay for performing the same work were unfair.

Recommendation

- 1.57 A reduction in incentives and earned privileges level as a result of a single incident should only be awarded after a separate incentives and earned privileges (IEP) review. (Repeated recommendation 7.66)

⁴ In the 2010 report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

Housekeeping point

- 1.58 Prisoners on the basic level of the IEP scheme should have personalised improvement targets, be regularly reviewed and be promoted to the standard level when appropriate.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.59 The number of adjudications had decreased and processes were sound. The use of force had reduced but was still high. Regular analysis of data identified areas for improvement. The use of ratchet cuffs was no longer routine and de-escalation techniques had improved. Use of the special cell was high and unregulated. The number of prisoners segregated was high and segregation usage unmonitored. The segregation unit was generally clean and in good order but the regime was too limited.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.60 The overall number of adjudications had decreased. Most of the 827 that had taken place in the previous six months had involved prisoners from the main wings, with only 27 concerning vulnerable prisoners. Although this represented a large increase, pro rata, in adjudications across the main wings, this had not been identified at the quarterly adjudication standardisation meeting. Unauthorised possession, threats and disobeying orders accounted for most of the charges.
- 1.61 Adjudication processes were sound and prisoners were fully engaged.

Housekeeping point

- 1.62 The prison should explore the apparent rise in the number of adjudications on general population wings.

The use of force

- 1.63 The use of force had decreased but remained higher than at comparator prisons.
- 1.64 The monthly use of force committee meeting considered a range of data, including the locations and types of incidents, analysis of paperwork and video recordings. Trends and repeat incidents were analysed to identify learning points.
- 1.65 The use of special accommodation had decreased but still remained higher than at comparator prisons. It had been used five times in 2012. We were not able to establish any governance arrangements and, unusually, use of special accommodation was not included in the use of force committee remit. We were unable to locate all of the authorisation and monitoring records; for those that we found, the quality of recording was poor.

- 1.66 Most use of force records were reasonably well completed but evidence of de-escalation and decisions about whether to use ratchet handcuffs were not always recorded and about 20 records, dating back to March 2012, were incomplete. Planned use of force was usually video-recorded and the footage we saw showed reasonable attempts at de-escalation and demonstrated that handcuffing was not routine.

Recommendation

- 1.67 **The use of special accommodation should be monitored, formally recorded and reviewed.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.68 All use of force documentation should be thoroughly completed within 14 days of the incident.

Segregation

- 1.69 Use of segregation was high, with around 33 prisoners being located there for an average of nine days each month throughout 2012. In spite of an excellent data set being produced by the unit staff, there was insufficient scrutiny of the unit and no review group to monitor or analyse its use.
- 1.70 During the inspection, there were between eight and 11 prisoners on the unit; they all reported being treated well there, and we saw some generally good interaction and high levels of support and encouragement toward some challenging prisoners. The staff group was relatively new and had yet to undergo all of the required training. There had been some excellent care and management planning for a small number of prisoners but reintegration planning processes in general were poor and too many prisoners were transferred to other establishments without their issues being addressed.
- 1.71 Cells on the unit were well decorated and equipped but had opaque and damaged windows and dirty, scaled toilets. The regime was minimal, there were no opportunities for any associated activity and prisoners exercised on the bare yards on their own.
- 1.72 Prisoners on the unit were usually unlocked by two members of staff but three officers unlocked those perceived as posing a serious risk. This practice was unregulated and insufficiently structured, with no planned reviews or enhanced recording. There were authorisation forms but the two in place during the inspection had not been authorised by a senior manager.

Recommendations

- 1.73 **A segregation monitoring and review group should be established to provide governance of segregation procedures. (Repeated recommendation 7.56)**
- 1.74 **Segregation unit staff should all be trained in de-escalation, diversity, suicide prevention, mental health awareness, personality disorder and motivational interviewing. (Repeated recommendation 7.55)**

- 1.75 A formal reintegration and care planning process for segregated prisoners should be introduced.
- 1.76 There should be regular management oversight of using three officers to unlock prisoners.

Housekeeping point

- 1.77 Opportunities for associated activity (including exercise) should be introduced, subject to appropriate risk assessment.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.78 The prison's recovery-focused treatment approach was appropriate, but some prisoners' expectations of methadone reduction had not been sufficiently well managed. Services and facilities on the recovery and drug-free wings lacked integration and investment. The dissolution of the drug strategy committee had resulted in a lack of an integrated approach to tackling drug use.
- 1.79 The recovery-focused treatment approach was developing well, with treatment progression from house block 1 – the clinical integrated drug treatment system wing – through to house block 5A, the drug-free wing. While the ratio of reduction to maintenance opiate substitution doses was appropriate (83%/17%), some prisoners' expectations of methadone reduction had not been sufficiently well managed. A few prisoners complained that the reduction was too rapid and had been done without a full discussion. Some also told us that they were using Subutex (buprenorphine) illicitly to compensate, and were getting into debt as a result.
- 1.80 The clinical and psychosocial teams were insufficiently integrated. Psychosocial workers were rarely involved in clinical reviews.
- 1.81 House block 5B contained the drug recovery wing and staff tried to run the wing in a way that was sympathetic to prisoners in recovery. This positive ethos was often hindered by understaffing and the limited number of specific interventions or programmes. Prisoners on the wing were drug tested and the presence of the psychosocial team on the wing allowed greater access to ad hoc one-to-one work. However, no group work was provided because of staffing shortages.
- 1.82 Towards the end of their treatment, prisoners could move on to house block 5A, the drug-free wing. They signed up to a testing compact, although no compact-based drug tests were conducted. This meant that random mandatory drug tests were the only way of determining if a prisoner was drug free; the lack of extra regular testing on the drug-free wing rendered its effectiveness and integrity questionable.
- 1.83 The 'Building Skills for Recovery' (BSR) course had replaced the prison addressing substance related offending (P-ASRO) programme. Prisoners we spoke to who had completed the course were very positive about its effectiveness. Neither Alcoholics Anonymous nor Narcotics

Anonymous services were available. There was one peer mentor on the wing but this was not a paid position.

- 1.84 The prison's drug strategy meeting had been disbanded, with responsibility devolved to a range of other meetings. Health services and substance use staff had less input than previously, resulting in less of an integrated approach to tackling drugs. The drug and alcohol strategy documents had been updated but still did not have an overall action plan or performance measures outlining responsibilities or timescales. However, the security department had a well-constructed, dynamic drug-supply action plan that was regularly reviewed (see section on security).
- 1.85 At the time of the inspection, plans to introduce a dual diagnosis service (for those with both substance use and mental health problems) had not yet been implemented.

Recommendations

- 1.86 **Clinical substance misuse and psychosocial services should undertake joint care planning and treatment reviews.** (Repeated recommendation 3.60)
- 1.87 **The regime on the drug recovery wing should include recovery-focused group work and other relevant activities and interventions, including employment.**
- 1.88 **Compact-based drug testing should be introduced to the drug-free wing.**
- 1.89 **The prison should ensure an integrated approach to tackling both drug supply and demand reduction.**
- 1.90 **A dual diagnosis service should be developed for prisoners who experience mental health and substance-related problems, and their care should be jointly coordinated by mental health, clinical substance misuse and psychosocial teams.** (Repeated recommendation 3.61)

Housekeeping points

- 1.91 Prisoners should be fully informed of the recovery-focused treatment approach, and dose reduction regimes should be appropriate to individual needs.
- 1.92 Peer mentors should be paid.

Section 2: Respect

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 Outside and internal areas were generally clean but some yards were littered. Cells were in a reasonable condition, although single cells housing two prisoners were too small and contained inadequate furniture. Most in-cell toilets were inadequately screened. Sufficient cleaning materials were generally available. Most showers were in good condition. Prisoners could obtain enough prison clothing but many complained of ill-fitting garments. Application forms were readily available but prisoners had little faith in the process. Rules were generally well communicated to prisoners. Access to telephones was affected by technical problems.
- 2.2 The outside environment was generally clean, although some yards were littered. House blocks that had been out of use during the previous inspection following prisoner disturbances had been refurbished and reopened. Cells were generally in a good state of repair but single cells housing two prisoners were too small and inadequately furnished. Prisoners in some shared cells did not have keys for lockable cupboards. The larger double cells had separate toilet facilities, whereas most other cells had inadequate privacy screening for the toilet.
- 2.3 Prisoners we spoke to said that they had no problems with keeping their cells clean. Most cells were clean. Most showers were in a good state of repair, although those on house blocks 2 and 5 required some attention. In our survey, 97% of respondents said that they could shower daily. The published offensive displays policy was not consistently applied and we found offensive materials displayed in some cells.
- 2.4 Prisoners could wear their own clothes, although they could not have clothing sent in. There was satisfactory access to stored property. All wings had adequate laundry facilities but some equipment had been out of order for a long time. Prisoners were issued with a reasonable amount of clothing. Clothing and bedding were clean but many prisoners complained about, and we saw, some ill-fitting clothing.
- 2.5 Application forms were readily available on the house blocks. However, prisoners expressed little confidence in the application system. Submitted application forms were logged on each house block but the logs showed that many applications sent off the house blocks to other departments, dating back as far as September 2012, had not received a response.
- 2.6 There were sufficient telephones for the population, although not all were private enough, and prisoners had several opportunities during the day to use them. However, in spite of the efforts of the prison and the service provider, access to the telephones was severely hindered by technical problems. In our survey, 47% of respondents said that they had problems getting access to the telephones, which was worse than the comparator of 25%.

- 2.7 Mail was dealt with promptly and appropriately, and few prisoners reported problems with sending or receiving mail. Prisoners could also receive emails; much work had been done to advertise this service to prisoners and visitors, resulting in an increase in its use.

Recommendations

- 2.8 Prisoners should not share cells that are intended for single use. (Repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 2.9 Toilet areas in cells should be fully screened.

Housekeeping points

- 2.10 Keys for lockable cupboards should be provided for all prisoners in all double cells.
- 2.11 The offensive display policy should be applied consistently.
- 2.12 Responses to applications should be recorded and tracked.

Staff–prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

2.13 Staff–prisoner relationships had improved but prisoners were still considerably less positive than at similar prisons. The introduction of prisoner consultation had been well received and showed that progress had been made in a number of areas. Staff–prisoner interactions were generally respectful. We observed active engagement during association and at other times. Personal officer entries in electronic case notes were poor, with little evidence of meaningful management checks.

- 2.14 Staff–prisoner relationships had improved considerably. In our survey, 70% of respondents said that staff treated them with respect, which was considerably better than the proportion (57%) at the time of the previous inspection, although still much worse than the 78% comparator. Black and minority ethnic, foreign national and Muslim prisoners were less positive, with just over 60% in each category saying that they were treated with respect.
- 2.15 Similarly, in our survey more prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that there was a member of staff they could turn to but the numbers were still lower than those at comparator prisons (see main recommendation HP55). Managers had undertaken a considerable amount of work to encourage better staff–prisoner relationships, and guidance to staff had been issued.
- 2.16 We saw generally polite and respectful relationships, with staff mostly using first or preferred names. During association, staff interacted with prisoners and were visible on the landings. Recording in electronic case notes and written records was poor, with few examples of personal officers introducing themselves and only a few showing a good knowledge of

prisoners' personal circumstances. Not many records had been checked by managers, and in the few that had, these issues had not been addressed.

- 2.17 The consultation process was well received by prisoners, and the minutes of monthly meetings showed that progress had been made in some areas, including resolving prison shop, food and visits issues.

Housekeeping point

- 2.18 Case note entries should reflect meaningful engagement with prisoners, including an introduction by personal officers, and quality assurance measures should be effective.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic⁵ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.19 Insufficient attention and resources were allocated to equality and provision was underdeveloped. The equality strategy was out of date and did not include a needs analysis or cover all protected characteristics. Meetings and action plans were not part of, or driven by, an overall strategy. There were few formal support groups for prisoners and there was little activity to support minority groups. Ethnic monitoring data were not interrogated thoroughly, and there was no monitoring of equality of access or treatment of prisoners from other minority groups. Responses to discrimination incident report forms were reasonable and scrutiny was good. Prisoners from some minority groups reported considerably more negatively than their counterparts across a wide range of areas in our survey.

Strategic management

- 2.20 A full-time equality manager worked across the three sites (HMPs Moorland, Hatfield and Lindholme) but no other staff were allocated to support delivery. Provision was underdeveloped. There were few formal support groups for prisoners and little activity to support minority groups. However, there were some pockets of good practice (see section on protected characteristics), particularly on the vulnerable prisoner house blocks, but these were reliant on individual staff and not part of an overall strategy. The equality manager had not received any recent training, and, while other staff had received 'Challenge It, Change It' diversity training, this did not provide sufficient education on broader cultural issues. The equality action team (EAT) was not represented at the security meeting (see main recommendation HP56).
- 2.21 The equality strategy was out of date, and did not include all protected characteristics, a needs analysis or details of local practice (see main recommendation HP56). The EAT, covering all

⁵ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

three prisons, met monthly by video link. Prisoner representatives and also a representative from the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) attended.

- 2.22 Ethnic monitoring data on black and minority ethnic prisoners were presented at each EAT meeting. However, the minutes of one meeting stated that members were 'unsure of what they should be challenging' and there was insufficient interrogation and scrutiny. No data were collected to monitor equality of access or treatment of prisoners from other minority groups. (see main recommendation HP56).
- 2.23 The seven prisoner equality representatives attended monthly prisoner equality group (PEG) meetings with the equality manager, but minutes demonstrated that the meetings were not always focused on equality issues.
- 2.24 Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were freely available. Eighty-four had been received in 2012, compared with 16 in 2011, an increase attributed to improved awareness of the system. Responses were reasonable and timely; internal scrutiny of responses was good, and effective oversight was provided by an independent panel.

Recommendation

- 2.25 **Prisoner discussion and support forums should be introduced for all aspects of diversity, using professional interpreting where necessary.** (Repeated recommendation 4.10)

Housekeeping points

- 2.26 Staff should be appropriately trained in all aspects of equality and diversity.
- 2.27 The race equality team should be represented at the security committee and report any security-related concerns arising from their work. (Repeated recommendation 4.28)
- 2.28 Prisoner equality group meetings should focus specifically on equality issues.

