

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMP Northumberland**

11-15 June 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

# Contents

	<b>Introduction</b>	5
	<b>Fact page</b>	7
	<b>Healthy prison summary</b>	9
<b>1</b>	<b>Safety</b>	19
<hr/>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Respect</b>	31
<hr/>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Purposeful activity</b>	47
<hr/>		
<b>4</b>	<b>Resettlement</b>	53
<hr/>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice</b>	65
<hr/>		
	<b>Appendices</b>	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	74
	II Prison population profile	75
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	78



# Introduction

This is our first inspection of HMP Northumberland since the former young offender institution, Castington and the adult category C training prison, Acklington were brought together as one prison. Now completely committed to the custody of adults and holding both mainstream prisoners and a significant vulnerable population of sex offenders, Northumberland is a huge facility capable of holding over 1,300 men. The prison currently occupies two adjacent sites, but there are plans to connect them by altering the fence line, which will further emphasise the size and complexity of the establishment.

As well as the challenge of ensuring a successful amalgamation, at the time of our inspection the prison was also undergoing a competitive market test process to determine whether it remained in the public sector or became private. In the context of this uncertainty, the establishment should take credit for what is a reasonably good report, particularly concerning the issues of safety and respect.

Our survey of prisoners indicated that more felt safe than in similar prisons and there were satisfactory procedures to tackle violence and self-harm. There were some improvements to make in arrangements for receiving and inducting new prisoners, but the use of force and segregation were low and well managed. The prison could not afford to be complacent about drug usage which was appreciable, but recent indicators suggested improvement.

The prison was a respectful place. The quality of accommodation was generally good, and some was excellent. The prison was clean and external areas were well maintained. Relationships between staff and prisoners were encouraging and there had been progress in the promotion of diversity. However, the prison needed to be more proactive about the wellbeing of older prisoners and those identified as disabled. The provision of health care was reasonable, but a number of issues needed to be addressed, not least the varied prisoner perceptions of the service they received.

Northumberland, as a training prison, offered a regime that had the potential to provide good quality opportunities and outcomes. There was a sufficient range of opportunity in learning and skills, good teaching and some good facilities. Achievement among learners was high. However, there were insufficient places to meet the needs of the population and allocation arrangements were so poor that those places that existed were not fully utilised. Punctuality was described as erratic. Prisoner perceptions of the regime on offer were disappointingly poor and it was inexcusable that, in a training prison, we found a third of the population locked up doing nothing during the working day.

It was clear that much work was being done to improve the quality of offender management and resettlement work, although the offender management unit was still being established and the prison had some way to go. Offender management caseloads were too high and some structures and processes were weak. Prisoner perceptions of offender management were poor. Work regarding public protection was, however, much better. Partnerships with Shelter appeared to be delivering good outcomes with regard to some resettlement pathways and the Gateway resettlement unit was an interesting, although not yet fully developed, initiative to support reintegration. The prison needed to become more confident about the use of temporary release to support resettlement. There was a lack of work to support the children and families resettlement pathway.

This inspection took place at a time of significant change and uncertainty for HMP Northumberland. Castington and Acklington had integrated well and felt like one entity, which

was a real achievement. We were impressed by the energetic and committed management team who were delivering some solid outcomes. The prison's priorities, however, must now be to deliver on the work begun in resettlement and to get prisoners usefully occupied in this training prison.

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

**September 2012**

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

HMP Northumberland is a category C prison for convicted adult male prisoners.

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

Public

**Region/Department**

North East

**Number held**

1263

**Certified normal accommodation**

1354

**Operational capacity**

1348

**Date of last full inspection**

June 2009 (Acklington)

January 2009 (Castington)

**Brief history**

HMP Northumberland was formerly two separate prisons situated a few hundred metres apart – namely, HMP Acklington and HMPYOI Castington, opened in 1972 and 1983 respectively. The merger of the two prisons was announced in 2010 and work began in April 2011 to merge all functions. On 31 October 2011 the merged prison became known as HMP Northumberland.

**Short description of residential units**

Single cell accommodation in 15 house blocks, five on the Castington site (house blocks 1-5) and 10 on the Acklington site (house blocks 6-15). House blocks 6-9 accommodated vulnerable prisoners.

**Name of governor/director**

Matt Spencer

**Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

Commissioner: North East Offender Health Commissioning Unit (NEOHCU)

Provider: Care UK

**Learning and skills providers**

Manchester College

**IMB chair**

Christine Fitch





# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Safety

---

- HP5 Prisoners reported positively about escort journeys. However, transfer arrangements between the two parts of the prison were cumbersome. The reception process was efficient. First night and induction arrangements needed to be improved. Most prisoners felt safe and violence reduction work was progressing well. Overall, the management of prisoners at risk of self-harm was reasonably good. Drug use remained a major security problem despite significant progress over the previous six months. Use of force appeared proportionate and governance was sound. Use of segregation was low and prisoners described positive experiences in the unit. There was a good drug and alcohol strategy but alcohol services were still limited. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- HP6 Most prisoners had short journeys to Northumberland and the vehicles inspected were clean and well equipped. Arrangements for transfer between the Acklington and Castington sites were cumbersome. Staff told us that vulnerable prisoners were not always correctly identified on escorts from Hull, leading to acute anxiety for the men being transferred.
- HP7 The reception process was quick and prisoners were positive about their treatment but all were strip-searched, which was disproportionate. Not all prisoners received a free phone call on the day of arrival or were able to see peer supporters in private.
- HP8 Most prisoners felt safe on their first night. However, night staff on one induction landing were unaware of their responsibilities towards new arrivals. The three induction programmes – one each for both sites and one for vulnerable prisoners – varied in quality. Some prisoners were under-occupied and locked up for long periods.
- HP9 In our survey, prisoners were more positive about safety than those in comparator establishments. Vulnerable prisoners felt less safe, but we found no obvious weaknesses in procedures that placed them at risk. Unexplained or suspicious injuries were investigated properly. The safer custody team was effective and making good progress on developing coherent arrangements across the two sites. Violent incident investigations were not always thorough. Perpetrators were challenged but work to support victims was underdeveloped.
- HP10 There had been two self-inflicted deaths since our previous inspection; the prison was making sufficient progress towards achieving the recommendations from the one completed investigation. Around 14 prisoners self-harmed each month, which was consistent with the rise in the population. Staff acted on concerns promptly.

- HP11 Assessment, care in custody and teamwork documents were generally good and reviews were multidisciplinary, although prisoners rarely had a consistent case manager. Constant observations were carried out in gated and camera cells, but these were poorly located in the segregation units, along with special accommodation. The governance of these cells and monitoring of the use of strip clothing was weak.
- HP12 There was good access to the Listener scheme on the Acklington site, and a scheme was about to start at Castington. Prisoners had access to voluntary counselling but it was under-resourced. Several prisoners had died shortly after release, but the National Offender Management Service did not routinely investigate these deaths.
- HP13 Some security arrangements, for example, prisoners being unable to wear their own clothes, were overly restrictive. Dynamic security was effective and supported by good staff-prisoner relationships. Security was suitably focused on the threats posed by illegal drugs and mobile phones entering the establishment. The mandatory drug testing figure was high at around 10%, but the trend had been downward since the previous year. In nearly 20% of cases where drugs were suspected drug testing was not being carried out. Closed visits were applied to non-visits related incidents and reviews were perfunctory.
- HP14 The number of adjudications was lower than in comparator prisons; they were well managed. The incentives and earned privileges policy was generally applied fairly, but it was inappropriate that prisoners on the basic level could not have the same breakfast as others. Use of force was relatively low. There was evidence of the use of de-escalation techniques. The control and restraint coordinator quality assured documentation, but video footage was not routinely reviewed.
- HP15 The use of segregation was low on both sites. The units were reasonably clean and the outside exercise equipment at Castington was a useful facility, but there was graffiti in the yard and in some cells. There were some restrictive practices in the segregation units and the regime was limited in both. The majority of prisoners did not spend long periods in segregation, but there was a lack of recorded care and reintegration planning. Staff were knowledgeable about the prisoners in their care, and prisoners were positive about their treatment. Monitoring of the use of segregation was underdeveloped.
- HP16 Joint work to provide prisoners on methadone with support for recovery was effective, and there was an appropriate focus on encouraging reduction rather than maintenance. A good drug and alcohol strategy was in place, with a dynamic treatment oriented action plan. Psychosocial interventions for drugs were good but alcohol services were too limited.<sup>1</sup>

---

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

## Respect

---

- HP17 The accommodation was generally of a good quality and the prison was clean. Laundry facilities were inadequate. Staff-prisoner relationships were very good. The management of diversity was generally effective but not enough was being done to meet the needs of the large numbers of older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities. Chaplaincy staff provided a good overall service to prisoners. Complaints were managed well. Health services were reasonably good. The standard of food was reasonable but lacked cultural variety. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- HP18 Cells were generally clean and external areas were well maintained. Most of the accommodation was of a good quality, and some was excellent. Showers were clean and easy to access, and a much needed programme of refurbishment had begun in the older house blocks.
- HP19 Laundry facilities were inadequate on both sites. Too many dryers and washers were out of order on wings and in central laundries. Laundry was often returned damp and personal clothing was not washed during weeks when there were public holidays. There was a shortage of prison clothing in some popular sizes.
- HP20 Phone access was good and systems for sending and receiving mail were efficient. The 'email a prisoner service' was fairly well used but many prisoners were still unaware of it. The applications system was not consistent or robust. In some house blocks prisoners had to apply for an application form and poor monitoring of applications made it impossible to assess timeliness.
- HP21 Prisoners across the establishment were very positive about relationships with staff, and there was a good cooperative atmosphere on both sites. Not all prisoners knew their personal officer. Those who did found them helpful but personal officer work did not focus enough on personal circumstances or sentence progression. There was regular consultation with prisoners and some limited evidence of progress on the issues raised.
- HP22 Measurable progress was being made on equality and diversity work. Ethnic monitoring was thorough and trends were monitored over time. Diversity reports generally related to low level incidents, which were well investigated, but diversity incident report forms were not easily available. Prisoner representatives received training and support and there was a committed group of staff champions for most protected groups.
- HP23 There few foreign national prisoners. There were no special arrangements for extended visits for those with family members travelling from abroad. There was some evidence of a lack of staff awareness of religious and cultural diversity, and locally developed staff awareness training had yet to be delivered. There were regular meetings for the substantial Gypsy, Roma and Traveller group, and a valued support group for gay and bisexual prisoners on the Acklington site.
- HP24 Prisoners who considered themselves to have a disability were significantly more negative about their experiences of prison than others. There was substantial under-identification of prisoners with disabilities. Disability liaison officers did not have enough facility time to work with these prisoners. However, the newer adapted cells

for people with disabilities provided very good accommodation, and a paid carer scheme was in place.