Protected characteristics

- 2.29 Approximately 25% of prisoners were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. In our survey, this group reported more negatively across a wide range of areas. For example, compared with white prisoners, more said that they currently felt unsafe (25% versus 15%), and that they had been victimised by other prisoners (32% versus 24%) or by staff (45% versus 24%). Only 38% of black and minority ethnic prisoners were working compared with 59% of white prisoners (see main recommendation HP56).
- 2.30 Foreign nationals represented a sizeable minority, with 204 such prisoners, 26 of whom had been held as detainees beyond their sentence expiry date. Some who were within days of their release date told us that they had not yet been told by the UK Border Agency whether they were to be detained after sentence. Staff and prisoners alike said that prisoners were sometimes not told of a decision to detain until either the day before or the day of release.
- 2.31 The foreign national strategy was out of date and not based on a needs analysis. There was little information displayed in languages other than English and professional telephone interpreting services were not used routinely for health care appointments and other sensitive

issues. A list was kept of prisoners who could not speak English but no additional effort was made to ensure that their needs were met. No independent immigration law advice was available. In our survey, foreign national prisoners reported more negatively than British nationals across a wide range of areas, with more currently feeling unsafe (38% versus 14%) and experiencing victimisation by other prisoners (50% versus 21%) or by staff (45% versus 27%). In our groups, these prisoners said that they felt discriminated against when applying for jobs, and in our survey only 30% said that they were working, compared with 56% of British prisoners (see main recommendation HP56).

- 2.32 There were 152 Muslim prisoners at the time of the inspection and they too responded more negatively than their non-Muslim counterparts across a wide range of areas in our survey. More said that they currently felt unsafe (27% versus 16%) and had experienced victimisation by other prisoners (33% versus 25%) or by staff (36% versus 28%). Only 38% said that they were working in the prison, compared with 56% of non-Muslim prisoners (see main recommendation HP56). The EAT had recognised the need for faith awareness training for staff but none had yet been delivered.
- 2.33 In our survey, 21% of prisoners said that they had a disability. Reasonable care plans were in place only for those on the vulnerable prisoner house blocks, and these were not updated regularly. Only two prisoners had personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPS). One prisoner we spoke to was an amputee and would have needed assistance in an emergency, but had no PEEP. Paid prisoner carers provided valuable support to prisoners with a disability and older prisoners with mobility problems. There were two adapted cells on house block 6 but there were no grab rails in the integral showers. The design of the prison, with multiple landings and stairs, made it difficult for some prisoners with disabilities to access a full regime.
- 2.34 There were 137 prisoners over the age of 50, the oldest being 81. In our survey, 43% of older prisoners considered themselves to have a disability. The disability and older people's policy related to all three establishments and was not based on a needs analysis. Some good work had been initiated on the vulnerable prisoner house blocks, including developing links with the local authority, the provision of activities such as a gardening club and bingo, and an older prisoners' forum; however, this had not been extended to other house blocks.
- 2.35 There was no policy for managing the needs of young men aged 18–21. However, as they were integrated into the adult population, vulnerability was assessed and managed in the same way as for their older counterparts, and thorough research had been undertaken before their integration.
- 2.36 In our survey, there were far more prisoners who identified themselves as a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller than the prison was aware of and there was no specific support for them.
- 2.37 In our survey, 3% of prisoners identified themselves as gay or bisexual. A sexual orientation, gender and identity policy had been developed in August 2012. However, it was not specific to Moorland and was not based on a needs analysis. It was not displayed on the house blocks because staff were concerned about how it would be received. A gay, bisexual and transgender prisoner group met monthly.

Recommendations

- 2.38 Foreign national prisoners should be given sufficient notice by the UK Border Agency of the intention to detain beyond sentence.

- 2.39 A needs analysis of foreign national prisoners should be conducted annually and the policy document should be updated to include its findings and to outline the strategy. (Repeated recommendation 4.41)
- 2.40 All prisoners with disabilities should be able to access a full regime. (Repeated recommendation 4.50)
- 2.41 All older prisoners and those with disabilities should be assessed to establish the requirements for individual care plans, which should be regularly updated. (Repeated recommendation 4.51)

Housekeeping points

- 2.42 Professional telephone interpreting services should always be used with relevant prisoners for health care and other sensitive matters, and displayed information should be in a range of appropriate languages.
- 2.43 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be put in place for all relevant prisoners.
- 2.44 Grab rails should be installed in the two adapted cells on house block 6.
- 2.45 The sexual orientation, gender and identity policy should be displayed on the house blocks.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.46 Prisoners (particularly Muslim prisoners) were positive about the chaplaincy. There was a range of services and classes but prisoners sometimes attended late. The chapel was not big enough for the increased number of Muslim prisoners attending Friday prayers.
- 2.47 Prisoners we spoke to were positive about the support provided by chaplains. In our survey, 53% said that they felt their religious views were respected and 56% that they could talk to a chaplain when required, both figures being better than at the time of the previous inspection. Muslim prisoners reported particularly positively on these survey questions.
- 2.48 There was a range of religious services and classes, although prisoners often arrived late because they had not been allowed off the wing in sufficient time. This was reflected in our survey, where only 49% of prisoners said that it was easy to attend services, and this was significantly less than in similar prisons.
- 2.49 The chapel and multi-faith room provided good environments. As the latter was too small to hold Friday prayers for Muslim prisoners, the chapel was being used instead. However, with the recent increase in the foreign national prisoner population at the establishment, the number of Muslims attending Friday prayers had increased to around 120 prisoners and even the chapel was no longer large enough.

Recommendation

- 2.50 Friday prayers should be held in an appropriate environment which is large enough to accommodate all attendees.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.51 Complaints were mostly completed on time, with issues fully addressed. Analysis was good but we were unable to verify that all complaints were responded to. Prisoners had limited confidence in the system.
- 2.52 Fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that complaints were dealt with fairly or quickly, and this was similar to our findings at the previous inspection. Around 300 complaints were submitted each month, with property, money and the regime regularly being the most common subjects.
- 2.53 Complaint forms and envelopes were available on the wings. The complaints clerk maintained a spreadsheet that indicated when replies were sent and by whom. This showed that replies were timely but the scanned records were incomplete, with many replies not being available. The replies that we saw were mostly reasonable and addressed the issues raised. The deputy governor reviewed 5% of complaints each month.
- 2.54 Information about the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman was available on all the wings but some wings continued to publicise the Board of Visitors, despite being replaced by the Independent Monitoring Board in 2003.

Recommendation

- 2.55 Prisoner confidence in the complaints system should be improved.

Housekeeping points

- 2.56 The scanning process should be reviewed to ensure that all replies are recorded.
- 2.57 Independent Monitoring Board noticeboards should be updated to reflect the current provision.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.58 A legal services officer provided basic assistance to prisoners but he had received no training for the role. Some prisoners did not understand what the service could do for them.

2.59 A member of staff in the library provided a signposting service and assisted prisoners in contacting solicitors and obtaining relevant telephone numbers. He had not received recent training and had little understanding, for example, of the different needs of foreign national prisoners.

2.60 There were posters around the prison advertising the legal services available but prisoners in our foreign nationals group did not understand what it could do for them.

Recommendation

2.61 A legal services officer, with the training and time to provide an effective service, should be known and accessible to prisoners. (Repeated recommendation 3.40)

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.62 The overall quality of health services had improved but the environment did not meet infection control standards. Partnership and clinical governance arrangements were good. There was a wide range of clinics, which were part of a wing-based service. The use of prisoner health care representatives on house blocks 3 and 4 was effective. Too many external appointments had been cancelled because of escorting staff shortages. Pharmacy services were reasonably good. Initial access to dental services was good, but the wait for follow-up appointments was increasing. Access to, and the quality of, mental health services were very good.

Governance arrangements

2.63 Health services were commissioned by NHS Doncaster. Primary care, mental health and substance misuse services were provided by Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust. Out-of-hours services were available and effective. Governance and monitoring arrangements were good. There was a range of clinical audits, and there were action plans to improve services. The establishment was managed as part of a cluster arrangement and staff were shared with HMP Hatfield. In our survey, 47% of respondents rated the overall quality of health care as good, which was similar to the comparator but considerably better than the proportion at the time of the previous inspection (35%). During the inspection prisoners generally commented positively about their health care.

2.64 An infection control audit had been undertaken within the previous year. However, the environment did not comply with expected standards and many areas of the department were in a poor state of decoration. The health needs assessment had been reviewed in October 2011 but no longer addressed the needs of prisoners.

- 2.65 Emergency resuscitation equipment, including oxygen and automated electronic defibrillators, were available. However, few officers knew where they were located and we were not assured that staff would know what to do in an emergency. There was not sufficient first-aid equipment and there was no standardised process for checking and replacing used products.
- 2.66 There were four prisoner health care representatives on house blocks 3 and 4. This was a new initiative and was working well, with regular meetings, and they were proactive in their support for older prisoners and those with disabilities. Complaints were managed through the NHS and prison system. Few written complaints had been received. The quality of the responses to complaints that we reviewed was reasonably good.

Recommendations

- 2.67 The environment should comply with infection control guidance and be refurbished.
- 2.68 The governor and head of health care should ensure that all staff know where emergency medical equipment is kept and what to do in an emergency. All first-aid equipment should be checked regularly and green boxes should contain a standardised range of products.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.69 In our survey, only 24% of prisoners, against the 36% comparator and 32% at the time of the previous inspection, said that it was easy to see the doctor. However, a wing-based nursing service had started over the previous few months, for which we saw good access and a short waiting list. Prisoners were being triaged to prevent inappropriate referrals to the GP. Nurse triage was available every morning, and also a range of nurse-led clinics, including asthma, smoking cessation and immunisations. A sexual health clinic was available. There was a range of health promotion literature and some useful events had been held.
- 2.70 A number of external appointments had been cancelled over the summer because of insufficient escort opportunities. Action had started only recently to address the backlog.

Recommendation

- 2.71 Access to hospital appointments should be monitored and cancellations and delays prevented.

Pharmacy

- 2.72 Medication was supplied on time. A pharmacist visited the prison approximately once a month to carry out medicine use reviews. Relevant stakeholders attended the medicines and therapeutics committee meeting and a formulary (list of medications used to inform prescribing) had been developed.
- 2.73 Medicines were supplied mainly from treatment rooms on the house blocks three times a day. Queues were generally well managed. The rooms were suitable, with several having a small annexe which provided the opportunity for confidentiality. Medicines were stored appropriately, in lockable cabinets.

- 2.74 The pharmacy room in the health care department was used to supply methadone and other controlled drugs. This was not well managed, caused disruption in the room and, as the electronic controlled drugs register was not available in the room, appropriate records could not be made at the time of administration. Although there were appropriate cupboards for controlled drugs in the integrated drug treatment system room on house block 1, methadone and Subutex were transported daily from the pharmacy room.
- 2.75 There was an in-possession policy. All prisoners were risk assessed on reception but there was no procedure for regular follow-up reviews. Most prisoners were given medication either weekly or monthly in-possession. Patients signed the prescription when they collected medicines, and were encouraged to reorder their medication. A limited range of medicines were supplied as 'special sick' (immediate health treatment without an appointment); with no patient group directions, the range of medicines was limited to those available in the general stock.
- 2.76 Medicines to be administered directly to prisoners were mainly dispensed from stock. Records of these were not always accurate and were not audited, and the stock levels recorded did not reflect current stock quantities. There was no audit of stock use in the treatment rooms and there was no clinical audit of supplies made. There was no record of date checking of stock medicines in the treatment room. Treatment rooms also held in-possession medicines that should have been supplied to the patient or returned to the pharmacy.

Recommendations

- 2.77 **Patient group directions should be produced, to allow the supply of more potent medicines by the nursing staff, where appropriate.** (Repeated recommendation 5.38)
- 2.78 **Use of general stock should be audited, so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions and agreed stock levels.** (Repeated recommendation 5.35)

Housekeeping points

- 2.79 The controlled drug register should be completed at the same time as administration of drugs.
- 2.80 The procedures for administering medicines for substance misuse should be reviewed, to reduce the unnecessary movement of controlled drugs around the prison.
- 2.81 The current in-possession policy and special sick policy should be reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee.

Dentistry

- 2.82 A new dental service had been commissioned in April 2012. The dentist and dental nurse were available for one session per week. Access to the dentist was satisfactory and the waiting list was short.
- 2.83 All equipment was maintained and was working satisfactorily. Infection control was generally satisfactory, although there was not a separate area for decontamination.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.84 There was good access to mental health services. The mental health team had a caseload of 48 patients. Improving access to psychological therapies (IAPT) provided primary care support for those with issues such as anxiety or sleep disturbances. A psychologist and consultant psychiatrist were available weekly. There were links with the chaplaincy, which offered bereavement counselling. Some good work was developing for prisoners with personality disorders, and training was offered to discipline officers. A service review by the clinical lead had identified gaps in provision for prisoners with learning difficulties/disabilities, autism and dementia.
- 2.85 Weekly interdisciplinary team meetings were held to discuss prisoners with complex mental health needs and a separate meeting was held to discuss those with a dual diagnosis (mental health and substance use problems). There were plans to deliver more group therapies.

Recommendation

- 2.86 **A full range of services for prisoners with mental health needs should be implemented in line with the service review.**

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.87 Prisoners reported negatively about the food. Menus were varied and met religious, cultural and medical needs. Hygiene standards in the kitchen and serveries were generally adequate. Breakfast packs were issued on the day before consumption. Mealtimes were too early. Prisoners had some limited opportunities to dine out of their cells but chose not to.
- 2.88 Prisoners were very negative about the food. In our survey, only 18% of respondents said that it was good, although this was much higher than at the time of the previous inspection (10%). The meals we sampled were adequate. The four-weekly pre-select menus were varied and religious, cultural and medical diet needs were met. A prisoner survey on food was undertaken twice yearly and the catering manager met prisoner representatives monthly to discuss concerns.
- 2.89 The main kitchen had been refurbished and both the kitchen and servery areas were reasonably clean. All prisoners were required to undergo basic food hygiene training before working in the kitchen and eight prisoners were undertaking vocational training leading to accredited qualifications.
- 2.90 Breakfast packs were still being issued on the night before consumption and mealtimes were too early: lunch was served from 11.30am and the evening meal from 4.30pm (slightly earlier at weekends). Prisoners told us they were hungry by mid-evening. In addition, the food was prepared long before mealtimes and stored on trolleys, where it became soggy. Prisoners had some limited opportunities to dine out of their cells but chose not to.

Recommendation

- 2.91 Meals should be served at appropriate mealtimes and prisoners should be provided with breakfast on the day it is to be eaten. (Repeated recommendation 8.13)

Housekeeping points

- 2.92 Prisoners should be allowed to eat in association where there is sufficient communal space. (repeated recommendation 8.11)
- 2.93 The time span between preparing food, and loading and delivering the heated trolleys to the wings should be minimised.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.94 New prisoners could wait too long for their first shop order. A range of catalogues was available. There was good consultation with prisoners about the prison shop.
- 2.95 New prisoners could wait up to 11 days for their first shop order, although they were given the opportunity to buy additional reception grocery packs, and advances of pay were available to those arriving with no funds. Prisoners could make purchases from a wide range of catalogues. Consultation arrangements were very good; an information pack, including price comparisons, was sent out to prisoner representatives in time for them to consult other prisoners before the monthly meeting. All prisoners received a statement of their cash account before the issuing of the weekly shop order form.

Section 3: Purposeful activity

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁶

- 3.1 Time out of cell for fully employed prisoners was reasonable, at over nine hours a day during the working week, although unemployed prisoners could experience less than three hours a day. At roll checks during the core day, over 35% of the total population was locked in their cells. Evening association periods were short and prisoners were locked up too early. Daily time in the open air was restricted to less than an hour during the week.
- 3.2 Fully employed prisoners experienced over nine hours out of their cells during the week but under seven hours at weekends. However, unemployed prisoners had less than three hours out of cell a day. Evening association periods during the week were short and prisoners were locked up too early, at 6.30pm on Monday to Thursday and at 4.30pm on Fridays and at weekends, which meant they spent over 16 hours a day locked up over the weekend. This impacted on their ability to contact family and friends. In our roll checks during core day periods, over 35% of the population was locked in their cells and not engaged in activity. We saw several instances of slippage of the published core day because of late roll checks, reducing access to association and activities.
- 3.3 Association areas were reasonable, with a range of games equipment. House block 5 had the added facility of gym equipment.
- 3.4 Daily exercise was limited to 45 minutes during the week. Exercise yards were mainly bleak but with some seating.

Recommendations

- 3.5 Prisoners should have the opportunity for evening association.
- 3.6 All prisoners should have one hour of exercise daily.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after their

⁶ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

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

3.7 The prison had failed to ensure that all prisoners were purposefully occupied during the core day. Regime activities were poorly planned, with too many activities interrupted by prisoners attending recreational PE. Insufficient emphasis was placed on ensuring that prisoners attended activities, and attendance was low in much of the provision. There were broadly enough activity places to meet need but these were underutilised. There was insufficient provision for vulnerable prisoners. The range of vocational training was good but there were too few places. Quality assurance processes were well applied in education and vocational training, and, overall, outcomes were very good for those prisoners who attended courses. Much teaching and training was good. Induction was too brief and too little account was taken of sentence planning targets when allocating prisoners to activities. The library provided a good service.

3.8 Ofsted⁷ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities:

Requires improvement

Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:

Requires improvement

Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:

Inadequate

Management of learning and skills and work

3.9 In spite of significant efforts by learning and skills managers to effect improvement, the prison had failed to ensure that all prisoners were purposefully occupied during the core day. Learning and skills managers had tried to improve attendance and reduce interruptions (see below) but had not been successful. In education classes, attendance had improved from a very low base of just over 40% to 68–77% but this was still too low and fluctuated monthly. At work, no electronic records were kept to measure attendance. Paper records showed attendance at 55% and 73%, respectively, over two weeks in September 2012; more recent records were not available (see main recommendation HP57).

3.10 The activity allocation process had improved and provided a more coherent approach, bringing work and education allocation together in one unit, but the sequencing of activities was not based on need. Places were allocated to optimum usage but were not filled to capacity. Some residential staff placed too little importance on ensuring that prisoners attended their allocated activities. Far too many prisoners who were allocated to activities were allowed to stay on their accommodation units with no sufficient reason for doing so and were often still paid their working wage. Developing a work ethic in prisoners was severely impeded by these practices.

3.11 Regime activities were poorly planned and too many education and vocational training classes and work activities were interrupted, particularly by recreational PE (see main recommendation HP57). The negative impact of this on much of the well-planned teaching and learning was significant.

⁷ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.12 A training needs analysis and a scale of need evaluation had informed curriculum planning and the prison had responded well to the marked change in the population. Good use had been made of prisoner views and local market intelligence to inform provision.
- 3.13 Quality assurance processes were well applied in education and vocational training but were at an early stage of development at work. Success rates had improved considerably over the previous three years. Teachers were well supported to develop their skills and mostly delivered high-quality teaching. The self-assessment report was thorough but when evaluating provision, insufficient account had been taken of the significant negative impact of the prison regime on the quality of provision.
- 3.14 The pay policy was inequitable and acted as a disincentive to attending education. A new, more equitable pay policy was in the final stages of approval and due to be implemented in January 2013.

Housekeeping point

- 3.15 Prisoners should not be paid when they do not attend work or training.

Provision of activities

- 3.16 The available activity places met the needs of approximately 80% of the population but these were underutilised. Provision for vulnerable prisoners met approximately 72% of need, which was insufficient. Most education places were part time and provided 174 places in the morning and 180 in the afternoon. Vocational training offered around 109 full-time places and work provided 479 jobs, but not all were full time or occupied the prisoners fully during the core day. Twenty-two learners were successfully undertaking distance learning and Open University courses.
- 3.17 The Manchester College provided education at entry levels 1 to 3. Functional skills in mathematics and English were offered mostly at level 1. Several information and communications technology (ICT) qualifications were available up to level 3, as well as art and design, food hygiene at level 2, and personal and social development qualifications such as alcohol awareness.
- 3.18 Vocational training was provided by East Riding College through a subcontract with The Manchester College. The range was good and had improved but there were too few places. Courses included catering, textiles, construction crafts and horticulture. Cleaning courses were also offered. The provision for vulnerable prisoners was limited to Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA), joinery, catering at level 1 and industrial catering.
- 3.19 Some good quality work and training was provided in the Braille and television and electrical equipment repair workshops, although this was not accredited. Staff in the Braille workshop ran an impressive Storytime Dads scheme (whereby detainees record stories for their children). A small proportion of low-quality work was provided in plastic recycling, moulding, assembly work and breakfast packaging. There was insufficient planning of work in some of these areas, with prisoners often sitting around with little to do.
- 3.20 Induction to activities was timely but too brief and did not promote the available activities sufficiently well. Prisoners made several choices on their preferred activity at induction, rather than being guided to select activities based on their needs. The lack of liaison between

education, the National Careers Service and sentence planning staff limited the opportunity to provide a coherent offer to prisoners and ensure that activities were appropriately sequenced to meet their needs.

Recommendations

- 3.21 Activity places should be utilised fully.
- 3.22 Provision for vulnerable prisoners should be increased.
- 3.23 The number of vocational training places should be increased.
- 3.24 The prison should coordinate better the induction process and the delivery of information on activities and careers guidance to ensure that prisoners' sentence planning needs have been prioritised and activities appropriately sequenced.

Quality of provision

- 3.25 In education classes, teaching and learning was generally good. Lessons were well planned. Information learning technology was used well by teachers and learners. Teachers changed learning activities frequently in order to meet prisoners' different learning styles. Learners confidently and respectfully challenged each others' views in group discussions.
- 3.26 However, teaching was too often impaired by the large number of learners absent from classrooms and by too many learners leaving the class before it had finished to participate in recreational PE and other regime activities, which disrupted learning and slowed progress (see also paragraph 3.11).
- 3.27 The process of initial and diagnostic assessment was adequate but the outcomes of these assessments were not used well to set targets on learning plans. Insufficient priority was placed on improving the more urgent literacy and numeracy needs identified for each individual. In many cases, completed targets were not replaced by new ones and there was insufficient focus on setting personal and social development targets. A few teachers held comprehensive and useful information about the behavioural and learning needs of each learner, although this was not widespread.
- 3.28 Learners' diaries were not used consistently well to record what had been learnt and achieved. Tutors did not challenge or address prisoners sufficiently when they made inappropriate entries in their diaries.
- 3.29 A wide range of learning support was available. Education staff provided good support for functional skills in workshops and training areas. Prisoners on distance learning courses received effective and comprehensive support throughout their learning programme. However, outreach support for ESOL learners was underdeveloped and the recently introduced peer support in class had not yet fully embedded.
- 3.30 Teaching, learning and assessment in vocational training were good. Most sessions were stimulating, provided appropriate challenge for learners, and were particularly well delivered in construction crafts and catering. Workshops were well equipped and provided good learning environments. Learners were enthusiastic and enjoyed these sessions. The management of behaviour was mostly good. Assessment was good and learners understood what they had to do to improve. Vocational training classes were interrupted by other regime activities

particularly recreational PE (see paragraph 3.11). The recording and recognition of prisoners' employability skills developed at work were weak, in spite of staff training in this area. The virtual campus had yet to be fully established and prisoner access to it was restricted.

Recommendations

- 3.31 The use of individual learning plans should be improved and targets should be based on the results of initial and diagnostic assessment and on the development of prisoners' personal, social and communication skills.
- 3.32 Learning diaries should be better utilised to ensure that learners reflect effectively on their achievements in lessons.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.33 Overall outcomes had improved over three years and were very good, with a 95% success rate for those taking qualifications in 2011/12. Success rates in education courses had increased from 72% in 2010/11 to 79% in 2011/12 and were satisfactory. They were very high for ESOL learners and for information and communications technology courses but were low and declining on literacy level 2 courses.
- 3.34 Achievements in vocational training programmes were outstanding and in the PICTA courses had improved considerably since the previous year. Learners in vocational areas developed particularly good craft skills. Many gained useful personal and employability skills but these were not always recognised or recorded.
- 3.35 The standard of learners' work in education classes met the requirements of the qualifications. The prison focused well on ensuring that they achieved their qualifications but there was insufficient emphasis on developing their writing skills or on recognising the personal and social skills they developed in class.
- 3.36 In the tailoring and Braille workshops, prisoners developed good skills, were very industrious and displayed a good work ethic. This level of skills development and progress was less evident in other industry work areas.

Recommendations

- 3.37 Success rates in education, particularly in literacy at level 2, should be improved.
- 3.38 Prisoners' personal, social and written communication skills in lessons should be developed.
- 3.39 Prisoners' employability skills developed at work should be recognised and recorded.

Library

- 3.40 The library, provided by Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, offered a good service. A designated prison officer escorted prisoners to the library from their accommodation units, provided legal support each weekday morning and managed newspaper delivery orders to each accommodation unit.

- 3.41 Each accommodation unit had three timetabled library sessions a week, in the afternoon and evenings, but there was no weekend access. During the morning, the library was used to support the well-established Toe by Toe programme (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read), education course work, legal support visits and for the excellent writer-in-residence scheme.
- 3.42 The needs of the population was regularly analysed and stock was rotated according to need. A range of newspapers was available in a small number of languages but did not meet the needs of the increased foreign national population. Prisoners had suitable access to the required range of legal books and Prison Service Instructions.

Housekeeping point

- 3.43 The range of newspapers in foreign languages should be increased to meet the needs of the foreign nation population.

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.44 PE was well managed. Indoor and outdoor facilities were good and equipment was well maintained. The range of recreational PE was good but there was no specific provision for older prisoners or those with disabilities. Achievement of qualifications was outstanding but too few prisoners participated in PE courses. Health and well-being and the importance of exercise were well promoted. PE staff provided good remedial support for prisoners referred by the health care department and the drug and alcohol rehabilitation team.
- 3.45 PE was well managed and staff promoted healthy living well. Staff were well qualified. Recreational PE was available to prisoners in the daytime, during the evening and at weekends, offering a wide range of sports, but there were no specific sessions for older prisoners or those with disabilities. The provision was well used, with around 65% of prisoners regularly attending around three sessions each week.
- 3.46 Facilities were good and equipment was well maintained. Changing rooms and showers had been refurbished and were in good condition.
- 3.47 The range of PE courses had improved and lessons were well planned. Courses included healthy living at level 1, gym instructor at level 2, first-aid at work and a qualification in the treatment of sports injuries. Although the number of prisoners participating in courses was low, success rates were outstanding, at 100%.
- 3.48 Healthy living and the importance of exercise were well promoted. PE staff provided good remedial support for prisoners referred by the health care department or the drug and alcohol rehabilitation team.

Recommendation

- 3.49 Specific, appropriate recreational PE sessions should be offered to older prisoners and those with disabilities.

Section 4: Resettlement

The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report.

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The management of reducing reoffending was poor, with no strategy or comprehensive analysis of need. The resettlement strategy covered the three sites but was limited in scope and detail, lacking outcome-focused objectives or timescales. Too many prisoners said that they could not achieve their sentence plan targets at the establishment. The use of release on temporary licence, although still low, was meaningful.
- 4.2 The monthly resettlement committee meeting covered the three sites (Moorland, Hatfield and Lindholme) but membership did not include the range of resettlement agencies, and minutes of the meetings did not clearly set actions required, with timescales. There was no reducing reoffending strategy integrating the work of the offender management unit (OMU) with the resettlement pathways and public protection. As a result, strategic management was severely hindered.
- 4.3 The resettlement strategy had been reviewed and covered all the pathways. An action plan had been developed for each pathway but its priorities were not sufficiently specific and it did not include clear timescales or outcome-focused objectives. This made it difficult to oversee progress or identify any remedial action required.
- 4.4 A useful spreadsheet had been developed which contained the offending-related needs of each prisoner. However, it had not been used to analyse or provide evidence for the needs of the very diverse population. For example, the spreadsheet showed that almost half of the sex offenders were in denial of their offending but there was no formal strategy for their management (see main recommendation HP58). The needs of the large number of young offenders and foreign national prisoners had not been analysed. In our survey, only 51% of respondents, against the 68% comparator and 81% at the time of the previous inspection, said that they could achieve their sentence plan targets at the establishment. There was little evidence of evaluation of services, and prisoner feedback was not used to identify gaps.
- 4.5 The use of release on temporary licence had improved. Although its use was still very low, opportunities were meaningful and involved purposeful activities such as maintaining family ties or attending Duke of Edinburgh Awards activities. Assessments were appropriate and adequately completed. A board met regularly to review the assessments.