- HP25 We found prisoners above retirement age locked in their cells during the core day in most house blocks, contrary to policy. There was very limited extra provision for them and little if anything to keep them occupied. There were some useful monthly older prisoner meetings, but not all older prisoners were aware of them and not enough was being done to meet the needs of this population.
- HP26 Chaplains met prisoners within the first 24 hours and were visible around the prison, although not all religious groups had regular contact with ministers of their faith. There were regular faith study classes and chaplains had good links with community groups.
- HP27 Responses to complaints were generally respectful and usually addressed the issues at hand. Governance arrangements had recently improved. An analysis of the types of complaint had begun to take place and there was evidence that action was being taken to deal with emerging problems.
- HP28 There was little information during induction about how to access legal services, but there were good legal reference materials in the library. Legal visits arrangements were appropriate, though better at the Acklington site.
- HP29 Prisoners reported mixed experiences of health care, and those on the Acklington site were more critical. Clinical governance systems were very robust. Primary care provision was good, but telemedicine was not being used to its full potential. Waiting times were low but failure to attend rates for the GP service were too high. Patients often arrived too early for health appointments and waited too long for escorts following appointments. A significant number of NHS outpatient appointments were missed, mainly because of transportation problems. We were concerned to find two automated external defibrillators (AEDs) with batteries that had almost expired. A large number of staff were trained to use AEDs, and some prisoners were also being trained. Dental waiting lists had been reduced to three weeks but extra sessions intended to remedy long waits were about to stop. Pharmacy services were generally good. There was a good mental health in-reach team and some voluntary counselling, but no contracted counselling services or therapeutic group activity. Transfers to NHS mental health units took too long, with three of the previous four transfers taking longer than two weeks.
- HP30 About a quarter of prisoners in our survey said that they thought the food was good, but the findings were better on the Castington site. We found the range and standard of food on both sites to be reasonable, but catering for a wider range of cultural needs was somewhat limited. There were good arrangements to ensure that food for vulnerable prisoners was not contaminated. Prisoner consultation was good. Prisoners were reasonably content with the shop, but found it particularly expensive in the light of their low wages.

## Purposeful activity

---

- HP31 There were insufficient activity spaces for the population. Too many prisoners were unemployed. We found nearly a third of the population locked up during the core day. Workshop facilities and education provision were good but spaces were not always

filled. The range of courses across both sites was appropriate, and there were high achievement rates. There were few opportunities above level 2. The library provision was generally good but access was variable. PE provision was excellent and well coordinated across the two sites. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good.

- HP32 The prison reported that prisoners spent just over eight hours per day out of their cells, but this assumed that nearly everyone was engaged in a scheduled activity. In reality, the figure was much lower for the significant number who did not work or who worked part time. During our roll checks, around 30% of prisoners were locked up during the core day. Exercise and association took place as scheduled and were rarely cancelled.
- HP33 The management of the learning skills and work provision needed improvement. Task allocation processes were inconsistent and lacked transparency. The management of those waiting for education or training was ineffective. Pay was generally low, although it did not disadvantage prisoners attending education. Appropriate quality improvement processes were in place.
- HP34 In our survey, prisoners' responses were more negative than those in comparator prisons when asked about activities. There were insufficient activity places for the population and under-use of existing places. A high proportion of prisoners were unemployed and too many of those in work were wing cleaners.
- HP35 The range of education and vocational training programmes was satisfactory. There were good opportunities to achieve qualifications up to level 2, but insufficient progression opportunities beyond that.
- HP36 Teaching and learning were good, with some very good individual coaching in education classes. Attendance was satisfactory, but punctuality was erratic. Very good use was made of peer mentors to support prisoners in education classes. The virtual campus was a good facility; it was well used for job searches but under-used for education courses.
- HP37 Prisoners' achievement of qualifications on many courses in education and vocational training was very high, and outstanding on some. There was good development of work skills. Learners demonstrated high standards of work across most areas, particularly in horticulture, catering and customer service.
- HP38 The libraries were welcoming and appropriately resourced and staffed. Provision was better at the Castington site. Access was reasonable for most, but poor for some prisoners. A wide range of materials was available in Castington, but the range of books and learning materials at Acklington was limited.
- HP39 PE provision was very well managed and staff were highly qualified and knowledgeable. Access to recreational PE was good, with an appropriate range of provision available for older prisoners. The prison's promotion of healthy living was good, with effective use made of well-trained orderlies. The quality of training was good, but there were few vocational training opportunities above level 1. Links with the resettlement unit were very good and PE staff ran a 'job ready' programme in the workshops for prisoners about to be released. PE induction was robust and there were good links with the health care department and the drug and alcohol rehabilitation team.

## Resettlement

---

- HP40 Strides had been made in the strategic management of resettlement and offender management. However, there was not yet a whole prison approach to this work. Offender supervisors had very high caseloads and the quality of their work varied widely. Most received no formal supervision. Release on temporary licence was under-used. Public protection arrangements were reasonable. There was some reasonably good work related to the pathways, including good accommodation support and finance advice from Shelter. The arrangements for booking visits were poor. There were some good developing initiatives to tackle attitudes and behaviour, but overall referral and assessment processes for programmes were inefficient. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good.
- HP41 Able senior managers were effectively driving the development of resettlement and offender management. However, there was not yet a whole prison approach to offender management. Prisoners reported negative experiences relating to contact with offender supervisors and their ability to progress. The reducing reoffending strategy was pathway based but did not address the needs of specific groups of prisoners such as those with indeterminate sentences.
- HP42 Monthly reducing reoffending meetings had been re-established in 2012 and were effective. Offender assessment systems were mostly completed on time, but a few had been many months late. There were more than 50 category D prisoners and a number of progressive moves had taken place. However, release on temporary licence (ROTL) was greatly under-used. Only two people had been granted ROTL in the previous year. The use of home detention curfew (HDC) had improved substantially, but most prisoners were not released on HDC on their eligibility dates.
- HP43 The offender management unit (OMU) was still being established. Although the self-contained pod system was promising, outcomes were inconsistent and caseloads for offender supervisors were too high. Supervisors saw some prisoners on an irregular basis and others only at annual reviews. The quality of their work varied from excellent to poor, and there was a lack of formal supervision for most of them.
- HP44 Forums for prisoners on indeterminate sentences had been introduced but awareness of them was limited. There were no specific events for lifers. Public protection arrangements were reasonable overall, but risk management plans needed improvement.
- HP45 The Gateway unit had a good focus on employment, education and training, but it was not meeting its full potential as a resettlement unit promoting independent living. There was some useful support for veterans in custody.
- HP46 Provision under the accommodation pathway was generally good. Shelter worked with a fairly large number of prisoners each month, dealing with a range of issues and problems. However, the provision was not well publicised on the wings and no reliable figures were kept for the number of prisoners released without settled accommodation.
- HP47 Jobcentre Plus and Shelter provided an adequate range of finance, benefit and debt advice, and a money management course was available through the education department.

- HP48 Arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work were reasonable and over a quarter of those discharged had gone into full-time education, training or employment. Relationships between staff in the resettlement unit, Jobcentre Plus and the careers information and advice service were productive, but links with employers were underdeveloped.
- HP49 All prisoners were assessed by health care staff before their release. There were arrangements for palliative care and the care programme approach was used for people with mental health problems. Links between drug and alcohol recovery team workers and local drug intervention project teams were good, with some of the latter providing gate pick-up services for newly released prisoners.
- HP50 Most visitors said that they found it extremely difficult to book a visit and some visit sessions started significantly later than advertised. Some aspects of security during visits were disproportionate, and included some occasions when visitors had been strip-searched by prison staff. The vision for the future development of the children and families pathway was limited; there was no comprehensive action plan setting out priorities or timescales. Visitors and prisoners were positive regarding the support provided by the North East Prison After Care Society. Extended family visits were held regularly.
- HP51 The restorative justice project was a promising development, and restorative principles underpinned some workshop work. The range of programmes was sufficient, with the addition of the controlling anger and learning to manage it programme, but referral and assessment processes were inefficient. Good support was available to prisoners with learning difficulties and the 'HOPE' scheme, which mentored prisoners through the sex offender treatment programme was a positive way of promoting offender engagement.

## Main concerns and recommendations

---

- HP52 Concern: There were insufficient activity spaces and existing spaces were not filled. Around a third of prisoners were locked up during the core day.

**Recommendation: Sufficient activity places should be provided to ensure all prisoners are purposefully engaged during the core day, and existing activity spaces should be fully used.**

- HP53 Concern: The OMU was under-resourced, caseloads for offender supervisors were too high and the quality of work varied widely. There was no formal supervision for most offender supervisors.

**Recommendation: The work of the OMU should be properly resourced and effectively integrated with the work of other departments, and all offender supervisors should receive formal supervision and support.**

- HP54 Concern: Family contact was not properly supported by the visits system. Visits booking systems were poor, visits regularly started late, and some aspects of security during visits were disproportionate, including the strip-searching of visitors.