Recommendations

- 4.6 A regular and comprehensive needs analysis of the diverse population should be used to develop action plans that have specific outcome-focused objectives, including clear timescales for completion.
- 4.7 Strategic management should be improved and a reducing reoffending strategy developed which clearly sets out the priorities for offender management, public protection and resettlement.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor and initial contact was timely. Large caseloads limited the amount of ongoing contact. Offender supervisors lacked training in working with sex offenders and other high-risk prisoners. Offender assessment system (OASys) completion was up to date but timeliness was not monitored and the quality of completion was too varied. Home detention curfew decisions and recategorisation reviews were late in too many cases. Public protection arrangements were thorough and appropriate restrictions were applied. Support for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was limited and little offence-focused work was undertaken by offender supervisors.
- 4.9 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor. In our survey, more prisoners (77%) than at comparator establishments (67%) said that they had an offender supervisor. Caseloads were high, with each offender supervisor holding about 75. Those we spoke to were not clear about the minimum contact levels with prisoners. We found that initial contact with prisoners was timely but ongoing contact was ad hoc and not always meaningful. Recording of contacts was inconsistent, with two systems in use: P-Nomis (electronic case notes) and the public protection log.
- 4.10 Offender supervisors received limited training, particularly for working with sex offenders and those in denial. There was insufficient contact with such prisoners and in each of the five cases we inspected there was a lack of focus on offending behaviour. This meant that the large number of sex offenders in denial of their conviction were not challenged or required to address their attitudes and behaviour.
- 4.11 The completion of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments was largely up to date, which was a considerable achievement, given the number of prisoners arriving at the establishment without one. However, the timeliness of OASys reviews was not routinely monitored and the quality of assessments carried out by offender supervisors was variable.
- 4.12 In our survey, 71% of prisoners said that they had a sentence plan, which was similar to the comparator but considerably lower than at the time of the previous inspection (80%). Some sentence planning boards for prisoners out of scope of offender management (those serving under 12 months) were limited to the offender supervisor and the prisoner. In our survey, far fewer prisoners than at other category C prisons said that their personal officer and other

relevant staff were working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets. The offender manager chaired sentence planning boards for in scope prisoners (those serving 12 months or more and classified as posing a high risk to the public). However, we did not find minutes of the meetings on file. Sentence plans included objectives to address reoffending and risk of harm in each of the five cases we inspected. However, reviews carried out by offender supervisors were too often late and the objectives did not include specific outcomes or timescales for completion. Sentence plans were not shared routinely with resettlement staff or others delivering interventions.

- 4.13 The number of successful applications for home detention curfews was relatively low. Although the assessment process was started early, prisoners were often released late, sometimes by up to three weeks. The appeals process worked well and we saw evidence of refusals being overturned.

Recommendations

- 4.14 Offender supervisors should be skilled in assessing and managing risk of harm and in working with sex offenders, including those in denial of their conviction.
- 4.15 The timeliness of home detention curfew approval should be improved, to ensure that the prisoners' release is not delayed.

Housekeeping points

- 4.16 Minimum levels of contact between offender supervisors should be applied and all contacts and other relevant information should be recorded in electronic case notes.
- 4.17 The timeliness of offender assessment system (OASys) reviews should be monitored by managers to ensure that they are carried out in line with the national standard timescale.
- 4.18 Sentence plan reviews should be completed on time, include outcome-focused objectives and specific timescales, and be shared routinely with resettlement staff.

Public protection

- 4.19 The number of public protection cases was extremely high, at 780, with 310 of these on active monitoring at the time of the inspection. This reflected the change in the prison population over the previous year, with the introduction of 325 sex offenders. Public protection processes had been reviewed and improved. All new receptions were screened for the risk they posed to others, including children. When relevant, restrictions on contact were applied pending a full assessment by the offender supervisor; this was normally completed within five working days. Offender supervisors informed prisoners in person of the restrictions on contact applied to them. The inter-departmental risk management team (IDRMT) meeting was held weekly and provided thorough and regular reviews of those on contact restrictions. Offender supervisors were appropriately involved in these reviews, and membership of the IDRMT was appropriate. We saw evidence of contact levels being revised to reflect new information and there was good and appropriate use of mail and telephone monitoring. Staff in the visits hall were fully aware of prisoners with contact restrictions.
- 4.20 Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were well managed. Offender supervisors attended level 3 meetings where possible and submitted written reports to level 2

meetings. The violent and sexual offenders register (ViSOR) was used well to support MAPPA and the management of high-risk prisoners. Duty staff accessed the system each working day and we were told about examples of information exchange to and from ViSOR. They also ensured that the system was up to date by checking new receptions against ViSOR. A large number (282) of ViSOR nominals were being held in the prison at the time of the inspection.

Categorisation

- 4.21 Reviews of categorisation were initiated on time but too many were approved late. The reason given for this was the late arrival or absence of the report from the offender manager. Timeliness was not monitored. Prisoners could appeal through the complaints system, and an appeals board was held which included the prisoner.
- 4.22 Progressive transfers were proactively managed. Links had been developed with other prisons and the observation, classification and allocation officer individually negotiated transfer in some cases. We saw some evidence of sex offenders being moved to a prison to access a sex offender treatment programme but the overall number transferred was low. Prisoners awarded category D status did not have to wait long to move to an open prison.

Recommendation

- 4.23 **Categorisation reviews should be concluded on time and timeliness monitored.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.24 The establishment held 86 prisoners serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) and 18 young adults serving a life sentence. They were all allocated an offender supervisor and initial contact was timely. All offender supervisors were adequately trained in the management of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners but they did not deliver enough offence-focused work.
- 4.25 Family days were available to life-sentenced but not IPP prisoners. The frequency of lifer family days was ad hoc, with no clear schedule for the coming year and very infrequent delivery over the previous year.
- 4.26 A discussion forum had recently been introduced for IPP prisoners but life-sentenced prisoners could not attend.
- 4.27 The few parole reports completed in the current year had been on time. The lack of sex offender treatment programmes hindered the progression of some indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (see also section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).

Recommendation

- 4.28 **Family days should be available to all indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and scheduled throughout the year to meet demand.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.29 Life-sentenced prisoners should have access to a support forum.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.30 Resettlement services offered prisoners appointments at different stages of their sentence but too many prisoners failed to attend. The profile of some of the resettlement services was not high enough. Formal links and information exchange between resettlement services and the offender management unit were underdeveloped. Shelter provision was good but outcomes were not monitored. Prisoners had contact with Jobcentre Plus before release and there was a programme aimed at preparing them for work, but there were no links with employers. There were pre-discharge health arrangements and there were good links with community drug intervention programme teams. There was limited debt advice available, and no money management course, but bank accounts could be opened. Support for maintaining contact with children and families was uncoordinated and the strategy and action plan were underdeveloped. Provision for domestic visits was good but sessions started late. No sex offender treatment programmes were delivered at the establishment and too many sex offenders were released without completing one. Some new initiatives and programmes were promising but not formally resourced.

4.31 Resettlement needs were identified through offender assessment system (OASys) assessments and referrals made to services where needed. In addition to contact with their offender supervisor, all prisoners were seen by the National Careers Service, based in the resettlement unit, which assessed prisoners and developed a plan for them as well as directing them to other resettlement agencies such as Jobcentre Plus or Shelter. Too many prisoners (30%) failed to attend appointments with the National Careers Service and resettlement contacts were not routinely recorded on electronic case notes. Formal integration of the OMU and the resettlement unit was weak and information exchange sometimes poor.

4.32 In our survey, far fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection (10% versus 18% and 13%, respectively) said that they had been helped to prepare for release. Our survey also showed that too few prisoners knew whom to turn to for help with finance and benefits. The reasons for these negative views were unclear, as the resettlement agencies worked with a large number of prisoners each month, although they spent little time on the wings and did not hold surgeries or drop-in centres, which limited their accessibility.

Recommendation

- 4.33 Attendance at resettlement appointments should be improved and formal links with the offender management unit established.

Housekeeping point

- 4.34 Resettlement staff should be more accessible and services more widely promoted.

Accommodation

- 4.35 Advice and guidance on accommodation matters was provided by a full-time housing adviser and a part-time assistant employed by Shelter. Shelter workers were not directly involved in induction but issued prisoners with an information pack. The range of help and advice was varied, including maintaining existing tenancies and paying off arrears, and they saw a large number of prisoners each month. There were also arrangements for external housing providers to interview prisoners before release. Very few prisoners were identified as homeless on release but the outcomes of the Shelter work were not monitored, other than comparing them against the key performance target.

Recommendation

- 4.36 The number of prisoners helped to obtain suitable accommodation should be monitored.

Education, training and employment

- 4.37 Formal employment, training and education advice for those being released was confused (see section on provision of activities and recommendation 3.24). A two-week accredited course, delivered six weeks before release, prepared prisoners for employment. National Careers Service staff aimed to see prisoners 12 months before release and on request but many prisoners did not attend appointments and it was unclear how these workers liaised with other resettlement staff to ensure that they met prisoners' needs.
- 4.38 Before release, prisoners were invited to attend a meeting with a Jobcentre Plus adviser, who explained how to access job search facilities. They also coordinated and arranged work-based learning opportunities on courses such as fork-lift truck training with local employers.
- 4.39 According to the prison's data, 16% of the prisoners released in the previous month had obtained employment, slightly exceeding the target of 15%. This information was often based on prisoners' self-declaration of employment and was not verified by the prison. A further 18% of those released had gone into further training or education in the community, slightly exceeding the target of 16%.
- 4.40 The prison had not developed links with employers; this limited its ability to support and provide potential job links for prisoners on release.

Recommendation

- 4.41 Links with employers should be developed.

Health care

- 4.42 There were reasonably good discharge arrangements for prisoners with mental and physical health problems. There were good links with local secure services for those with complex mental health needs. Mental health assessments were undertaken expeditiously and prisoners were transferred to a secure NHS setting within two weeks of release.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.43 Communication and joint working between the OMU and the psychosocial team were effective. Links with local drug intervention programme teams were good.
- 4.44 Good information on harm minimisation was provided to prisoners from reception through to release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.45 There was no specialist debt adviser but the Shelter housing officer provided some support to prisoners with housing-related debts. There was no specific money management course. Jobcentre Plus focused on setting up new benefits claims and saw prisoners six weeks before release. Library staff helped prisoners to apply for community care grants.
- 4.46 Credit Union savings accounts had been available since December 2011 and 172 prisoners had successfully opened an account in preparation for release.

Housekeeping point

- 4.47 Prisoners should have access to a wider range of specialist debt advice and a money management course.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.48 In our survey, prisoners were negative about the support they had received in maintaining contact with their friends and family. Provision under this pathway was uncoordinated and the action plan was underdeveloped. A parenting course was provided through the education department, and there had been a pilot scheme to provide a one-off parenting course run by prison staff, although future funding had not been secured.
- 4.49 An enhanced version of Storytime Dads (whereby detainees record stories for their children) was available which was peer led and enabled prisoners to record DVDs for their children and provide accompanying storybooks. Families were encouraged to attend oral hearings and assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring reviews, and a few had taken up this offer.
- 4.50 Domestic visits were provided every afternoon except Monday and Friday. Visitors centre staff were friendly and helpful and provided advice and information to visitors. A range of information was displayed but there were limited play resources for children. Visitors could book future visits in the centre, as well as by telephone and email, and we saw many making use of this facility.

- 4.51 On the days we observed visits they started late, with long delays for prisoners and visitors alike in reaching the visits hall. The entrance area became crowded and some visitors had to wait outside in the rain. Gate and visits hall staff were polite and respectful, and visitors were positive about their treatment.
- 4.52 The large visits hall was furnished with institutional-looking furniture, apart from the separate area for enhanced prisoners, which provided a more comfortable environment. However, this area was cold, and prisoners and visitors asked to move into the main hall. The children's play area only opened once a week and there was little to occupy children. There was a popular refreshments bar and there were vending machines.
- 4.53 A survey of visitors had been carried out and ongoing feedback was invited. Monthly updates were given to visitors and some welcome changes had been made because of this consultation, such as the supply of pushchairs and umbrellas, and a more consistent provision of refreshments.
- 4.54 Family visits were available to all prisoners but provision did not match need and they were oversubscribed. During these visits, prisoners were able to have photographs taken of themselves with their families.

Recommendations

- 4.55 **Support for prisoners to maintain contact with their family members and friends should be prioritised and better family pathway provision developed.** (Repeated recommendation HP49)
- 4.56 **Visits should start at the published time.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.57 The children's play area should be open during each visits session.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.58 No sex offender treatment programmes (SOTPs) were delivered at the establishment, hindering prisoners' progress. There were informal arrangements with other prisons providing SOTPs but the number of places on these programmes was too low to meet need. Of the 41 prisoners waiting to transfer to do a SOTP at the time of the inspection, at least 14 of them would be released within the next five months without being offered a place. Although almost half of the sex offenders were in denial of their offending behaviour, there was no formal strategy to manage them, and most went unchallenged (see main recommendation HP58).
- 4.59 The thinking skills (TSP) and controlling anger and learning to manage it (CALM) programmes were delivered and achieved key performance targets, but too few of these courses were delivered to sex offenders. Only one TSP course had been delivered to them in the current year and at the time of the inspection 16 were waiting to take part. The number of mainstream prisoners waiting to do TSP was manageable but a few had waited too long for a place on CALM. A large number of prisoners at HMP Lindholme were waiting to move to Moorland to do one of these programmes, lengthening waiting times for prisoners at the establishment. There was no provision to address domestic violence.

- 4.60 Links between the programmes team and offender supervisors were well developed, and we found examples of the two working together to motivate prisoners and support them through a programme.
- 4.61 Some interesting initiatives were available. Remedi delivered a victim awareness course to a large number of prisoners each year, with some progressing to meetings with victims. 'Men Talking' was a programme that had potential to target bullying behaviour. The A-to-Z motivational programme was delivered and was a useful tool for sex offenders in denial but it was not resourced or formally planned.

Recommendation

- 4.62 **New offending behaviour initiatives should be formalised in a strategy and resourced accordingly.**

Additional resettlement services

- 4.63 The Veterans in Custody project was well developed at the establishment but the support officer had no profiled time to spend on it and did not have full access to the internet, which made it difficult for him to find support agencies.
- 4.64 Veterans were not always identified during induction, so their details were not passed to the OMU. Links with the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association (SSAFA), Royal British Legion (RBL) and Combat Stress were excellent, and some representatives from these organisations visited the prison to interview prisoners. A varied range of support was available to veterans and one such prisoner we spoke to was complimentary about the help he had been offered by the RBL in preparation for his release. We also heard positive feedback about an ex-prisoner who had been helped by the RBL to find work and settle on his release.

Housekeeping point

- 4.65 Veterans should be identified during induction and the information passed to the offender management unit.