**Recommendation: Visitors should be able to book visits quickly and easily, have the full amount of visit time each session. Both visitors and prisoners**



**should experience proportionate security in the visits area. Strip-searching of visitors by prison staff should cease.**



# Section 1: Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Many prisoners had positive experiences of escorts. However, a significant number of vulnerable prisoners had less positive experiences. The video-link was used well. Movement between the two sites was cumbersome.
- 1.2 In our survey most prisoners were positive about their experiences of escorts, which was confirmed by our conversations, observations and analysis of prisoner escort records. Vehicles were clean, well equipped and managed by professional staff. However, vulnerable prisoners reported longer journeys, problems with property and anxiety about threats to their personal safety from other prisoners. Some vulnerable prisoners arriving from HMP Hull were not correctly identified as such during escort. They were to fill spaces in the mainstream part of the prison. They said that they had not known this and had not received any information about HMP Northumberland in advance. Staff told us that difficulties surrounding the transfer of vulnerable prisoners from HMP Hull were common.
- 1.3 The video-link facility was used effectively to avoid unnecessary escorts, but the procedure for moving prisoners between the two secure sites to use the facility was unnecessarily cumbersome. Prisoners were formally transferred as they would have been between different establishments, entailing time-consuming administrative and security procedures. Both receptions had arrangements to provide civilian clothing to prisoners on escort or discharge, but not for hospital appointments.

### Recommendation

---

- 1.4 **Vulnerable prisoners should be correctly identified during escort. They should only be integrated into the mainstream population on the basis of individual care planning.**

### Housekeeping points

---

- 1.5 Procedures for moving prisoners between the two sites should be simplified.
- 1.6 Prisoners should be given civilian clothing for outside hospital appointments.

## 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.**

- 1.7 Most prisoners reported positive experiences of their first days at Northumberland. The reception process was swift but prisoners were inappropriately strip-searched as a matter of routine. Most prisoners usually felt safe on their first night and induction was generally considered helpful. However, there were some weaknesses in both first night and induction procedures.
- 1.8 Prisoners reported positive experiences of reception, especially at the Castington site, and vulnerable prisoners said that they were particularly well treated. Both receptions were clean, but there was some graffiti in the holding rooms. Some of the holding rooms had appropriate information on notice boards. There were televisions, but we did not see them used.
- 1.9 Prisoners were positive about their treatment in reception and the process was swift. Most prisoners reported that searching in reception was conducted professionally, but it was inappropriate that all prisoners were routinely strip-searched on reception. The information provided to prisoners about the value of canteen packs in reception was often incorrect.
- 1.10 Most prisoners – 87% compared with 83% in comparator prisons – reported that they felt safe on their first night. Accommodation was clean and well equipped. First night officers interviewed all new arrivals and completed an assessment form. However, in one house block, night staff were unaware of newly arrived prisoners and made no particular effort to monitor them. There was no written first night policy.
- 1.11 All prisoners were offered a free telephone call on the wing, but many of these took place in the main wing office and were not private; some late arrivals could not make calls until the next day. Showers were not offered in reception, but most prisoners arrived in time for evening association and could shower on the wing.
- 1.12 Most prisoners met an Insider<sup>2</sup> on their first night, either in reception or on the wing. However, Insiders were not easily identifiable and there was no routine opportunity to speak to them in private. Their role varied across both sites of the establishment and was not always well understood. Prisoners could ask to see a Listener<sup>3</sup> on the Acklington site, but the service was not routinely offered. The chaplaincy team was not usually available until the next day.
- 1.13 Three induction programmes were in operation (one for each site, and one for vulnerable prisoners). In our survey, about three-quarters of prisoners said that they found induction helpful compared with 65% in comparator prisons, but vulnerable prisoners and prisoners with disabilities were less content. The induction programme on the Acklington site left prisoners under-occupied and locked up for long periods.
- 1.14 The quality and quantity of information about the prison provided to prisoners varied across the sites, and some of it was dated. Prisoners attended a group information session, which was sometimes enhanced by a visual presentation. A variety of other agencies was supposed to provide additional input into the programme, but some attended infrequently.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.15 **Prisoners should not be routinely strip-searched in reception.**
- 

<sup>2</sup> Experienced prisoners who provide general advice and support to their peers upon arrival into custody.

<sup>3</sup> Prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm.

- 1.16 All newly arrived prisoners should be able to make a free, private telephone call on the day of arrival, and have an opportunity to see a peer support worker and a chaplain in private. Night staff should follow clear first night procedures.
- 1.17 Induction should provide a consistent and good quality introduction to the prison and offer all prisoners sufficient occupation.

## Housekeeping points

---

- 1.18 Prisoners should be given accurate information about the price of canteen packs in reception.
- 1.19 All holding cells should be clean; they should contain reading material and offer other activities to occupy prisoners while they wait.

## Bullying and violence reduction

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.20 Most prisoners felt safe and violence reduction work was developing well. Procedures were in place to keep vulnerable prisoners safe. A more flexible use of both sites could have helped support the safer custody strategy. Investigations into incidents were weak though good efforts were being made to investigate unexplained injuries. Victims did not receive enough support.
- 1.21 In our survey most prisoners' overall perceptions of safety were similar or better than in comparator prisons. Prisoners on the Castington site felt safer than those on the Acklington site.
- 1.22 Vulnerable prisoners, mainly those charged with sex offences, accounted for a third of the population and were held on the Acklington site. In our survey they reported more negatively about experiences of victimisation than others. However, there was no significant difference in their overall feelings of safety when compared with other prisoners – 9% said they felt unsafe compared with 8% of main location prisoners. Vulnerable prisoners were escorted around the prison separately from other prisoners and we found no obvious weaknesses in procedures that placed them at risk.
- 1.23 The former 'poor copers' landing, known as G3, where there had been an unsafe mix of prisoners, had been disbanded and vulnerable prisoner accommodation was now used for such prisoners. However, if their behaviour was problematic they were returned to one of the main units. We spoke to two such prisoners who had been both bully and victim. They felt unsafe on the main units and had withdrawn from all out of cell activity.
- 1.24 The prison could not move prisoners easily between the two sites to support the safer custody strategy (see section on escorts and transfers). On the Castington site eight prisoners had been identified for a possible move to Acklington. All claimed to be under threat, some were on assessment, care and custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents and most had withdrawn from the regime.

- 1.25 In the previous five months, an average of 76 violent incident reports had been submitted every month and most concerned debt, drugs and mobile phones. Name calling related to offences and conflicts about property were also common. There was no evidence of significant gang problems. The rate of prisoner on prisoner assaults was similar to comparator prisons and efforts had been made to encourage greater vigilance in areas where there were more assaults.
- 1.26 In our survey, 30% of those who said that they had been victimised had not reported it, which was higher than in comparator prisons and suggested a lack of confidence in staff's ability to protect them. Not all investigations of violent incidents were thorough and evidence to support findings was often thin. Investigations did not always take place promptly. There was no evidence that investigations were routinely quality assured. Good efforts, however, were made to investigate unexplained or suspicious injuries; 26 had been investigated between January and May 2012. These were often instigated by staff after noticing a prisoner's injuries.
- 1.27 There was a two staged antisocial and unacceptable behaviour strategy, with reviews taking place every week. Most involved staff challenging prisoners about their bullying behaviour but personal targets were rarely set. Sanctions included demotion to the basic regime and a requirement to complete a simple workbook designed to challenge attitudes about bullying. The final sanction was segregation with a view to transfer, but we were told this was rare. Over the previous five months an average of 12 prisoners every month had been subject to the strategy. Twice as many victims as perpetrators had been moved following incidents. Victim support plans were not used, although these were included as part of the strategy.
- 1.28 Separate policy meetings for both violence reduction and safer custody were held every month and these alternated between both sites. A range of staff had chaired the violence reduction meetings, where attendance was poor. Prisoners discussed safety issues at the prisoner consultative committee, which a member of the safer custody team attended. The absence of a representative from the security department at the safer custody meeting was a significant gap, given that the ingress of drugs and mobile phones was considered a major factor in violent incidents. Minutes of meetings did not reflect discussions about the effectiveness of the prison's strategy in reducing violence.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.29 **Movement of prisoners between the two sites to help support the safer custody strategy should be better facilitated.**
- 1.30 **Investigations of violent and antisocial behaviour should be thorough and quality assured.**
- 1.31 **Greater support should be given to prisoners who are victimised and efforts made to promote confidence in procedures.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.32 Attendance at violence reduction meetings should be improved.

# Self-harm and suicide prevention

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.33 The management of prisoners at risk of self-harm was reasonably good overall. Comprehensive investigations were completed following incidents of serious self-harm but not enough was done to identify lessons from deaths occurring shortly after release. Procedures relating to the care of those at risk were mixed. There was good access to Listeners, who felt well supported.
- 1.34 There had been two apparent self-inflicted deaths in the prison since our last inspection and a further death occurred in the week following this inspection. Progress on recommendations from investigations and inquests were monitored and discussed at the monthly safer custody meetings.
- 1.35 A further three prisoners had died within one week of their release since our last inspection. In two of these cases the prisoners had died within two days of release. Two of the three cases had been investigated by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman, but the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) had not reviewed release plans to establish if any lessons could have been learned.
- 1.36 Attendance at the monthly safer prisons meeting was poor and key departments including the chaplaincy, probation and psychology were often unrepresented. Listeners could only attend when the meeting took place at the Acklington site.
- 1.37 On average around 14 prisoners self-harmed each month, which was consistent with the rise in the population since our previous inspection of Acklington. Comprehensive investigations were completed following incidents of serious self-harm and were discussed at the monthly safer custody meetings to highlight any lessons.
- 1.38 Prisoners considered at serious risk of self-harm were transferred to prisons with 24 hour health care, but this had been required infrequently. There was no on site health care cover at night and the journey to the local hospital could take around 20 minutes. About 150 staff had completed training in the use of the defibrillator including most permanent night staff. Staff carried anti-ligature knives and were familiar with emergency procedures. However, there was no procedure to ensure that sufficient staff trained in first aid worked at night.
- 1.39 On average 24 ACCT documents were opened each month – a proportionate rise since we last inspected Acklington. Concerns were acted on promptly. ACCT records suggested generally good care and engagement, but care maps were not updated regularly and the quality of ongoing records varied. Post closure reviews were completed and contact was made with outside agencies where relevant. The chaplaincy saw all prisoners on ACCT documents regularly. Prisoners had access to counselling, but more than 20 were on the waiting list. ACCT training was scheduled regularly but was often cancelled.

- 1.40 Constant observations were carried out in gated or camera cells in both separation and care units (SACUs), which was inappropriate. None of the cells in the prison met the current specification for safer cells. In one case record a prisoner at risk had commented that he felt he was being punished for feeling low after being placed in a cell for observation.
- 1.41 The governance and monitoring of the use of the camera, gated cells and strip clothing needed to be improved. We found several incidents in special accommodation records where strip clothing had been issued – apparently to reduce the risk of self-harm. In one case this was for a period of over three days. The use of these measures was not monitored at the safer custody meeting.
- 1.42 Prisoners at the Acklington site, including in the vulnerable prisoner units, had good access to Listeners including at night, but they were very rarely called to the SACU. Castington did not yet have a Listeners' team, although one was planned. Listener suites were available. Listeners felt well supported by the Samaritans and the safer custody team.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.43 **A review of release plans should be completed where prisoners die shortly after release.**
- 1.44 **Prisoners subject to ACCT procedures should have a consistent case manager.**
- 1.45 **Sufficient first aid trained staff should be available at night.**
- 1.46 **Prisoners who are solely at risk of self-harm and in need of close supervision should not be held in the SACU.**
- 1.47 **The use of strip clothing should be monitored by the safer prisons meeting.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.48 Attendance at the safer prisons meeting should be improved.

## Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

---

### Expected outcomes:

**The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.<sup>4</sup>**

- 1.49 Work to promote the safeguarding of adults was in progress. A draft policy had been written but this needed to be developed in coordination with the health care provider.

---

<sup>4</sup> We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).



- 1.50 Work was being progressed to promote the safeguarding of adults but there were as yet no formal links with the local adult safeguarding board. The former Castington Young Offender Institution (YOI) had developed safeguarding approaches and provided a sound platform for progress; however, the safeguarding of adults at risk was not promoted across both sites.
- 1.51 The prison had a draft safeguarding adults strategy covering the merged prison. The health care provider had developed a separate policy on risk assessment and the management of adults at risk in March 2011, which needed to be coordinated with the prison's work. A 'whistle-blowing' policy, which the former Castington YOI had introduced, was in place.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.52 **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 for both sites.**

## 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.**

- 1.53 Security was overly restrictive for a category C prison. Dynamic security was effective and supported by good relationships. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) rates were high but the trend was downward. Security objectives were not publicised to staff. Security information was well analysed but not always promptly acted on. Closed visits were used excessively and not always for visits-related incidents.
- 1.54 There were some overly restrictive procedures and rules, such as prisoners not being allowed to wear their own clothing, although managers were addressing this. Dynamic security was effective and supported by good staff-prisoner relationships.
- 1.55 Security was appropriately focused on the threats posed by illegal drugs and mobile phones entering the establishment, and there had been significant finds in the preceding six months. In our survey, 38% of all prisoners said it was easy to obtain illegal drugs in the prison, and 13% said that they had developed a drug problem in the establishment, both significantly higher than in comparator prisons. This problem was reported to be worse at the Castington site, where 19% of prisoners said they had developed a drug problem in the prison, compared with 10% at the Acklington site.
- 1.56 MDT suites on both sites were clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. The MDT rate was high at around 10%. Although the trend had been downward since the previous year, it was sufficiently high to suggest that the prison still had a significant drug problem – particularly with illicit Subutex. A supply reduction strategy and a zero tolerance approach had been taken, but nearly 20% of suspicion tests were not being carried out within the specified timescale due to insufficient MDT staff. Searches of staff were limited and predictable.
- 1.57 Security information was well managed. Security information reports (SIRs) were analysed reasonably promptly, but there was some slippage at weekends. Target searches were

completed within a reasonable timeframe. Staff from all departments attended the monthly security committee. Local security objectives were set, but they were not specific or aimed at individuals, nor were they shared with staff outside the security committee. The local police intelligence officer provided each site with considerable support.

- 1.58 At the time of the inspection, 58 prisoners were subject to closed visits and 27 were banned visitors. These figures had risen considerably since the start of 2012 when a zero tolerance approach took effect. As a consequence many prisoners were being placed on closed visits for incidents that were not related to visits. Reviews of closed visits took place each month but these were perfunctory and prisoners remained on closed visits for at least three months.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.59 **Restrictive security practices should be reviewed in the context of the prison's category C remit.**
- 1.60 **MDT should be appropriately staffed to ensure tests are completed within prescribed timescales.**
- 1.61 **Prisoners should not be placed on closed visits for reasons unrelated to visits and reviews should genuinely consider whether someone can have this sanction withdrawn.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.62 Security objectives should be publicised among staff.

## Incentives and earned privileges

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.63 The IEP policy was appropriate and generally applied fairly. Prisoners on the basic regime were given support to improve their behaviour, but were unable to access a full breakfast.
- 1.64 The local policy document was appropriate and generally well understood. In our survey, just over half of respondents felt the IEP scheme was fairly applied, similar to those in comparator prisons, but older prisoners, those with disabilities and vulnerable prisoners were less positive. Monitoring to detect potential discrimination in the operation of the scheme was in place for different ethnic groups, but not for other minorities.
- 1.65 Prisoners could not attain enhanced status if they did not comply with sentence plan targets but many vulnerable prisoners convicted of sexual offences were unwilling to undertake the programme work specified. Although this was a legitimate requirement, many vulnerable prisoners cited this aspect of the IEP scheme as unfair. Far more vulnerable than main location prisoners (49% to 42%) said the scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour.

- 1.66 Only 1% of prisoners were on the basic regime. These men were given a clear explanation of what behaviour they needed to change and were reviewed every week. However, it was unacceptable that the provision of food (the cooked element of breakfast) was used as a sanction and denied to prisoners on the basic regime.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.67 **Monitoring of the IEP scheme should be extended to cover vulnerable prisoners, older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities.**
- 1.68 **All prisoners should have equal access to prison meals.**

## Disciplinary procedures

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.69 The number of adjudications was low, quality assurance was in place and there were appropriate reviews of the adjudications tariff. Use of force was low but video footage involving planned use of force was not reviewed. The use of special accommodation was low but governance was poor. The segregation unit was used infrequently and was reasonably clean, but the regime was restricted. Care and reintegration planning did not take place and some individuals spent too long in segregation without a management strategy.
- 1.70 Between December 2011 and May 2012 there had been 943 adjudications across both sites, which was low compared with similar prisons. Adjudications were held in suitable rooms. Prisoners were given sufficient time and information to prepare for their hearings, and those who requested legal advice were given 14 days to obtain it.
- 1.71 Adjudication records were mostly detailed and demonstrated an appropriate level of investigation. Approximately 40% of charges were for unauthorised possession and the vast majority of these concerned drugs or mobile phones. One hearing concerning the possession of a mobile phone was referred to the police in line with recent NOMS guidance. Punishments were fair and in accordance with the published tariff. Adjudication review meetings took place quarterly and provided for adequate quality assurance arrangements.

## The use of force

---

- 1.72 There had been 71 incidents involving some force between December 2011 and May 2012. This was low compared with similar prisons, but the trend was slightly higher than in the preceding 12-month period, when there had been 119 incidents.
- 1.73 Following a recommendation made at our 2009 inspection, the regional custodial manager had commissioned a review into the management and use of control and restraint (C&R) at the Castington site; there had been a troubling number of injuries sustained by young people in the two-year period preceding that inspection. During 2009, force was used on 326 occasions at Castington but this had dropped to 120 from January to August 2010 and then it was used only six times in the remainder of that year.

- 1.74 There was evidence that some of the review's 22 recommendations had been implemented, including the appointment of a full time C&R coordinator, who completed quality assurance checks of documentation. These were generally detailed and completed to a reasonable standard. However, video footage following the planned use of force was not reviewed. We viewed footage from four incidents and were satisfied that force was used as a last resort. Handcuffs were not routinely applied. Incidents involving the use of force were considered as part of the quarterly meetings of the segregation management and review group (SMARG) and a comprehensive amount of information relating to the use of force was collected and analysed, but follow-up action was limited.
- 1.75 Governance surrounding the use of special accommodation was poor across both sites but worse at Acklington, where no log was maintained. At Castington records showed that special accommodation was used on seven occasions in 2010, 12 occasions in 2011 and four occasions to the end of May 2012. The average occupancy of the accommodation was almost seven hours – double that of comparable prisons. Special accommodation documentation was routinely opened for prisoners placed in special accommodation or gated cells because of self-harm concerns. There was evidence that some of these prisoners were being deprived of bedding and given anti-ligature clothing.
- 1.76 The strip cell at Castington contained only a concrete plinth and had no furniture or sanitation, but there was no evidence that prisoners were held there. It was used to carry out strip-searches of prisoners located in the segregation unit, who were refractory or suspected of having a weapon. There was one other strip cell at Castington but this was used as a store room. There were no records of use of a strip cell at Acklington, and we observed one prisoner being strip-searched in it before being located to a normal cell.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.77 **Video footage of incidents involving the planned use of force should be routinely reviewed by managers.**
- 1.78 **There should be effective governance of special accommodation, use of strip conditions and the gated cell to ensure that all are used to the minimum possible extent.**

## Segregation

---

- 1.79 Use of segregation was low. The average occupancy over the previous six months was five a month in both units. During that time, 10% of prisoners held in segregation at Acklington had been held there for over a month for reasons other than punishment. Poor records meant it was difficult to measure the periods of time spent in segregation at Castington, though they did not appear to be excessive. However, we were concerned that one prisoner at Castington had been segregated for approximately nine months, including four months at a previous establishment. He was subject to an ACCT document and he remained a 'three staff unlock'. It was clear that this individual was difficult to manage, but there was no clear strategy or care plan for his long-term management.
- 1.80 Communal areas and cells in both units were reasonably clean, but we found some graffiti in the exercise yard and in a number of cells at Castington. The multi-gym exercise equipment at Castington was a useful facility. The exercise yard at Acklington was a good size albeit stark. One occupied cell had chairs but the unoccupied cells at Castington did not. There were plans to move to a single segregation unit at Castington providing 18 places.