Section 5: Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points 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, or in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 5.1 All data on bullying should be analysed to identify trends and direct action. A clear policy should be introduced for the management and transfer of prisoners in the segregation and induction units and should include how problem or vulnerable behaviour and underlying causes will be investigated, how individual needs will be met and options for reintegration or transfer. Interventions should be introduced to challenge bullying behaviour and support victims. (HP54)
 - 5.2 Prisoners' perceptions of poor staff-prisoner relationships and victimisation should be explored and findings acted on. (HP55)
 - 5.3 Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners with protected characteristics are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (HP56)
 - 5.4 Attendance at learning and skills and work should be prioritised. The number of unemployed prisoners should be reduced and staff should monitor and challenge non-attendance. Other activities, including recreational PE, should be timetabled so that they do not disrupt the working day. (HP57)
 - 5.5 Attitudes, thinking and behaviour programmes to address sexual offending and sex offenders in denial should be provided. (HP58)

Recommendations

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6 Prisoners should be disembarked promptly and handcuffs should not be used to restrain prisoners between escort vans and reception, except when justified by a risk assessment. (1.5)

Early days in custody

- 5.7 Reception holding rooms should be clean, free of graffiti and display relevant information about the prison. (1.14)
- 5.8 Prisoners with a formal role in providing advice and support should be available on the induction unit. (1.15)

- 5.9 Induction procedures should be completed promptly so that prisoners can be employed within a week of arrival. (1.16)
- 5.10 Prisoners who are not new arrivals should not be located on the induction unit unless they have a specific role in induction. (1.17)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.11 A violence reduction survey for prisoners should be carried out and used to inform the violence reduction strategy. It should explore reasons for prisoners' perceptions of staff intimidation and take action accordingly. (1.28, repeated recommendation 3.10)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.12 Prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring procedures should only be held in segregation under exceptional circumstances. (1.35)
- 5.13 Regular management reviews of support plans should ensure they are of a consistently high quality. (1.36, repeated recommendation 3.20)
- 5.14 Case reviews of prisoners on open ACCT documents should be better attended by representatives from all departments that have regular dealings with the prisoner. (1.37, repeated recommendation 3.21)

Safeguarding

- 5.15 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.42)

Security

- 5.16 A log should be kept of every strip-search and squat-search. (1.50, repeated recommendation 7.17)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.17 A reduction in incentives and earned privileges level as a result of a single incident should only be awarded after a separate incentives and earned privileges (IEP) review. (1.57, repeated recommendation 7.66)

Discipline

- 5.18 The use of special accommodation should be monitored, formally recorded and reviewed. (1.67)
- 5.19 A segregation monitoring and review group should be established to provide governance of segregation procedures. (1.73, repeated recommendation 7.56)

- 5.20 Segregation unit staff should all be trained in de-escalation, diversity, suicide prevention, mental health awareness, personality disorder and motivational interviewing. (1.74, repeated recommendation 7.55)
- 5.21 A formal reintegration and care planning process for segregated prisoners should be introduced. (1.75)
- 5.22 There should be regular management oversight of using three officers to unlock prisoners. (1.76)

Substance misuse

- 5.23 Clinical substance misuse and psychosocial services should undertake joint care planning and treatment reviews. (1.86, repeated recommendation 3.60)
- 5.24 The regime on the drug recovery wing should include recovery-focused group work and other relevant activities and interventions, including employment. (1.87)
- 5.25 Compact-based drug testing should be introduced to the drug-free wing. (1.88)
- 5.26 The prison should ensure an integrated approach to tackling both drug supply and demand reduction. (1.89)
- 5.27 A dual diagnosis service should be developed for prisoners who experience mental health and substance-related problems, and their care should be jointly coordinated by mental health, clinical substance misuse and psychosocial teams. (1.90, repeated recommendation 3.61)

Residential units

- 5.28 Prisoners should not share cells that are intended for single use. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.9)
- 5.29 Toilet areas in cells should be fully screened. (2.9)

Equality and diversity

- 5.30 Prisoner discussion and support forums should be introduced for all aspects of diversity, using professional interpreting where necessary. (2.25, repeated recommendation 4.10)
- 5.31 Foreign national prisoners should be given sufficient notice by the UK Border Agency of the intention to detain beyond sentence. (2.38)
- 5.32 A needs analysis of foreign national prisoners should be conducted annually and the policy document should be updated to include its findings and to outline the strategy. (2.39, repeated recommendation 4.41)
- 5.33 All prisoners with disabilities should be able to access a full regime. (2.40, repeated recommendation 4.50)
- 5.34 All older prisoners and those with disabilities should be assessed to establish the requirements for individual care plans, which should be regularly updated. (2.41, repeated recommendation 4.51)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.35 Friday prayers should be held in an appropriate environment which is large enough to accommodate all attendees. (2.50)

Complaints

- 5.36 Prisoner confidence in the complaints system should be improved. (2.55)

Legal rights

- 5.37 A legal services officer, with the training and time to provide an effective service, should be known and accessible to prisoners. (2.61, repeated recommendation 3.40)

Health services

- 5.38 The environment should comply with infection control guidance and be refurbished. (2.67)
- 5.39 The governor and head of health care should ensure that all staff know where emergency medical equipment is kept and what to do in an emergency. All first-aid equipment should be checked regularly and green boxes should contain a standardised range of products. (2.68)
- 5.40 Access to hospital appointments should be monitored and cancellations and delays prevented. (2.71)
- 5.41 Patient group directions should be produced, to allow the supply of more potent medicines by the nursing staff, where appropriate. (2.77, repeated recommendation 5.38)
- 5.42 Use of general stock should be audited, so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions and agreed stock levels. (2.78, repeated recommendation 5.35)
- 5.43 A full range of services for prisoners with mental health needs should be implemented in line with the service review. (2.86)

Catering

- 5.44 Meals should be served at appropriate mealtimes and prisoners should be provided with breakfast on the day it is to be eaten. (2.91, repeated recommendation 8.13)

Time out of cell

- 5.45 Prisoners should have the opportunity for evening association. (3.5)
- 5.46 All prisoners should have one hour of exercise daily. (3.6)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.47 Activity places should be utilised fully. (3.21)

- 5.48 Provision for vulnerable prisoners should be increased. (3.22)
- 5.49 The number of vocational training places should be increased. (3.23)
- 5.50 The prison should coordinate better the induction process and the delivery of information on activities and careers guidance to ensure that prisoners' sentence planning needs have been prioritised and activities appropriately sequenced. (3.24)
- 5.51 The use of individual learning plans should be improved and targets should be based on the results of initial and diagnostic assessment and on the development of prisoners' personal, social and communication skills. (3.31)
- 5.52 Learning diaries should be better utilised to ensure that learners reflect effectively on their achievements in lessons. (3.32)
- 5.53 Success rates in education, particularly in literacy at level 2, should be improved. (3.37)
- 5.54 Prisoners' personal, social and written communication skills in lessons should be developed. (3.38)
- 5.55 Prisoners' employability skills developed at work should be recognised and recorded. (3.39)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.56 Specific, appropriate recreational PE sessions should be offered to older prisoners and those with disabilities. (3.49)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.57 A regular and comprehensive needs analysis of the diverse population should be used to develop action plans that have specific outcome-focused objectives, including clear timescales for completion. (4.6)
- 5.58 Strategic management should be improved and a reducing reoffending strategy developed which clearly sets out the priorities for offender management, public protection and resettlement. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.59 Offender supervisors should be skilled in assessing and managing risk of harm and in working with sex offenders, including those in denial of their conviction. (4.14)
- 5.60 The timeliness of home detention curfew approval should be improved, to ensure that the prisoners' release is not delayed. (4.15)
- 5.61 Categorisation reviews should be concluded on time and timeliness monitored. (4.23)
- 5.62 Family days should be available to all indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and scheduled throughout the year to meet demand. (4.28)

Reintegration planning

- 5.63 Attendance at resettlement appointments should be improved and formal links with the offender management unit established. (4.33)
- 5.64 The number of prisoners helped to obtain suitable accommodation should be monitored. (4.36)
- 5.65 Links with employers should be developed. (4.41)
- 5.66 Support for prisoners to maintain contact with their family members and friends should be prioritised and better family pathway provision developed. (4.55, repeated recommendation HP49)
- 5.67 Visits should start at the published time. (4.56)
- 5.68 New offending behaviour initiatives should be formalised in a strategy and resourced accordingly. (4.62)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.69 Newly arrived prisoners should be offered refreshments. (1.18)
- 5.70 Night staff on the induction unit should carry out enhanced observations of new arrivals and carry anti-ligature knives. (1.19)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.71 All staff in contact with prisoners should be trained in ACCT procedures. (1.38)

Security

- 5.72 Monthly security objectives should be properly communicated to all staff. (1.51)
- 5.73 All requested suspicion tests should be completed within set timescales. (1.52)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.74 Prisoners on the basic level of the IEP scheme should have personalised improvement targets, be regularly reviewed and be promoted to the standard level when appropriate. (1.58)

Discipline

- 5.75 The prison should explore the apparent rise in the number of adjudications on general population wings. (1.62)

- 5.76 All use of force documentation should be thoroughly completed within 14 days of the incident. (1.68)
- 5.77 Opportunities for associated activity (including exercise) should be introduced, subject to appropriate risk assessment. (1.77)

Substance misuse

- 5.78 Prisoners should be fully informed of the recovery-focused treatment approach, and dose reduction regimes should be appropriate to individual needs. (1.91)
- 5.79 Peer mentors should be paid. (1.92)

Residential units

- 5.80 Keys for lockable cupboards should be provided for all prisoners in all double cells. (2.10)
- 5.81 The offensive display policy should be applied consistently. (2.11)
- 5.82 Responses to applications should be recorded and tracked. (2.12)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.83 Case note entries should reflect meaningful engagement with prisoners, including an introduction by personal officers, and quality assurance measures should be effective. (2.18)

Equality and diversity

- 5.84 Staff should be appropriately trained in all aspects of equality and diversity. (2.26)
- 5.85 The race equality team should be represented at the security committee and report any security-related concerns arising from their work. (2.27, repeated recommendation 4.28)
- 5.86 Prisoner equality group meetings should focus specifically on equality issues. (2.28)
- 5.87 Professional telephone interpreting services should always be used with relevant prisoners for health care and other sensitive matters, and displayed information should be in a range of appropriate languages. (2.42)
- 5.88 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be put in place for all relevant prisoners. (2.43)
- 5.89 Grab rails should be installed in the two adapted cells on house block 6. (2.44)
- 5.90 The sexual orientation, gender and identity policy should be displayed on the house blocks. (2.45)

Complaints

- 5.91 The scanning process should be reviewed to ensure that all replies are recorded. (2.56)

- 5.92 Independent Monitoring Board noticeboards should be updated to reflect the current provision. (2.57)

Health services

- 5.93 The controlled drug register should be completed at the same time as administration of drugs. (2.79)
- 5.94 The procedures for administering medicines for substance misuse should be reviewed, to reduce the unnecessary movement of controlled drugs around the prison. (2.80)
- 5.95 The current in-possession policy and special sick policy should be reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee. (2.81)

Catering

- 5.96 Prisoners should be allowed to eat in association where there is sufficient communal space. (2.92, repeated recommendation 8.11)
- 5.97 The time span between preparing food, and loading and delivering the heated trolleys to the wings should be minimised. (2.93)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.98 Prisoners should not be paid when they do not attend work or training. (3.15)
- 5.99 The range of newspapers in foreign languages should be increased to meet the needs of the foreign nation population. (3.43)

Offender management and planning

- 5.100 Minimum levels of contact between offender supervisors should be applied and all contacts and other relevant information should be recorded in electronic case notes. (4.16)
- 5.101 The timeliness of offender assessment system (OASys) reviews should be monitored by managers to ensure that they are carried out in line with the national standard timescale. (4.17)
- 5.102 Sentence plan reviews should be completed on time, include outcome-focused objectives and specific timescales, and be shared routinely with resettlement staff. (4.18)
- 5.103 Life-sentenced prisoners should have access to a support forum. (4.29)

Reintegration planning

- 5.104 Resettlement staff should be more accessible and services more widely promoted. (4.34)
- 5.105 Prisoners should have access to a wider range of specialist debt advice and a money management course. (4.47)
- 5.106 The children's play area should be open during each visits session. (4.57)

5.107 Veterans should be identified during induction and the information passed to the offender management unit. (4.65)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Beverley Alden	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Caroline Elwood	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Alice Reid	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Helen Carter	Health services inspector
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
Ian Mather	Care Quality Commission
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector
Neil Edwards	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the four tests of a healthy prison. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is provided in the right-hand column.

Safety	
Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.	
At the last inspection, in 2010, prisoners' first experiences of Moorland had improved and they received a good reception, speedy transfer through to the first night centre and relevant subsequent induction. Violence reduction and suicide prevention measures were generally good. Most prisoners reported feeling safe but too many reported that they had felt threatened or intimidated by staff. Aspects of the regime were over-restrictive. There was good care of segregated prisoners and most were reintegrated. Planned use of force was not video-recorded. Clinical management of substance misuse was good, although there was insufficient integration of services, and there was little evidence of drug use. There was insufficient analysis of trends in relevant security intelligence. Overall outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.	
Main recommendations	
The security committee should thoroughly analyse statistical information provided including the reasons for any significant change to the type or quantity of security information reports submitted and trends in other relevant data. (HP43)	Achieved
Recommendations	
The poor prisoner perceptions about their experience during transfer should be explored. (1.5)	Achieved
The establishment should establish a wider range of interventions for persistent bullies. (3.8)	Not achieved
Consultation with prisoners in terms of anti-bullying and violence reduction should be improved and findings acted on. (3.9)	Not achieved
A violence reduction survey for prisoners should be carried out and used to inform the violence reduction strategy. It should explore reasons for prisoners' perceptions of staff intimidation and take action accordingly. (3.10)	Partially achieved Rec repeated, 1.28
Regular management reviews of support plans should ensure they are of a consistently high quality. (3.20)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.36
Case reviews of prisoners on open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be better attended by representatives from all departments that have regular dealings with the prisoner. (3.21)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.37

Replies to complaints should be comprehensive and fully address the issues. (3.33)	Achieved
Clinical substance misuse and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services should undertake joint care planning and treatment reviews. (3.60)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.86
A dual diagnosis service should be developed for prisoners who experience mental health and substance-related problems, and their care should be jointly coordinated by mental health, clinical substance misuse and CARAT teams. (3.61)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.90
The security department should be tasked with developing and implementing a supply reduction action plan. (3.67)	Achieved
The establishment should ensure that the mandatory drug testing programme is adequately resourced to undertake the required level of weekend and target testing. (3.68)	Achieved
The practice of unlocking basic regime prisoners singly should be discontinued. (7.14)	Achieved
Residential staff should interact with prisoners during association. (7.15)	Achieved
Communication between the security department and the diversity team should be improved. (7.16)	Achieved
A log should be kept of every strip-search and squat-search. (7.17)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.50
The relevant Prison Service codes and instructions should be amended to make clear that visitors should not be strip-searched by prison staff. (7.18)	Not achieved
Protocols with the police should ensure that prompt and effective police support is provided to any incident where there is substantial intelligence that a visitor is bringing drugs into the prison. The visitor should not be strip-searched but detained for a short period until the police arrive. (7.19)	Partially achieved
The rules concerning clothing, property brought in from other prisons and restricting mail should be relaxed. (7.20)	Partially achieved
The prison should take further action to reduce the number of adjudications. (7.30)	Achieved
Trends and patterns in adjudications data should be analysed thoroughly and appropriate action taken in response. (7.31)	Achieved
The prison should take action to reduce the number of incidents of use of force. (7.38)	Not achieved
Staff should fully record the use of de-escalation and the level of force used. (7.39)	Partially achieved