- 1.81 The regime in both units was basic and there were some restrictive practices. Televisions were not authorised, irrespective of IEP status, and most prisoners remained locked behind their doors for most of the time. Prisoners had daily access to showers, exercise and telephones, and we were told they could attend religious services following risk assessment. Staff in both units were knowledgeable about the prisoners in their care and we observed excellent staff-prisoner interactions at both sites.
- 1.82 The governance and monitoring of segregation was limited. Reviews were carried out in a timely fashion but were rarely multidisciplinary and Independent Monitoring Board members were not routinely informed of meetings. Targets and regimes were pre-printed at both sites showing little consideration of individual circumstances. There had only been one meeting to consider and review the use of segregation since January 2012 and this had been poorly attended. A large amount of information was shared but there was no identification or analysis of trends over time.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.83 **The segregation unit should be subject to more effective governance and monitoring.**
- 1.84 **There should be clear reintegration and care planning. Regimes should be assessed on an individual basis and target setting should address the reasons why prisoners are in segregation.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.85 Normal cells should be fully equipped for occupancy.

## 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.**

- 1.86 Clinical and psychosocial teams worked effectively with GPs to move prisoners on methadone into recovery. Opiate substitute prescribing was insufficiently flexible. There were long waits for secondary detoxification. Psychosocial intervention for drugs was good, but alcohol services were currently limited.
- 1.87 A total of 122 prisoners across the two sites were receiving methadone treatment: 102 on the Acklington site and 20 on the Castington site. Across the sites approximately 60% of prisoners receiving methadone were on reduction doses, which was a good ratio of reduction compared with maintenance. The clinical and psychosocial teams worked closely together and alongside the GPs, delivered regular reviews and effectively encouraged an increasing number of methadone patients into reduction. All prisoners on the methadone programme were also engaging with the psychosocial arm of the drug and alcohol recovery team service.
- 1.88 With only two administration locations operating one at a time, long daily waits for methadone administration at the Acklington site caused prisoners some frustration. Subutex was not prescribed owing to diversion fears, but this inflexible approach did not mirror community

services. Six prisoners were on the waiting list for secondary detoxification and the average waiting time for initiation was approximately four weeks. This was excessive, although symptomatic relief was offered in the interim.

- 1.89 A good drug and alcohol strategy was in place with a dynamic treatment-oriented action plan, which was reviewed monthly by the drug strategy committee. The action plan did not include any supply reduction initiatives, but the security action plan covered this area.
- 1.90 Psychosocial interventions for drugs were good with a total of 485 prisoners engaged in tiered treatment across the two sites. The prison addressing substance related offending (P-ASRO) scheme was in place with places offered to prisoners on methadone treatment and those with polydrug issues.
- 1.91 In our survey, 23% of prisoners significantly higher than the 16% in comparator prisons, said that they had arrived with alcohol problems; only 57%, significantly lower than in the 68% in comparator establishments, said that they had received help for alcohol problems. The previously run 'Alcohol related violence' (ARV) course was in the process of being taken over by the Interventions Department. The alcohol intervention programme (AIP) had yet to be introduced. Alcoholics Anonymous meetings were available.
- 1.92 The prison had ceased all provision of compact-based drug testing (CBDT) as a result of funding cuts, which was a retrograde step for the delivery of programmes like P-ASRO and undermined plans to establish drug-free and drug recovery wings. In the absence of CBDT, measurement of the effectiveness or of the maintenance of programme integrity was likely to be very difficult.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.93 **Prescribing regimes for substance dependent prisoners should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidelines.**
- 1.94 **Waiting times for secondary detoxification should be significantly reduced.**
- 1.95 **There should be sufficient services to address the needs of prisoners with alcohol problems.**
- 1.96 **Funding should be made available, nationally, for prisons to conduct CBDT on prisoners involved in recovery-focused programmes and accommodation.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.97 Long daily waits for methadone on the Acklington site should be addressed.

# Section 2: Respect

## Residential units

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 Cells and residential units varied in age and design but were clean and in reasonable condition. There was good access to showers. Laundries were not fully functional and there was a shortage of some prison clothing. The management of applications was not consistent between residential units. Mail services were efficient. Prisoners were able to access personal property promptly but deliveries of incoming parcels were delayed on the Acklington site.
- 2.2 Residential units on both sites were clean and well maintained although they varied in age and design. New units provided a high standard of accommodation. There were some structural problems with older and prefabricated units, but these did not significantly affect living conditions. External areas were well maintained and generally free of litter.
- 2.3 Cells were clean, adequately furnished and large enough for one person. Not all cells had curtains, a number of toilets were unscreened, others were without toilet lids and some keys for lockable cabinets were missing.
- 2.4 House blocks 5 (Castington site) and 7 (Acklington site) were enhanced prisoner wings of a similar design. Prisoners on house block 7 had room keys but those in house block 5 did not, which prevented them from having access to their rooms during association. All communal and association areas were large enough for the number of prisoners, and association sessions were well supervised.
- 2.5 In our survey only 16% of prisoners reported that they had problems accessing telephones, significantly better than in comparator prisons. Each wing had an adequate number of telephones with the exception of house block 14 which had just four for 112 prisoners.
- 2.6 In our survey only 36% of prisoners reported that cell call bells were normally answered within five minutes, significantly lower than in comparator prisons, but in a random check we found only one example of a response time longer than five minutes. Responses to cell call bells were centrally recorded on both sites, but there was no management audit of this information.
- 2.7 In our survey respondents were more positive than in comparator prisons about access to showers. In house block 10 prisoners had en-suite showers and in other house blocks showers were clean and prisoners could shower in private. A programme of refurbishment had begun in the older house blocks on the Acklington site.
- 2.8 There was a shortage of common sizes of prison clothing and some was in a poor state of repair. We were told that the prison had difficulty in obtaining clothing from the central Prison Service supplier. Prisoners could wear their own clothing during association; it was washed every week in central laundries on each site. A number of washing and drying machines were

broken, leading to clothing being returned damp. No personal clothing could be washed during weeks with a public holiday.

- 2.9 The ease with which prisoners could make applications varied between house blocks; 76% of prisoners surveyed said that it was easy to make an application, significantly lower than in the comparator prisons (86%). On some units application forms could only be obtained by making a written request and on others the racks containing applications were not fully stocked. Logs of applications made were kept and on some house blocks carbon copies were retained. However, we only once saw a record of responses being kept. The inconsistency in practice meant that it was not possible to monitor the timeliness or quality of responses to applications.
- 2.10 The management of prisoners' mail was effective, with a daily collection and delivery of letters. A log was kept of legally privileged mail that was opened by censors in error. Prisoners could receive emails and this was a reasonably well used service, despite not being widely publicised. We met many prisoners who were not aware of the service.
- 2.11 Prisoners' property was appropriately stored. Property could not be sent in and any purchases had to come from approved sources. We found that there was no backlog of applications for stored property on either site; however, at the Acklington site, there were delays of up to six days before purchased property was issued.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.12 **Cells should have screened toilets with lids, curtains and lockable storage.**
- 2.13 **Prisoners should be provided with privacy keys to their cells.**
- 2.14 **Residential managers should regularly audit the records of responses to cell call bells and investigate the reasons for prisoners' negative views of response times.**
- 2.15 **Prisoners should be provided with prison clothing in the appropriate size and in a good state of repair.**
- 2.16 **There should be a consistent application system which provides prisoners with free access to application forms and is monitored for timeliness and quality of responses.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.17 The number of telephones on house block 14 should be increased to meet the ratio of one to 20 prisoners.
- 2.18 The email service for prisoner correspondence should be publicised around the prison and during induction.
- 2.19 Purchases should be issued to prisoners within a day of arrival.



## 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.**

- 2.20 Relationships between staff and prisoners were very good. All prisoners had personal officers and there was a good policy, but interactions did not focus on personal circumstances or prisoners' sentence progression. Prisoners were consulted on a regular basis.
- 2.21 During the inspection we observed friendly and supportive interactions between staff and prisoners on both sites. In our survey, 82% of prisoners reported that staff treated them with respect and 81% felt that there was a member of staff they could turn to for help, both significantly higher than in comparator prisons (76% and 74% respectively).
- 2.22 There was a good personal officer policy and all prisoners were allocated two officers to provide cover. However, in our survey only 72% knew that they had one, significantly lower than those in comparator prisons (76%). Personal officers made regular entries in prisoners' files, but many were brief and most limited to wing behaviour. There was little evidence of a focus on the personal circumstances of prisoners or on the support they required to achieve sentence progression. There were regular management checks, but these did not always identify poor practice.
- 2.23 Monthly prisoner consultation meetings were held with prisoner wing representatives. Many of the prisoners' requests were related to security restrictions but representatives of the security department did not attend meetings to explain or consider objections to these restrictions. Prisoners did not always gain prompt access to notes from the meetings.

### Recommendation

---

- 2.24 **Personal officers should support prisoners' achievement of sentence plan targets.**

### Housekeeping point

---

- 2.25 Representatives from the security department should attend prisoner consultation meetings, and notes of the meetings should be displayed on residential units prominently and promptly.

## Equality and diversity

---

### Expected outcomes:

**The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic<sup>5</sup> are recognised and addressed:**

---

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

these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.26 Equality and diversity work was not yet based on a needs analysis, but progress was being made and some useful provision was in place. Men with disabilities were under-identified and work with protected groups, especially prisoners with disabilities and older men, was underdeveloped.

## Strategic management

---

- 2.27 The equality and diversity policy covered each of the protected groups as well as veterans, although not Gypsy, Roma and Travellers or young adults. A full prisoner survey had been completed to inform future provision. The senior management team (SMT) discussed equality and diversity monitoring each month. Monthly prisoner equality and diversity meetings considered monitoring data, impact assessments, and prisoner concerns. Management attendance at this latter meeting was variable although a Gypsy, Roma and Traveller outreach worker had just started attending. There was no specific reference to each of the protected groups but matters were progressed from month to month. Monitoring data was well scrutinised, and disparities were properly investigated. Minutes of meetings were not well publicised to prisoners.
- 2.28 The diversity and equality action plan (DEAP) captured concerns from a number of sources, and was updated frequently. Seven equality impact assessments had been completed in the previous three years and all had been recently reviewed. Diversity incident report forms (DIRFs) were not freely available on most wings. Few DIRFs had been submitted – 48 in 2011 and 14 so far in 2012. Most related to low level incidents, and those in our sample were well investigated. DIRFs were not yet subject to external scrutiny.
- 2.29 Two very committed senior officers shared the full-time equality and diversity post covering both sites. There were committed staff champions for most protected groups, who delivered some support to prisoners. Ten trained and supported prisoner equality and diversity representatives were in place, as well as disability representatives on most wings. Equality and diversity information could be accessed on the intranet by staff and pictures of the equality and diversity team were visible on all residential wings.
- 2.30 Staff and prisoners received comprehensive information about equality and diversity during their induction and most staff had received 'Challenge it change it' diversity training. Several events had taken place to celebrate and promote diversity, often involving the chaplaincy department.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.31 **Equality and diversity work should be informed by a needs analysis.**
- 2.32 **DIRFs should be freely available to prisoners in all residential areas and subject to external scrutiny.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.33 Equality and diversity minutes should be freely available to prisoners.

## Protected characteristics

---

- 2.34 There were 36 (3%) black and minority ethnic prisoners. Few tensions were evident between prisoners from this group and white prisoners. Arrangements to identify and monitor prisoners convicted of a current or previous racially aggravated offence or of involvement in a racist incident were good. Alerts were put on prisoners' case notes to inform staff. There was a significant group of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners who were well supported by the diversity manager and a Gypsy, Roma and Traveller outreach worker. Group support meetings for them had started in May 2012.
- 2.35 There were few (seven) foreign national prisoners; one had been notified that he was to be deported. Officials from the UK Border Agency attended the prison on an ad hoc basis. There was little translated information for prisoners, and interpretation services were rarely used. During the inspection the codes needed to access the service had been locked in the desk of an absent member of staff. Not all foreign national prisoners were aware of the availability of free phone calls and air mail letters to help them maintain family contact. There were no special visiting arrangements for families travelling from abroad.
- 2.36 In our survey 47% of prisoners, significantly lower than in comparator prisons (54%) said that their religious beliefs were respected; findings on the Castington site (40%) were poorer than at Acklington (49%). There was some evidence of a lack of awareness of religious and cultural diversity, and locally developed staff awareness training had yet to be delivered. The diversity manager and Muslim chaplain met Muslim prisoners each week after Friday prayers. Faith provision was not adequate for some religions (see section on faith and religion).
- 2.37 About a fifth of prisoners responding to our survey said that they had a disability, which was more than double the number identified by the prison. Twenty-four per cent of prisoners in our survey said that they had mental health problems. There was no screening for 'hidden' disabilities, such as dyslexia. Prisoners who considered themselves to have a disability were significantly more negative about their experiences at the prison than others. Disability liaison officers (DLOs) did not receive enough facility time for their role; one had only received five hours in the year to date.
- 2.38 There were some excellent, spacious adapted cells for men with disabilities in the newer house blocks on the Acklington site and one adapted cell on the Castington site. Lifts and ramps had been installed to allow access to most areas of the prison. The prison employed paid prisoner carers and wheelchair pushers, who had received basic training for their roles. We found some care plans, but most had not been regularly reviewed.
- 2.39 The one transgender prisoner was receiving good one to one support from her wing senior officer. In our survey 2% of prisoners considered themselves to be gay or bisexual. There were two staff champions who held group meetings every two months on the Acklington site. Prisoners valued this support but were frustrated that meeting dates were inconsistent.
- 2.40 There was one young adult at the time of the inspection. Appropriate risk assessments were in place, and most staff on his wing showed a good understanding of the support that young adults needed.
- 2.41 There were 213 prisoners over the age of 50: 114 were aged 50-59; 76 aged 60-69; 23 were over 70 and the oldest prisoner was 84. Most of the older prisoners were located on house block 9, the designated older prisoner wing. In our survey, 26% of prisoners over the age of 50 considered themselves to have a disability. There were regular older prisoner meetings, but

not all older men were aware of them. It was taking too long to put in place reasonable adjustments identified for these prisoners, such as food trays and appropriate chairs.

- 2.42 We also found prisoners over retirement age locked in their cells during the core day on most house blocks, contrary to the prison's policy. There was limited extra provision for them and little if anything to keep them occupied.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.43 **Foreign national prisoners should be made aware of free telephone and mail provision for maintaining contact with family, and extended visits should be in place for visitors from abroad. All staff should be aware of interpretation services and able to use them as necessary.**
- 2.44 **There should be systematic identification of prisoners with disabilities, and thorough, properly resourced support, including regular group meetings.**
- 2.45 **Prisoners over retirement age should not be locked in their cells during the core day and there should be regular, predictable group meetings and sufficient activities to keep them occupied.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.46 Staff training on religious and cultural diversity should be delivered as planned.

## 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.**

- 2.47 Most prisoners could see a religious leader every week. There were regular faith study classes and good links with community groups.
- 2.48 The chaplaincy generally provided prisoners with a good service. The duty chaplain met all new prisoners within 24 hours of arrival and gave them information about available support. Photographs of the chaplaincy team were on display on all wing notice boards and most had information about faith events. Prisoners in Christian and Muslim faith groups could attend corporate worship every week. Buddhist, Sikh, Pagan, Jehovah's Witness and Quaker worship took place fortnightly.
- 2.49 The chapels on both sites provided a good environment. There were two good multi-faith rooms. Religious artefacts and religious texts were provided for those who needed them. Memorial services were organised for prisoners who had experienced bereavement and the chaplaincy had offered pastoral support to prisoners, staff and family following a death in custody.
- 2.50 In our survey 39% of prisoners, significantly lower than in comparator prisons said that it was easy to attend religious services. Findings were significantly better at Castington (49%) than at

Acklington (35%). The integrated drug treatment system (IDTS), other treatments and access to property clashed with worship on Sundays.

- 2.51 Prisoners could attend a good range of faith based study courses, including the Alpha course, and the Reflex Bible study group, which offered ongoing contact with supportive faith groups after release. Chaplaincy community engagement had been very good over the previous 12 months.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.52 **All prisoners should have access to corporate worship/faith meetings every week, without having to give up other regime activities.**

## 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.**

- 2.53 The quality of responses to complaints was reasonable. Replies were generally respectful and adequately addressed the issues at hand but some were cursory. Governance arrangements had improved and responses were quality checked. The prison had begun to analyse complaints and there was evidence of action to deal with emerging problems.
- 2.54 The number of formal complaints, averaging about 150 per month, was not excessive and prisoners knew how to use the system. Governance arrangements for recording, managing and investigating complaints were developing. The complaints clerk ensured that all complaints were logged and dispatched expeditiously to managers in appropriate areas for response. The prison had begun to carry out an analysis of the types of complaint made and there was evidence that action was being taken to deal with emerging problems.
- 2.55 Interim replies for more complicated cases were issued to prisoners along with a predicted conclusion date. Most (about 90%) received a response within three working days of receipt.
- 2.56 Overall, the quality of responses was reasonably good, generally respectful and addressed the issues raised. There were examples, however, where responses were cursory and did not provide assurances that a full investigation of the facts had taken place. There were also a significant number of low level complaints about domestic issues that could have been dealt with informally by residential officers on house blocks.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.57 **All responses to complaints should show that a full investigation of the facts had taken place.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.58 **Low level complaints about domestic issues should be dealt with quickly by residential staff.**

## 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.**

2.59 Prisoners were provided with limited information about legal services and bail information was inconsistent. Access to legal visits was adequate.

2.60 There were no trained legal services officers. Information relating to cases was usually delivered by offender supervisors through the offender management unit or directly by prisoners' solicitors. Staff were generally unable to offer any advice or signposting to services and there was little information in the induction programme about access to legal services. However, good legal reference materials were available in the library. A register of appellants was kept by the prison's custody office and there was no evidence that prisoners' cases were being impeded.

2.61 Access to legal visits was good and took place in private facilities on both sites. Access was better at the Acklington site, where legal visits took place on five afternoons per week, including Saturday; at Castington, they were limited to three afternoons per week. Survey results indicated that most prisoners were content with these arrangements.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.62 **Information about legal services should be made available to prisoners.**

## 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.**

2.63 Satisfaction with health care was similar to comparator prisons. Clinical governance systems were robust. Automated external defibrillators at Acklington were not in an optimal state of readiness. Telemedicine was available but not used to its potential. Patients often arrived too early for health appointments and waited too long to return. Primary and secondary mental health services were integrated. There was an absence of contracted counselling services or therapeutic group activity. Transfers to NHS mental health units took too long.