Planned use of force should be video-recorded and used for monitoring and training purposes. (7.40)	Partially achieved
There should be consistency in the use of restraints. (7.41)	Achieved
The use of special accommodation should be reduced. (7.42)	Achieved
Special accommodation should be used only for refractory prisoners, and for the minimum amount of time. (7.43)	Achieved
Prisoners entering segregation should not be routinely subjected to a strip-search. (7.54)	Achieved
Segregation unit staff should all be trained in de-escalation, diversity, suicide prevention, mental health awareness, personality disorder and motivational interviewing. (7.55)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.74
A segregation monitoring and review group should be established to provide governance of segregation procedures. (7.56)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.73
The basic regime should allow prisoners limited association, so that they can demonstrate improvements in behaviour. (7.64)	Achieved
Prisoners on the basic regime should be allowed to work and attend education. (7.65)	Achieved
A reduction in incentives and earned privileges level as a result of a single incident should only be awarded after a separate IEP review. (7.66)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 1.57

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2010, cells were shabby, in a poor state of decoration and contained graffiti but communal areas were clean and well decorated. Too many prisoners were in prison clothing. Prisoners were frustrated about delays in sending and receiving mail. Prisoner perceptions of relationships with staff were poor and the effectiveness of their personal officers varied. The overarching incentives and earned privileges scheme was good but it was applied too punitively. Diversity provision was generally poor, although some good support for prisoners with particular needs had been provided on an ad hoc basis. Prisoners had little confidence in the complaint process. Chaplaincy services were limited. Prisoners' perception of the food was poor. Primary health care services had improved and mental health services were developing. Overall outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Out-of-commission house blocks should be refurbished as a matter of priority. (HP42)	Achieved
The dynamic between staff and prisoners should be analysed and action taken to improve staff-prisoner relationships. (HP44)	Partially achieved

Systematic arrangements should be put in place to meet all the diverse needs of prisoners and ensure equality of treatment. (HP45)	Not achieved
Prisoner confidence in the application and complaints and racist incident referral systems should be improved. (HP46)	Partially achieved
Recommendations	
Prisoners should not share cells that are intended for single use. (2.9)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.8
Cells should be subject to a rolling decoration programme. (2.10)	Achieved
Damaged flooring should be replaced. (2.11)	Achieved
Prisoners should have daily access to telephones. (2.12)	Achieved
Prisoners should be able to rely on a prompt and efficient mail service. (2.13)	Achieved
Prisoners should be encouraged to make greater use of the email service. (2.14)	Achieved
Prisoners should have ready access to clean, properly fitting, prison-issue clothing. (2.18)	Partially achieved
Prisoners should be able to shower daily. (2.21)	Achieved
The dedicated provision for young adults should cater for the particular needs and demands of this group. (2.24)	No longer relevant
Young adults should have the same access to the regime as adults. (2.25)	Achieved
Training and development programmes should emphasise the importance of pro-social modelling or the need for staff to model and encourage appropriate prisoner behaviour. (2.32)	Achieved
Prisoner consultation meetings should include regular discussions of relevant issues of importance, such as safety and the operation of the regime, and be used to support effective communication. (2.33)	Achieved
All staff should routinely use prisoners' titles and surnames or preferred names. (2.34)	Achieved
Personal officers should be coached in their responsibilities and supported by managers to carry these out. (2.39)	Partially achieved
All personal officers should introduce themselves and get to know the prisoners on their caseload. (2.40)	Not achieved
A legal services officer, with the training and time to provide an effective service, should be known and accessible to prisoners. (3.40)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.61
There should be a prison visitor scheme. (3.52)	Not achieved

The race and equalities meeting should focus on the diverse needs of prisoners at a strategic level. (4.6)	Not achieved
The diversity team should be resourced to a sufficient level to meet the needs of prisoners. (4.7)	Not achieved
The race and equalities action plan should take into consideration assessment of need and provision of services for prisoners with diverse needs. (4.8)	Not achieved
There should be a complete overhaul of the race and equalities strategy to take into account all strands of diversity. (4.9)	Not achieved
Prisoner discussion and support forums should be introduced for all aspects of diversity, using professional interpreting where necessary. (4.10)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.25
Prisoners from Gypsy and Traveller backgrounds should be identified and supported. (4.24)	Not achieved
The operation of the racist incident report form system should be monitored, trends analysed and remedial action taken where necessary. (4.25)	Achieved
Impact assessments should be specific to HMP Moorland. (4.26)	Not achieved
There should be a clear system to identify prisoners responsible for racially aggravated offences or identified as racist, with an updated register maintained. (4.27)	Achieved
The race equality team should be represented at the security committee and report any security-related concerns arising from their work. (4.28)	Not achieved Rec repeated as a housekeeping point, 2.27
Prisoners should be encouraged to celebrate their own culture and heritage and understand and respect that of others as part of the communal life of the prison. (4.29)	Achieved
Staff should be appropriately trained in race and diversity. (4.30)	Not achieved
Prisoners' negative perceptions about being treated with respect in relation to their religion should be explored. (4.33)	No longer relevant
Access to regime activities should be monitored by religion. (4.34)	Not achieved
A needs analysis of foreign national prisoners should be conducted annually and the policy document should be updated to include its findings and to outline the strategy. (4.41)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.39
There should be a record of the needs of all prisoners who cannot speak English and of how their needs are being met. (4.42)	Partially achieved
All prisoners with disabilities should be able to access a full regime. (4.50)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.40
All older prisoners and those with disabilities should be assessed to establish the requirements for individual care plans, which should be regularly updated. (4.51)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.41

Plans and policies should be put in place to identify and meet the needs of older prisoners when required. (4.52)	Partially achieved
There should be a clear policy for the management of prisoners presenting with gay, bisexual and gender (including transgender) issues, and this should be publicised on residential units. (4.58)	Partially achieved
The reception and house block health consultation rooms should be refurbished to be compliant with infection control standards. (5.6)	Achieved
All registered nurses should receive training in resuscitation at least annually. (5.15)	Achieved
There should be a patient forum that is representative of the prison population. (5.16)	Partially achieved
Barrier protection should be freely available to all prisoners. (5.24)	Not achieved
Waiting times to see a physiotherapist should be reduced. (5.25)	Achieved
Staff should be trained in the use of triage algorithms. (5.26)	Partially achieved
Prisoners should be able to see a doctor in private, subject to risk assessment. (5.27)	Achieved
Lockable cupboards should be provided in cells for patients who receive in-possession medication. (5.34)	Achieved
Use of general stock should be audited, so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions and agreed stock levels. (5.35)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.78
There should be a review of procedures for ordering repeat prescriptions for patients who receive medicine by administration, in order to avoid the need to make unauthorised supplies beyond the term of prescriptions. (5.36)	Achieved
The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the special sick policy, to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied. (5.37)	Achieved
Patient group directions should be produced, to allow the supply of more potent medicines by the nursing staff, where appropriate. (5.38)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 2.77
A step-wise approach to pain management, such as the World Health Organization, should be used reduce opiate usage. (5.39)	Achieved
The fax system for ordering reordering medications should be subject to audit. (5.40)	Achieved
The dental team should be included in the health care department resuscitation training. (5.49)	Achieved
Applications to see the dentist should be triaged, preferably by dental staff, before being placed on the waiting list. (5.50)	Achieved

Uniformed staff should have the training to recognise and take appropriate action when a prisoner may have mental health problems. (5.59)	Achieved
Group therapies should be available to prisoners who need support for emotional and mental health problems. (5.60)	Partially achieved
Prisoners should be transferred expeditiously to secondary and tertiary care as clinically indicated. (5.61)	Achieved
Prisoners should be allowed to eat in association where there is sufficient communal space. (8.11)	Not achieved Rec repeated as a housekeeping point, 2.92
The range of items on the menu should be broadened. (8.12)	Achieved
Prisoners should be provided with breakfast on the day it is to be eaten. (8.13)	Not achieved Rec repeated 2.91
Prisoners should be fully consulted about their views on the food, including an annual prisoner survey, and the issues identified addressed. (8.14)	Achieved
An impact assessment of catering, which addresses the full range of diversity, should be conducted and action taken to address issues identified. (8.15)	Not achieved
Prisoners working in the kitchen should be offered the opportunity to undertake vocational training. (8.16)	Achieved
Prices charged to prisoners for prison shop purchases should be in line with those on the high street. (8.25)	Achieved
Shop order sheets and statements of prisoners' accounts should be issued in good time for corrections to be notified and implemented before purchases are ordered. (8.26)	Achieved

Purposeful activity

Prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.

At the last inspection, in 2010, time out of cell had reduced and young adults had less time out of cell than the adult population. Although there were enough activity places at the time of the inspection, owing to a reduced population, not all prisoners were engaged in work or education. Vocational courses had high qualification pass rates. Learning and skills provision was generally good. The small library was well organised and well used. Access to the gym, supervision and equipment levels were good. Overall, outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

A longer working day should be provided, with fewer interruptions, so that prisoners can work more meaningful hours and complete qualifications more quickly. (HP47)	Not achieved
--	---------------------

Recommendations	
Lesson observations and evaluation feedback processes in accredited training should be carried out to allow for trend analysis and ongoing quality improvement. (6.6)	Partially achieved
Quality improvement group meetings should focus on learner outcomes, in addition to operational issues affecting attendance, using data to set numerical improvement targets that are regularly reviewed. (6.7)	Partially achieved
Prisoners should be systematically surveyed for their views, to inform curriculum planning and improvement. (6.8)	Achieved
Work skills developed through activities should be accredited. (6.12)	Not achieved
The long waiting lists for some courses and work placements should be reduced. (6.13)	Partially achieved
The pay structure should be improved, to ensure that those on learning and skills courses are not on less pay than those in work activities. (6.14)	Partially achieved
The number and range of accredited vocational courses should be increased. (6.17)	Achieved
The PE timetable should be rescheduled, so that prisoners attending education, training or work activities do not have to attend for recreational PE during the core working day. (6.18)	Not achieved
It should be ensured that the available data on learner outcomes is accurate and accessible to staff. (6.26)	Achieved
The use of individual learning plans should be improved, to record individual learning targets more effectively. (6.27)	Not achieved
The use of learner diaries should be improved, to record what has been learnt rather than what the prisoner feels about a lesson. (6.28)	Not achieved
The number of industry-recognised vocational training courses should be increased. (6.39)	Achieved
A suitable all-weather outdoor PE activities area should be provided. (6.40)	Achieved
The existing wing-based PE facilities should be fully utilised. (6.41)	No longer relevant
Additional toilet facilities and modesty screens should be provided for the shower and changing areas. (6.42)	Achieved
PE lessons should be quality assured regularly to ensure that teaching practice is to a good standard. (6.43)	Achieved
Time out of cell should be advertised clearly on each wing and applied consistently to all prisoners. (6.50)	Achieved

Time out of cell should be monitored separately for Moorland and Hatfield. (6.51)	No longer relevant
Prisoners who are not on the basic regime should have access to association every day. (6.52)	Achieved
Prisoners should be offered outdoor clothing if they wish to exercise in inclement weather. (6.53)	Achieved
Exercise yards and association areas should be equipped with appropriate furniture and equipment. (6.54)	Partially achieved

Resettlement

Prisoners are prepared for their release back into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

At the last inspection, in 2010, the resettlement strategy was weak and the completed needs analysis limited. Layered offender management was well progressed and offender supervisors managed their caseloads effectively. Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were managed well. Resettlement services were mixed, with some excellent support for accommodation needs but unimaginative provision around contact with families. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

A focused strategic direction should be given to resettlement as the key role of the establishment. (HP48)	Partially achieved
--	--------------------

Support for prisoners to maintain contact with their family members and friends should be prioritised and better family pathway provision developed. (HP49)	Not achieved Rec repeated, 4.55
---	------------------------------------

Recommendations

A broader analysis of prisoner needs should be undertaken, utilising offender assessment system (OASys) data, in order to identify the most prevalent offending related factors. This should be used to inform the resettlement strategy and action plan. (9.6)	Partially achieved
---	--------------------

Release on temporary licence should be introduced for resettlement purposes. (9.7)	Partially achieved
--	--------------------

Sentence plans should contain outcome-focused objectives that are measurable, with a specific timescale for their achievement. (9.18)	Not achieved
---	--------------

Sentence plan reviews should be timely and involve the prisoner. (9.19)	Partially achieved
---	--------------------

Quality assurance processes should be improved to ensure that all issues are identified and acted on. (9.20)	Not achieved
--	--------------

Reviews of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be carried out in line with the national standard timescale. (9.29)	Partially achieved
--	--------------------

All risk management plans should describe how the objectives of the sentence plan and other activities address the risk of harm to others and protect actual and potential victims. (9.30)	Not achieved
Prison staff should ensure that prisoners are able to attend their careers information and advice service interview. (9.43)	No longer relevant
Prisoners should be given the opportunity to open bank accounts. (9.48)	Achieved
All prisoners should be assessed to establish if they have financial difficulties or debt problems, and assistance should be offered where necessary. (9.49)	Achieved
A comprehensive needs analysis of the prison population should be carried out to inform the drug and alcohol strategy and future service provision. (9.63)	Achieved
The drug strategy document should be updated, include alcohol services and contain detailed action plans and performance measures. (9.64)	Partially achieved
The CARAT team should monitor the number of young adults accessing the service and ensure that their needs are met. (9.65)	Achieved
The CARAT service should develop a mechanism for service user feedback. (9.66)	Achieved
Links between the CARAT service and the offender management unit should be formalised to ensure that substance-related work is integrated with sentence planning. (9.67)	Achieved
Prisoners and young adults should have access to an alcohol-related offending behaviour programme. (9.68)	Achieved
A peer support scheme should be developed to offer ongoing support to prisoners who have completed the prison addressing substance related offending (P-ASRO) programme. (9.69)	Partially achieved
Compact-based drug testing of P-ASRO participants should be clearly separated from mandatory drug testing in terms of staffing and location. (9.70)	Achieved
Visitors should have access to a well-run, properly equipped crèche in the visits hall. (9.82)	Not achieved
A visitor survey should be carried out, based on a representative sample. The results should be used to help inform service development. (9.83)	Achieved
All prisoners should be eligible to be considered for family days. (9.84)	Achieved
There should be a clear strategy which describes actions and allocates responsibilities for maintaining and improving prisoners' links with families and friends. (9.85)	Not achieved
A comprehensive analysis of prisoners' offending behaviour needs should be carried out and the results used to inform which programmes are delivered and how they are developed. (9.91)	Not achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	149	683	86.2
Recall	13	93	11.0
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0.0
Remand	0	0	0.0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0.0
Detainees	1	22	2.4
Other		2	0.4
Total	163	802	100