## Governance arrangements

---

- 2.64 In our survey prisoner satisfaction with health care was similar to comparator prisons, although prisoners at Acklington were less satisfied than those at Castington.
- 2.65 Health care was commissioned by the North East Offender Health Care Unit (NEOHCU). There was a draft health needs assessment and a health development plan was being considered. The service provider was Care UK. Partnership working with the prison was good. The management of health care was unified with staff moving between Acklington and Castington, but health care functioned separately on each site.
- 2.66 Clinical governance arrangements were very robust. In particular root cause analysis was used effectively to learn lessons arising from serious and untoward incidents. Health service personnel attended prisoner consultation groups and the views of 10% of health service users were canvassed every month. Feedback on actions was given to the consultation group but general feedback to the house blocks was poor.
- 2.67 A senior nurse manager was responsible for health care and there were sufficient clinicians. Recruitment had been problematic though all posts, except three, were now filled. Attention was being given to skills mix issues during forthcoming interviews. Staff credentials were checked regularly and nurses' access to training was very good – all were up to date with mandatory requirements. Clinical supervision was well organised.
- 2.68 There were evidence based approaches to care planning; care plans were recorded on SystemOne (the electronic clinical information system) or on printed hard copy records and subject to clinical audit. There was a communicable diseases policy and an information sharing protocol.
- 2.69 There were health care centres on both sites and medical rooms on several house blocks on either site. The Castington health centre was being refurbished; the inpatient unit had been closed and was now incorporated into the health centre. Use of the new space was being delayed because of agreed but uncompleted works.
- 2.70 Some areas of flooring required attention in both health centres. Although some had been redecorated, waiting rooms were stark in appearance and had hard, uncomfortable, wooden benches. Several house block medical rooms were modern though others were dated and had design problems such as limited space. Some had infection control issues such as sink drains that were not offset or inadequate hand-washing instructions. Cleanliness was monitored. A senior nurse was responsible for infection control and audits had generated a plan to rectify problems and improve cleanliness. The medical room on house block 9 had a medicines hatch that was difficult for patients with limited hand or wrist mobility to negotiate.
- 2.71 Patients complained about waiting excessively in congested waiting rooms before and after their appointment. In Acklington we observed patients in the waiting room an hour after seeing the doctor.
- 2.72 Standardised sets of resuscitation equipment including automated external defibrillators (AEDs) and oxygen were located in the health centres and house block medical rooms. There were records of regular checking. The prison also had AEDs that were located in house block offices (commonly just a few metres from the medical rooms) and subject to regular checks. Despite this at Acklington, all chest pads were out of date and two AEDs had batteries close to discharge. The prison had two AED models each. Over 151 officers (around 30%) had been

trained in the use of AEDs though on the majority of house blocks we visited there were no trained staff on duty. Some prisoners were being trained in the use of defibrillators.

- 2.73 We observed professional and good natured interactions between nurses and patients. A senior nurse was responsible for the care of more than 200 prisoners who were aged 50 or over. Specialist equipment for occupational therapy or physiotherapy was available as required.
- 2.74 Prisoners were given information about health services at reception and during induction. Prisoners knew how to comment or complain about their care and the system was confidential.
- 2.75 There was a health promotion action group (HPAG) and health promotion was prominent in the health centres. At Castington, health promotion activities took place in each house block but the approach was less systematic at Acklington. In some house blocks uniformed officers selected items to display but they did not coordinate this with the HPAG. As it was becoming problematic to obtain supplies of NHS materials, the HPAG had imaginatively engaged the art department to produce in-house materials.
- 2.76 Prisoners had access to age-appropriate screening, immunisation and vaccination programmes. Barrier protection was available from the house block medical rooms, but availability was not well advertised on all blocks.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.77 **Patients should not wait excessive periods of time in waiting rooms prior to and following their health care appointments.**
- 2.78 **Waiting rooms should be made more comfortable and be used to promote health.**
- 2.79 **The partnership board should coordinate strategies for the provision of AEDs, checking of equipment, training and deployment of trained staff.**
- 2.80 **There should be active and systematic health promotion throughout the prison.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.81 Feedback from patient consultation exercises should be better distributed in the house blocks.
- 2.82 The medication hatch in house block 9 should be redesigned.
- 2.83 The availability of condoms should be advertised in all house blocks.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

---

- 2.84 Reception health screening occurred at both sites. All prisoners were offered a 'wellman' health assessment within seven days of arrival. Those arriving under medical care were seen by the GP on the day following reception. Telephone interpretation was available but rarely used.
- 2.85 Prisoners could access health care by completing a health application that was placed in an envelope marked confidential. Alternatively they could approach the nurses in the house



blocks who used SystmOne to generate appointments and tasks. A local GP practice provided medical services. Prisoners complained that it took too long to access a GP, but we found that non-urgent appointments were available within 72 hours and urgent appointments on the following day. Northumbria Doc provided GP out of hours cover.

- 2.86 There was a typical range of daily primary care clinics covering GP, nurse, physiotherapy, optometry and age-specific activities. There was an active hepatitis immunisation programme and treatment for hepatitis C was available. Nurses undertook triage in the house blocks or in the health centres, although triage algorithms were not used.
- 2.87 The failure to attend rate for the Castington GP clinics was high at 10.1% compared with only 1.5% at Acklington. The care of patients with lifelong conditions such as asthma, diabetes and heart disease was good. Remedial exercise was available in the gym.
- 2.88 SystmOne was used effectively with templates and care plans completed as appropriate. Patients were asked to consent to the acquisition and sharing of confidential information as necessary.
- 2.89 Patients had good access to external appointments at hospitals in Northumbria. Appointments were well managed and rarely cancelled for security reasons. Escort staffing was becoming difficult due to the concentration of hospital clinics on particular days; the issue was under discussion. Mobile diagnostics and visiting specialists, including genitourinary consultants and an orthopaedic surgeon, attended the prison. Telemedicine was available but was only used for dermatology and endocrinology.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.90 **Action should be taken to reduce time lost due to patients failing to attend appointments.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.91 Prisoners should be better informed about waiting times in health care.
- 2.92 Triage algorithms should be used to support and standardise nurses' clinical decision making.
- 2.93 Telemedicine should be reviewed to increase the range of consultations for which it is used.

## Pharmacy

---

- 2.94 The pharmacy service was limited to the supply of medicines and occasional visits to house blocks by pharmacy technicians to check stock. Patients did not have direct contact with a pharmacist or technicians. Medicines management and clinical governance procedures in the pharmacy were good with standard operating procedures in place.
- 2.95 Most medicines were supplied in possession and risk assessments were in place. The in-possession policy did not identify drugs that were high risk and liable to abuse. Pharmacy staff did not know where completed risk assessments were stored. We sampled a number of medicine charts and found that some patients were receiving high risk medicines weekly in possession.

- 2.96 Pharmacy staff on duty at the time of the visit did not know how to access prescribing data from SystmOne to demonstrate the prescribing trends for these and other products. Patient group directions were in place but for a limited range of conditions. The canteen list included Strepsils but not paracetamol.
- 2.97 Patients were responsible for reordering their in-possession medication. The pharmacy staff printed the repeat prescriptions for the prescribers to sign. This provided the pharmacy staff with an opportunity to monitor patients' compliance with their medical treatments. Concerns such as overdue requests were communicated to the prescriber.
- 2.98 The storage of stock was generally well managed. There was no audit trail in place for the supply of unlicensed medication known as 'specials'. The controlled drugs (CD) cabinet in the pharmacy was not large enough to store the volume of methadone that was recorded in the CD register as having been received. Following methadone administration in some of the house blocks, the stock was returned to the main IDTS medical room rather than stored in the house block medical rooms. One prisoner had been supplied medication that required storage in a fridge, though he did not have access to one. SystmOne was used to record prescribing and administration but it was not accessible in house block 9, where there were also no copies of the *British National Formulary* (BNF) or access to the clinical intranet. We found out of date BNFs in several other places.
- 2.99 The medicines management committee met every month but representatives from the NEOHCU did not attend. Aggregated prescribing data was not available to the meeting.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.100 **All pharmacy staff should have access to SystmOne to ensure they can obtain information about a patient's medication and treatment when they are in the house blocks.**
- 2.101 **Pharmacy staff should be supported to develop pharmacy services such as pharmacy led clinics and medicine use reviews for the prison population.**
- 2.102 **The in-possession policy should identify high risk medications and how they should be administered.**
- 2.103 **An additional CD cabinet should be placed in the pharmacy to ensure the storage of methadone is compliant with the regulations.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.104 Clear, retrievable records of the date checks that take place should be kept in the pharmacy.
- 2.105 A record of the supply of 'special' products should be kept and include the details of the person to whom the product was supplied.
- 2.106 Refrigeration facilities must be available to prisoners who have in-possession medication that requires storage at low temperatures.
- 2.107 A review of patient group directions should take place to enable the supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor.

- 2.108 Out of date pharmacy reference materials should be discarded.

## Dentistry

---

- 2.109 Dental surgeries on both sites were equipped to a high standard. The main service provider – Weymouth Dental – also provided out of hours cover. Access to a dentist was a major source of concern for prisoners who reported that they might wait for up to nine months to be seen. There had been significant problems with access in the past six months. Extra dental sessions had been provided, but were about to cease, and dental triage was in place. The average wait for a first non-urgent appointment was three weeks. Problems accessing routine care persisted with some patients waiting longer than six months to commence a course of treatment.
- 2.110 Prisoners were given advice and information on oral health, although dental staff felt unable to influence the content of the canteen list to include recommended products.
- 2.111 The dental chair, amalgam separator and X-ray equipment were appropriately maintained and certified. Separate decontamination facilities were planned to enable compliance with best practice guidance. Dental waste was subject to professional disposal. The responsible primary care trust had inspected the surgeries in the last year.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.112 **The NEOHCU should commission sufficient dental services to meet the needs of the population.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.113 The prison should take professional advice on the range of oral hygiene products available to prisoners via the canteen list.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

---

- 2.114 Patients we spoke with felt supported by the mental health team. A total of 215 officers had been trained in mental health first aid and 40 in mental health awareness, which was a significant number and indicated commitment. Generally, uniformed officers said that they were confident in this aspect of their work and felt supported by nurses.
- 2.115 Mental health nurses and a sessional psychiatrist were employed by Northumberland, Tyne and Wear Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust to provide an integrated primary and secondary care service. Prisoners could be referred by telephone or paper application; most referrals originated from uniformed officers. All were seen within 48 hours and assessments brought to a weekly allocations meeting.
- 2.116 The six nurses each carried a case load of 15 to 20 patients. Cognitive behaviour therapy and solution based approaches were used to support patients with common and more complex mental health problems. One staff member was qualified and specialised in caring for people with learning disabilities, another in supporting people with a personality disorder and post-traumatic stress. A cascade system of clinical supervision was in use. Specialist therapists received supervision from external sources.