Sentence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	2	25	2.8
Less than 6 months	2	1	0.31
6 months to less than 12 months	2	6	0.83
12 months to less than 2 years	13	65	8.1
2 years to less than 4 years	57	184	24.97
4 years to less than 10 years	58	387	46.11
10 years and over (not life)	5	54	6.11
ISPP	6	80	8.91
Mandatory life	18	0	1.86
Total	163	802	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age 18		
Under 21 years	163	16.9
21 years to 29 years	298	30.9
30 years to 39 years	219	22.7
40 years to 49 years	148	15.3
50 years to 59 years	82	8.5
60 years to 69 years	37	3.8
70 plus years	18	1.9
Please state maximum age 81		
Total	965	100

Nationality	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	153	608	78.9
Foreign nationals	10	194	21.0
Total	163	802	100

Security category	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	0	0
Uncategorised sentenced	2	1	0.3
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	0	0
Category C	4	772	80.4
Category D	0	23	2.39
Unclassified	14	1	1.5

Unsentenced	3	1	0.42
YOI Closed	135	3	14.3
YOI Open	3	0	0.3
Uncategorised sentenced males	2	1	0.3
Total	163	802	100

Ethnicity	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	108	514	64.6
Irish	0	0	0.0
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	1	0	0.1
Other white	5	59	6.63
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	5	9	1.5
White and black African	2	1	0.3
White and Asian	3	5	0.82
Other mixed	1	3	0.4
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	5	5	1.0
Pakistani	8	41	5.1
Bangladeshi	1	4	0.5
Chinese	0	2	0.2
Other Asian	5	41	4.9
Black or black British			
Caribbean	11	26	3.8
African	5	30	3.6
Other black	0	8	0.8
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	2	0.2
Other ethnic group	1	15	1.65
Not stated	2	36	3.9
Total	163	802	100

Religion	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	1	0	0.1
Church of England	27	232	26.8
Roman Catholic	27	123	15.5
Other Christian denominations	16	68	8.7
Muslim	29	123	15.8
Sikh	0	2	0.2
Hindu	1	0	0.1
Buddhist	1	26	2.8
Jewish	0	1	0.1
Other	1	7	0.8
No religion	60	220	29.0
Total	163	802	100

Other demographics	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)		21	2.2
Total		21	2.2

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	20	2.1	115	11.9
1 month to 3 months	34	3.6	174	18
3 months to 6 months	41	4.2	153	15.8
6 months to 1 year	41	4.2	276	28.6
1 year to 2 years	19	2.0	49	5
2 years to 4 years	7	0.7	10	1
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	161	16.6	777	80.3

Sentenced prisoners only

	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	1	25	2.7
Public protection cases		780 of which 310 are on active monitoring	80.8
Total			

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			6	0.62
1 month to 3 months			6	0.62
3 months to 6 months	1	0.1%	3	0.31
6 months to 1 year	0	0.0%	10	1.03
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total	1	0.1	25	2.6

Main offence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	66	136	20.9
Sexual offences	4	283	29.8
Burglary	35	104	14.4
Robbery	70	93	16.9
Theft and handling	2	16	1.8
Fraud and forgery	0	1	0.1
Drugs offences	12	77	9.0
Other offences	13	52	7.0
Civil offences	0	0	0
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	0	1	0.1
Total	202	763	100

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

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

At the time of the survey on 13–4 November 2012, the prisoner population at HMP Moorland was 958. The sample size was 214. Overall, this represented 22% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

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

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

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 177 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 19% of the main prison population. The response rate was 83%. In addition to the six respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 28 questionnaires were not returned and three were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in category C trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 38 category C trainer prisons since April 2007.
- The current survey responses in 2012 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Moorland in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are aged 21 and under and those over 21.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who consider themselves to be veterans and those who do not.

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

It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and those of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in changes to percentages from previously published surveys.

However, all percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

Summary

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

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

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

Survey summary

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	28	(16%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	50	(28%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	51	(29%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	26	(15%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	10	(6%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	6	(3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	5	(3%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	152	(88%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	17	(10%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	3	(2%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	7	(4%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	6	(4%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	19	(11%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	48	(28%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	54	(32%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	11	(6%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	19	(11%)
	<i>Life</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>	31	(18%)
	<i>No</i>	140	(82%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	174	(99%)
	<i>No</i>	1	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	168	(96%)
	<i>No</i>	7	(4%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	113 (64%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>White - other</i>	10 (6%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	15 (8%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> ..	1 (1%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?		
	<i>Yes</i>	3	(2%)

	No	167 (98%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?	
	None	44 (25%)
	Church of England.....	56 (32%)
	Catholic.....	23 (13%)
	Protestant	4 (2%)
	Other Christian denomination.....	9 (5%)
	Buddhist.....	2 (1%)
	Hindu	0 (0%)
	Jewish.....	1 (1%)
	Muslim	34 (19%)
	Sikh.....	0 (0%)
	Other.....	3 (2%)
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?	
	Heterosexual/straight.....	168 (97%)
	Homosexual/gay.....	2 (1%)
	Bisexual	3 (2%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?	
	Yes.....	36 (21%)
	No	139 (79%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	
	Yes.....	18 (10%)
	No	156 (90%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	
	Yes.....	89 (51%)
	No	87 (49%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?	
	Yes.....	77 (44%)
	No	99 (56%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	Less than 2 hours	120 (68%)
	2 hours or longer.....	42 (24%)
	Don't remember.....	14 (8%)
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	My journey was less than two hours	120 (69%)
	Yes.....	28 (16%)
	No	21 (12%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than two hours	120 (68%)
	Yes.....	3 (2%)
	No	50 (28%)
	Don't remember.....	3 (2%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	115 (65%)
	No	47 (27%)
	Don't remember	14 (8%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	142 (81%)
	No	27 (15%)
	Don't remember.....	6 (3%)

Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	43 (25%)
	<i>Well</i>	79 (45%)
	<i>Neither</i>	39 (22%)
	<i>Badly</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (3%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	114 (65%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	43 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (3%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	<i>Yes</i>	146 (83%)
	<i>No</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	122 (70%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	31 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	22 (13%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	136 (78%)
	<i>No</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	12 (7%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	32 (18%)
	<i>Well</i>	87 (50%)
	<i>Neither</i>	34 (19%)
	<i>Badly</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Loss of property</i>	33 (19%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	21 (12%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Physical health</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Mental health</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	42 (24%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Other</i>	8 (5%)
	Did not have any problems	61 (35%)
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>No</i>	76 (44%)
	Did not have any problems	61 (35%)

Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Tobacco</i>	137 (80%)
	<i>A shower</i>	66 (38%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	37 (22%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>	106 (62%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>	108 (63%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	99 (58%)
	Did not receive anything	4 (2%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Chaplain</i>	105 (63%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	111 (66%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	40 (24%)
	<i>Prison shop/canteen</i>	38 (23%)
	Did not have access to any of these	24 (14%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	93 (57%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	77 (47%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	92 (56%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	107 (65%)
	<i>Health services</i>	101 (62%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>	97 (59%)
	Not offered any information	28 (17%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	143 (82%)
	<i>No</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (5%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	21 (12%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	117 (68%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	12 (7%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	21 (12%)
	<i>Yes</i>	87 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	47 (27%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	18 (10%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	36 (22%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	52 (31%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	46 (28%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	32 (19%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:					
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	28 (17%)	53 (32%)	27 (16%)	25 (15%)	17 (10%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	22 (15%)	56 (38%)	29 (19%)	13 (9%)	5 (3%)
						24 (16%)
						(9%)

Get bail information?	8 (6%)	10 (7%)	27 (20%)	14 (10%)	10 (7%)	67 (49%)
-----------------------	-----------	------------	----------	----------	------------	----------

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?

Not had any letters	28 (16%)
Yes.....	73 (43%)
No	70 (41%)

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

Yes.....	58 (34%)
No	15 (9%)
Don't know	97 (57%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	120 (71%)	45 (26%)	5 (3%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	165 (96%)	4 (2%)	2 (1%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	130 (77%)	27 (16%)	12 (7%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	108 (64%)	50 (30%)	11 (7%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	54 (32%)	93 (55%)	22 (13%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	101 (60%)	62 (37%)	6 (4%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	33 (19%)	74 (44%)	63 (37%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good	3 (2%)
Good	28 (16%)
Neither	37 (21%)
Bad	51 (29%)
Very bad	54 (31%)

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

Have not bought anything yet/ don't know	6 (3%)
Yes.....	68 (40%)
No	98 (57%)

Q4.7 Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?

Yes.....	101 (59%)
No	19 (11%)
Don't know	52 (30%)

Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes.....	91 (53%)
No	22 (13%)
Don't know/N/A	58 (34%)

Q4.9 Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?

Yes.....	94 (56%)
No	15 (9%)
Don't know/N/A	59 (35%)

Q4.10 How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?

I don't want to attend	43 (25%)
Very easy.....	37 (22%)
Easy.....	46 (27%)

Neither	8 (5%)
Difficult	4 (2%)
Very difficult	7 (4%)
Don't know	25 (15%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	130 (76%)		
	No	30 (18%)		
	Don't know	10 (6%)		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	15 (9%)	79 (49%)	68 (42%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	15 (10%)	59 (40%)	73 (50%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....	103 (61%)		
	No	37 (22%)		
	Don't know	29 (17%)		
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints:			
	<i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	52 (32%)	33 (20%)	77 (48%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	52 (34%)	20 (13%)	83 (54%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes.....		33 (21%)	
	No		125 (79%)	
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	Don't know who they are	56 (34%)		
	Very easy.....	16 (10%)		
	Easy.....	27 (16%)		
	Neither	37 (22%)		
	Difficult.....	16 (10%)		
	Very difficult	14 (8%)		

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is	13 (8%)		
	Yes	100 (59%)		
	No	41 (24%)		
	Don't know	16 (9%)		
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is	13 (8%)		
	Yes.....	75 (46%)		
	No	58 (36%)		
	Don't know	16 (10%)		

Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes.....	21 (13%)
	No	143 (87%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	129 (79%)
	<i>Very well</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Well</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Badly</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	7 (4%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	118 (70%)
	No	50 (30%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	116 (69%)
	No	51 (31%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	41 (24%)
	No	130 (76%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>Never</i>	37 (22%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	40 (24%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	48 (28%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	10 (6%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	60 (36%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	44 (26%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	42 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	23 (14%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/ her</i>	60 (37%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	35 (22%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	9 (6%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	57 (33%)
	No	115 (67%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	30 (18%)
	No	138 (82%)

Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	115 (71%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>At work</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>During movement</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>At education</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>At health services</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	4 (2%)
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	44 (26%)
	No	125 (74%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Debt</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your age</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	51 (30%)
	No	118 (70%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Medication</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Debt</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)

Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	96 (64%)
	Yes.....	16 (11%)
	No	38 (25%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people:						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	20 (12%)	9 (5%)	33 (19%)	26 (15%)	52 (30%)	32 (19%)
	The nurse	18 (11%)	32 (20%)	64 (40%)	21 (13%)	16 (10%)	11 (7%)
	The dentist	34 (21%)	3 (2%)	19 (12%)	19 (12%)	39 (24%)	47 (29%)

Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people:						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	24 (14%)	27 (16%)	49 (29%)	27 (16%)	16 (10%)	25 (15%)
	The nurse	13 (8%)	29 (18%)	57 (35%)	25 (15%)	20 (12%)	20 (12%)
	The dentist	43 (27%)	11 (7%)	33 (21%)	24 (15%)	21 (13%)	26 (16%)

Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>Not been</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Very good</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Good</i>	57 (34%)
	<i>Neither</i>	37 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	23 (14%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes.....	86 (50%)
	No	86 (50%)

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	86 (50%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	40 (23%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (12%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes.....	62 (36%)
	No	108 (64%)

Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	108 (66%)
	Yes.....	27 (16%)
	No	29 (18%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	38 (22%)
	No	132 (78%)

Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	25 (15%)
	No	143 (85%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	32 (19%)
	<i>Easy</i>	15 (9%)

Neither	16 (10%)
Difficult	7 (4%)
Very difficult	6 (4%)
Don't know	92 (55%)

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy.....	17 (10%)
Easy.....	17 (10%)
Neither	15 (9%)
Difficult.....	7 (4%)
Very difficult	12 (7%)
Don't know	99 (59%)

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes.....	10 (6%)
No	157 (94%)

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?

Yes.....	10 (6%)
No	156 (94%)

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?

<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	126 (76%)
Yes.....	21 (13%)
No	18 (11%)

Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?

<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	143 (86%)
Yes.....	12 (7%)
No	11 (7%)

Q10.9 Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?

<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	141 (85%)
Yes.....	19 (11%)
No	6 (4%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
Prison job	14 (9%)	12 (7%)	31 (19%)	29 (18%)	34 (21%)	43 (26%)
Vocational or skills training	26 (17%)	10 (6%)	34 (22%)	28 (18%)	32 (21%)	26 (17%)
Education (including basic skills)	18 (12%)	26 (17%)	45 (29%)	29 (19%)	22 (14%)	15 (10%)
Offending behaviour programmes	38 (25%)	7 (5%)	20 (13%)	32 (21%)	29 (19%)	29 (19%)

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

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	42 (26%)
Prison job	85 (52%)
Vocational or skills training	26 (16%)
Education (including basic skills).....	39 (24%)
Offending behaviour programmes	15 (9%)

Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
	Prison job	50 (35%)	33 (23%)	42 (30%)	17 (12%)
	Vocational or skills training	61 (45%)	30 (22%)	25 (19%)	19 (14%)
	Education (including basic skills)	54 (37%)	54 (37%)	22 (15%)	15 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	70 (52%)	26 (19%)	22 (16%)	16 (12%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				24 (14%)
	<i>Never</i>				24 (14%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>				45 (27%)
	<i>About once a week</i>				68 (41%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>				5 (3%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				39 (23%)
	<i>Yes</i>				71 (43%)
	<i>No</i>				57 (34%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				35 (21%)
	<i>0</i>				23 (14%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				29 (17%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				54 (32%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				27 (16%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				41 (24%)
	<i>0</i>				30 (18%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				63 (37%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				19 (11%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				16 (9%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				7 (4%)
	<i>0</i>				5 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				9 (5%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				15 (9%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				133 (79%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)				
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>				27 (16%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>				31 (18%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>				26 (15%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>				25 (15%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>				25 (15%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>				15 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				22 (13%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?		
	<i>Yes</i>		53 (32%)
	<i>No</i>		113 (68%)

Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes.....	78 (46%)
	No	92 (54%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes.....	80 (47%)
	No	91 (53%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	29 (17%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Easy</i>	35 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	36 (21%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (5%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	3 (2%)
	Yes.....	145 (85%)
	No	23 (13%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/NA</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>No contact</i>	42 (25%)
	<i>Letter</i>	42 (25%)
	<i>Phone</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Visit</i>	67 (40%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes.....	127 (77%)
	No	38 (23%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	3 (2%)
	Yes.....	119 (70%)
	No	49 (29%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	52 (31%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>Involved</i>	39 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	20 (12%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	52 (32%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	51 (31%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	38 (23%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	33 (20%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	15 (9%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	52 (31%)
	Yes.....	59 (35%)

No 24 (14%)
 Don't know 32 (19%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 52 (31%)
 Yes..... 21 (12%)
 No 65 (38%)
 Don't know 31 (18%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 52 (31%)
 Yes..... 34 (20%)
 No 34 (20%)
 Don't know 49 (29%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?
 Yes 10 (6%)
 No 75 (45%)
 Don't know 83 (49%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?
 Yes..... 16 (10%)
 No 147 (90%)

Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	35 (23%)	42 (27%)	76 (50%)
Accommodation	39 (26%)	47 (32%)	63 (42%)
Benefits	31 (21%)	41 (28%)	74 (51%)
Finances	36 (26%)	24 (18%)	77 (56%)
Education	41 (29%)	30 (21%)	70 (50%)
Drugs and alcohol	51 (36%)	32 (23%)	57 (41%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?
Not sentenced 3 (2%)
 Yes..... 65 (41%)
 No 91 (57%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Moorland 2012

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

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		177	5853	177	194
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	16%	1%	16%	37%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	100%	98%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	10%	10%	10%	11%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	8%	5%	8%	5%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	11%	10%	11%	8%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	18%	9%	18%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	98%	96%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	29%	25%	29%	22%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	4%	2%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	19%	11%	19%	7%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	21%	17%	21%	16%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	6%	10%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	51%	35%	51%	25%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	44%	52%	44%	40%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	24%	45%	24%	34%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	52%	71%	52%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	5%	9%	5%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	65%	68%	65%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	81%	81%	81%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	70%	68%	70%	60%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	65%	61%	65%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	7%	19%	7%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	83%	89%	83%	91%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction				
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	70%	52%	70%	
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	82%	78%	69%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	72%	68%	48%
When you first arrived:				
3.4 Did you have any problems?	65%	61%	65%	69%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	16%	19%	22%
3.4 Did you have any housing problems?	12%	15%	12%	21%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	3%	4%	4%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting family?	24%	21%	24%	32%
3.4 Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	3%	2%	4%
3.4 Did you have any money worries?	16%	14%	16%	15%
3.4 Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	16%	13%	16%	14%
3.4 Did you have any physical health problems?	10%	11%	10%	
3.4 Did you have any mental health problems?	15%	11%	15%	
3.4 Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	5%	4%	5%	9%
3.4 Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%	19%	20%	34%
For those with problems:				
3.5 Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	32%	39%	32%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6 Tobacco?	80%	79%	80%	95%
3.6 A shower?	38%	32%	38%	28%
3.6 A free telephone call?	22%	43%	22%	45%
3.6 Something to eat?	62%	69%	62%	64%
3.6 PIN phone credit?	63%	53%	63%	
3.6 Toiletries/ basic items?	58%	44%	58%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	63%	52%	63%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	66%	72%	66%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	24%	36%	24%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	23%	17%	23%	8%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	57%	53%	57%	39%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	47%	46%	47%	48%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	56%	45%	56%	38%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	65%	45%	65%	51%
3.8	Health services?	62%	57%	62%	54%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	59%	50%	59%	56%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	83%	82%	77%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	93%	88%	88%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	57%	66%	57%	48%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	78%	85%	78%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	49%	49%	49%	31%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	52%	53%	52%	54%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	15%	13%	12%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	43%	41%	43%	50%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	34%	46%	34%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	71%	64%	71%	50%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	92%	97%	73%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	77%	82%	77%	77%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	64%	75%	64%	38%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	41%	32%	23%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	60%	71%	60%	63%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	20%	29%	20%	25%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	29%	18%	10%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	46%	40%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	59%	58%	59%	52%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	53%	54%	53%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	56%	59%	56%	49%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	49%	53%	49%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	86%	77%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	54%	63%	54%	51%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	45%	52%	45%	41%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	61%	63%	61%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	30%	34%	30%	25%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	19%	40%	19%	35%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	21%	16%	21%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	26%	31%	26%	27%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	59%	55%	59%	59%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	46%	47%	46%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	13%	5%	13%	11%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	41%	44%	41%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	70%	78%	70%	57%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	70%	76%	70%	60%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	24%	31%	24%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	20%	20%	20%	9%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	65%	75%	65%	58%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	62%	64%	62%	44%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	31%	33%	36%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	13%	18%	18%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	26%	20%	26%	16%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	9%	10%	8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	5%	4%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	12%	12%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%	3%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	2%	5%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%	3%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	4%	4%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	3%	3%	3%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	30%	25%	30%	27%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	10%	9%	15%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	2%	5%	4%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	12%	10%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	5%	2%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	2%	5%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	4%	5%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	30%	38%	30%	43%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24%	36%	24%	32%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	59%	58%	59%	60%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	14%	14%	14%	10%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	53%	49%	53%	49%
9.2	The nurse?	57%	62%	57%	57%
9.2	The dentist?	38%	43%	38%	30%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	47%	45%	47%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	50%	46%	50%	42%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	77%	87%	77%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	37%	25%	37%	27%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	48%	49%	48%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	22%	23%	22%	31%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	15%	17%	15%	22%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	30%	28%	24%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	20%	18%	20%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	7%	6%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	6%	6%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	54%	64%	54%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	52%	63%	52%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	76%	81%	76%	68%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	26%	45%	26%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	28%	37%	28%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	46%	50%	46%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	20%	17%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	53%	62%	53%	60%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	16%	18%	16%	15%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	24%	29%	24%	22%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	9%	15%	9%	19%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	65%	85%	65%	81%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	36%	44%	36%	44%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	55%	76%	55%	68%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	41%	62%	41%	62%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	63%	82%	63%	71%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	59%	63%	59%	65%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	48%	74%	48%	72%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	41%	56%	41%	64%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	44%	49%	44%	33%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	43%	51%	43%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	48%	37%	48%	22%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	21%	48%	21%	39%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	79%	78%	79%	66%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	9%	15%	9%	3%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	32%	36%	32%	30%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	46%	44%	46%	70%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	47%	25%	47%	40%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	32%	25%	32%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Moorland	prisons comparator	HMP Moorland 2012	HMP Moorland 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	86%	83%	86%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	29%	33%	29%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	29%	38%	29%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	17%	25%	17%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	47%	34%	47%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	77%	67%	77%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	71%	73%	71%	80%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	56%	56%	56%	57%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	46%	45%	46%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	34%	35%	34%	
13.6	Offender manager?	30%	27%	30%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	6%	15%	6%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	13%	18%	13%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	51%	68%	51%	81%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	18%	21%	18%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	29%	27%	29%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	7%	6%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	10%	18%	10%	13%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	36%	37%	36%	
13.12	Accommodation?	43%	41%	43%	
13.12	Benefits?	36%	43%	36%	
13.12	Finances?	24%	31%	24%	
13.12	Education?	30%	40%	30%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	36%	48%	36%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	42%	56%	42%	44%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Moorland 2012

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
Number of completed questionnaires returned		52	125	31	140	34	142
1.3	Are you sentenced?	96%	99%	90%	100%	97%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	42%	8%			33%	15%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	94%	97%	84%	99%	97%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			68%	21%	91%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	2%	10%	0%	0%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	60%	2%	36%	17%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	26%	19%	21%	6%	24%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	12%	13%	10%	6%	12%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	69%	43%	74%	45%	62%	48%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	65%	72%	68%	71%	62%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	61%	67%	61%	65%	59%	66%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	70%	82%	63%	84%	73%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	57%	73%	67%	70%	53%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	67%	64%	76%	62%	76%	62%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	66%	66%	67%	65%	65%	66%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	86%	67%	86%	73%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	78%	92%	70%	91%	77%	91%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	49%	41%	52%	51%	48%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	71%	71%	50%	75%	77%	70%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	98%	90%	98%	94%	97%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	38%	30%	24%	33%	44%	29%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22%	16%	20%	17%	29%	15%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	28%	44%	30%	41%	23%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	42%	66%	37%	64%	44%	62%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	51%	57%	53%	73%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	58%	55%	46%	59%	62%	55%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	65%	81%	64%	79%	64%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	66%	57%	63%	51%	63%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	48%	63%	48%	63%	49%	62%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	46%	43%	47%	55%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	13%	13%	11%	13%	16%	12%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	63%	73%	63%	72%	64%	72%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	69%	70%	67%	71%	67%	70%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	14%	22%	10%	23%	18%	21%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	59%	67%	57%	67%	58%	66%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	42%	30%	50%	30%	50%	29%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	25%	15%	38%	14%	27%	16%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	32%	24%	50%	21%	33%	25%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	8%	14%	17%	11%	15%	11%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	2%	17%	2%	12%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%	3%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	10%	3%	10%	3%	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	2%	2%	7%	1%	0%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners		White prisoners		Foreign national prisoners		British prisoners		Muslim prisoners		Non-Muslim prisoners	
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better													
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse													
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details													
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference												
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	45%	24%	45%	27%	36%	28%						
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	19%	7%	10%	10%	15%	9%						
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	1%	7%	2%	3%	2%						
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	14%	0%	7%	4%	12%	2%						
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	14%	2%	14%	3%	3%	6%						
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	2%	0%	2%	0%	2%						
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	26%	27%	24%	12%	28%						
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	56%	61%	61%	59%	55%	61%						
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	32%	57%	50%	51%	38%	53%						
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	33%	38%	50%	33%	27%	39%						
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	21%	31%	24%	29%	27%	28%						
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	38%	59%	30%	56%	38%	56%						
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	15%	17%	15%	16%	16%	16%						
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	40%	18%	45%	19%	35%	22%						
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	15%	7%	11%	9%	16%	8%						
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	42%	48%	43%	47%	44%						
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	60%	43%	43%	49%	62%	45%						
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	17%	22%	10%	23%	23%	20%						
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	79%	66%	82%	77%	79%						
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	12%	7%	7%	9%	12%	8%						
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	46%	46%	40%	46%	44%	46%						
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	57%	43%	50%	47%	47%	47%						

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50, under 21) HMP Moorland 2012

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Prisoners aged 50 and over		Prisoners under the age of 50		Prisoners under the age of 21		Prisoners aged 21 and over	
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better													
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse													
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details													
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference													
Number of completed questionnaires returned		36	139			21	155			28	148		
1.3	Are you sentenced?	97%	99%			96%	99%			97%	99%		
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	17%	19%			10%	19%			8%	20%		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%			100%	99%			100%	99%		
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	96%			100%	95%			100%	95%		
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	11%	34%			10%	32%			43%	27%		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	2%			0%	2%			4%	1%		
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	23%			4%	22%			29%	18%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?					43%	18%			3%	24%		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	17%	9%			33%	7%			0%	12%		
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	39%	54%			76%	47%			64%	48%		
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	81%	67%			90%	67%			74%	69%		
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	55%	68%			62%	65%			78%	63%		
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	78%			85%	77%			82%	77%		
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	66%			90%	66%			66%	69%		
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	80%	61%			61%	65%			59%	65%		
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	61%	67%			56%	67%			56%	68%		
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	83%			85%	81%			89%	80%		
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	86%	89%			85%	88%			82%	89%		
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	39%	51%			53%	49%			56%	48%		

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	60%	73%	85%	69%	77%	69%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91%	98%	96%	97%	100%	96%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	30%	56%	29%	27%	33%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	20%	28%	17%	15%	19%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	46%	38%	80%	34%	34%	41%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	68%	57%	76%	57%	56%	60%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	54%	74%	51%	48%	55%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	47%	58%	63%	55%	50%	57%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	75%	85%	75%	76%	76%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	61%	57%	61%	57%	61%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	45%	62%	67%	57%	52%	60%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	48%	50%	46%	52%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	13%	5%	14%	15%	13%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	69%	85%	68%	74%	69%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	67%	71%	80%	68%	71%	69%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	23%	19%	35%	18%	15%	21%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	80%	61%	85%	62%	56%	66%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	31%	25%	34%	30%	34%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	27%	16%	10%	19%	19%	18%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	47%	21%	26%	26%	22%	27%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	22%	10%	11%	12%	8%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	5%	0%	5%	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	9%	4%	0%	5%	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	1%	0%	2%	0%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse			Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	36%	28%	21%	32%	16%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	3%	12%	5%	11%	11%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	5%	0%	5%	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	9%	4%	0%	6%	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	3%	1%	5%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	6%	1%	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	17%	26%	30%	24%	37%	22%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	60%	59%	78%	57%	62%	59%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	86%	41%	80%	46%	11%	58%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	68%	28%	42%	35%	11%	41%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	23%	30%	11%	30%	40%	25%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	60%	50%	52%	52%	45%	54%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	25%	14%	0%	18%	0%	19%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	22%	24%	11%	26%	11%	27%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	13%	9%	0%	11%	8%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	44%	42%	44%	35%	45%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%	55%	26%	51%	65%	45%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	18%	21%	5%	22%	11%	22%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	63%	83%	55%	82%	92%	76%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	3%	10%	25%	7%	0%	10%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	46%	46%	30%	48%	46%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	46%	47%	35%	49%	38%	49%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (veterans) HMP Moorland 2012

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		18	156
1.3	Are you sentenced?	95%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	22%	18%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	89%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	17%	31%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	11%	21%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	33%	19%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	72%	48%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	65%	65%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	89%	67%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	65%	65%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	71%	65%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	84%	81%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	87%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	50%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	76%	70%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	97%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	56%	29%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	33%	16%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	65%	37%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	67%	57%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	75%	51%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	55%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	75%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	72%	60%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	67%	58%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	12%	13%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	72%	70%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	84%	68%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	11%	21%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	76%	63%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	33%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	19%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	35%	25%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	17%	11%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised you are from a different part of the country than others? (By prisoners)		
8.5	Have you been victimised because you are from a traveller community? (By prisoners)		
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	35%	30%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	5%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	12%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised you are from a different part of the country than others? (By staff)		
8.7	Have you been victimised because you are from a traveller community? (By staff)		
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	17%	25%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	69%	58%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	56%	49%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	44%	36%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	30%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	47%	53%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	12%	17%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	29%	24%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	67%	41%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	28%	51%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	17%	21%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	72%	79%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	17%	8%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	28%	48%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	44%	47%