- 2.117 Patients with common mental health problems had access to guides and self-help materials. Standard self-help materials needed to be adjusted to better suit the reading abilities of some prisoners. Some specialist groups, for example, on stress management, provided meaningful activities designed to help patients cope more easily in house blocks.
- 2.118 A contracted counselling service for people with emotional distress had ceased over a year ago. While the counsellors had continued voluntarily, a service was not guaranteed.
- 2.119 Patients with complex mental health problems were reviewed regularly by the psychiatrist, and patients with serious and enduring illnesses were managed using the care programme approach.
- 2.120 In the year prior to our visit, four patients had to be transferred to external mental health services. One patient was transferred within seven days, but three experienced unacceptable delays of several weeks while waiting for beds.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.121 **Patients should have access to a full range of support for mental health problems including counselling and group therapies.**
- 2.122 **The transfer of patients to external health care beds should be expedited and occur within Department of Health transfer target timescales.**

## 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.**

- 2.123 The kitchen at Castington was old and worn but generally clean. The new kitchen at Acklington was an excellent facility. The choice and standard of food was reasonable but catering for a wider range of cultural needs was limited. Arrangements to ensure that food for vulnerable prisoners in Acklington was not contaminated were well developed and prisoner consultation was good.
- 2.124 There were separate catering arrangements at the two sites. The Castington kitchen was old and worn but clean and reasonably maintained. The new large kitchen at Acklington was an excellent facility; it was clean and well equipped to produce a large number of meals.
- 2.125 We found the quality and range of food to be good at both sites. Lunch and dinner were selected from a four week rolling menu, offering a reasonable variety of healthy options, including daily portions of fruit and vegetables. Most meals were cooked using fresh ingredients and there was little use of pre-prepared food. Bread was baked every day at Acklington. As well as cereal, breakfast included hot food such as boiled eggs or sausages every day, which were prepared on the morning they were eaten.
- 2.126 The menus generally met the needs of different diets including vegetarian, vegan and halal, but catering for a wider range of cultural needs, particularly at Castington, was limited. The

quality of food we tasted was good; portions were generous and served at the correct temperature.

- 2.127 In our survey 24% of prisoners overall said that the food was good, significantly lower than in comparator prisons. However, perceptions were much worse at Acklington where 20% thought the food was good compared with about a third of those at Castington.
- 2.128 At both sites, regular meetings with servery workers took place, a food survey was carried out twice a year and prisoner representatives had begun to meet formally with catering managers. Food comments books were in place in all residential units and were accessible to prisoners.
- 2.129 The catering manager at Acklington met with prisoner representatives on the vulnerable prisoners units at least twice a month to discuss fears they had about the contamination of food during preparation in the kitchen. As a result, effective safeguards had been put in place to ensure that food was not tampered with. Vulnerable prisoners had been invited into the kitchen to observe these measures at first hand.

## Recommendation

---

- 2.130 **Catering should meet a wider range of cultural needs.**

## Purchases

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.131 Prisoners were generally positive about their experience of the prison shop but complained about high prices and low wages. Consultation arrangements were good and there was a good range of catalogue providers.
- 2.132 In our survey significantly more prisoners than in comparator prisons said that they had access to the prison shop on their arrival. However, canteen order forms were only issued every Friday for delivery the following Friday, which meant that some prisoners could wait up to 10 days for a shop order. Prisoners were reasonably content with the shop provision, but found it particularly expensive in light of their low wages. Order forms identified items that were suitable for different religious groups, as well as for vegans and vegetarians. There were good consultation arrangements across both sites and prisoners were involved in making changes to the local product list.
- 2.133 There was a good range of catalogues for specialist items, but an administration charge of 50 pence was levied on each order. Newspapers could be ordered in advance but there was no provision for families to order them for prisoners. Prisoners could request a copy of their financial transactions at a cost of 10 pence per month of transactions.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.134 **Prisoners should be able to place a shop order the day after reception.**

**2.135 Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders.**

## Section 3: Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

---

**Expected outcomes:**

**All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.<sup>6</sup>**

- 3.1 The prison reported inflated time out of cell figures based on an inaccurate interpretation of the published core day. Actual time out of cell varied widely between the units. Exercise and association took place as scheduled.
- 3.2 The prison reported that the average amount of time prisoners were spending out of their cells was just over eight hours per day. However, this was only possible as a result of an inaccurate interpretation of the core day based on the mistaken notion that nearly everyone was engaged in a scheduled activity. In reality, it was much less (about three hours) for a significant number who did not work (about 20%) and for those who worked part time (also see section on work education and training). Morning and afternoon roll checks during the core day found just under a third of the population locked in their cells.
- 3.3 In contrast, time out of cell for prisoners on the Gateway unit and super enhanced units in house blocks 6 and 10 were very good. They were unlocked for nearly all of the core day. Exercise and association took place for all prisoners as scheduled every day and was rarely cancelled.

### Recommendation

---

- 3.4 **All prisoners should spend more time out of their cells and should be gainfully occupied during the working day.**

## Learning and skills and work activities

---

**Expected outcomes:**

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

- 3.5 The management of learning and skills and work was satisfactory. There were too few activity spaces for the population and too many prisoners were unemployed. Workshop facilities and education provision were good but underused. The range of courses across both sites was appropriate, and there were high achievement rates. There were too few opportunities above

---

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

level 2. The library provision was generally good but access was variable. PE provision was excellent and well coordinated across the two sites.

Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:	Good
Quality of learning and skills and work provision:	Good
Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:	Satisfactory

## Management of learning and skills and work

---

- 3.6 The management of learning and skills, education and work was satisfactory, but needed improvement. Experienced and capable senior managers had a clear strategic vision and appropriate plans for the future development of the provision.
- 3.7 The quality of learning and skills and work was good, and there were high achievement rates for those prisoners who could access the provision. However, processes for the allocation of individuals to activity were inconsistent and lacked transparency, and the management of those waiting for education, training or work was ineffective.
- 3.8 Appropriate quality improvement processes, including self-assessment, observations of teaching and learning and the use of prisoner feedback were in place. The quality improvement group (QIG) met regularly and was clearly focused on making a positive impact on the provision. Self-assessment had clearly identified many of the key strengths and areas for improvement, and data were used well to support judgements. Arrangements for assessments and verification were satisfactory. Although pay was generally low, this did not disadvantage prisoners who attended education.
- 3.9 The promotion of safeguarding and equality and diversity was generally good. There was a high level of mutual respect between learners and staff. Learning and skills staff were able to recognise and deal well with issues when they arose and had received appropriate training.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.10 **Allocation to activities should follow transparent procedures that are clear to all staff and prisoners.**

## Provision of activities

---

- 3.11 There were insufficient purposeful activity places, around 140 places short, and existing learning and work places were underused. Around 20% of prisoners were unemployed and there were too many cleaners on some of the house blocks. In our survey, prisoners responded more negatively than those in comparator prisons to a range of questions about access to activities, including prison work and vocational training (see main recommendation HP52).
- 3.12 The range of education courses was satisfactory and included literacy and numeracy, information communications technology and art. Vocational training courses provided an adequate range of provision and included bricklaying, catering, horticulture, barbering and painting and decorating.



- 3.13 Although a good proportion of vocational courses went up to level 2, there were insufficient progression opportunities above that. A reasonable proportion of prisoners were engaged in education or vocational training, mainly full time. However, vulnerable prisoners were not able to access training in the main kitchen or courses in bricklaying and painting and decorating. Prisoners discharged early were able to gain accreditation for any units completed.
- 3.14 Induction to learning and skills was generally satisfactory and all prisoners were given a suitable initial assessment of their literacy and numeracy needs unless this had previously been undertaken. Appropriate advice and guidance was given to prisoners by A4E, the careers information and advice service provider.
- 3.15 Suitable use was made of sentence plans to inform the action planning process with learners. Individual learning plans (ILPs) were variable – some were clear and detailed, others had few short-term targets. Insufficient use was made of ILPs to record learners' progress.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.16 **Course progression routes for learners should be improved, particularly above level 2.**
- 3.17 **Appropriately risk assessed vulnerable prisoners should be able to access the full range of vocational training.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 3.18 The quality and consistency of ILPs should be improved, particularly to record learners' progress.

## Quality of provision

---

- 3.19 Teaching and learning were good with some very good individual coaching in education classes. Teaching staff were well qualified and experienced and took appropriate account of prisoners' different learning styles, making effective use of a wide range of learning materials.
- 3.20 Resources for learning were of a high quality and vocational learning workshops were adequately equipped. The quality of teaching and learning accommodation was mostly good and well maintained. Support for learners, provided by well trained prisoner peer mentors in class, was very good and particularly effective. The 32 prisoners on Open University and distance learning courses were well supported by education and library staff.
- 3.21 Attendance was satisfactory but punctuality was erratic and sometimes poor in Acklington. Assessments were appropriately planned with clear feedback given to learners. The virtual campus was a good facility, but insufficiently used to support education courses. However, it was well used by the resettlement unit to assist in job searches.
- 3.22 Jobs in the prison were available in a reasonable range of areas such as waste recycling, kitchen work, painting and decorating, general maintenance, barbering and horticulture. However, too many cleaners on the house blocks were not fully occupied during the core day. Most work areas offered prisoners the opportunity to gain qualifications.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.23 **The prison should reduce the proportion of house block cleaners.**

## Education and vocational achievements

---

- 3.24 Achievement rates on many courses were high at well over 80%, and outstanding on some at between 95% and 100%. The development of work skills such as communication and working with others was good. Learners demonstrated high standards of practical work across most areas, particularly in horticulture, catering, and engineering. The well presented cafeterias staffed by prisoners on both sites provided prisoners with an excellent opportunity to hone good customer service skills.

## Library

---

- 3.25 The libraries on both sites were generally good and excellent in Castington, where the provision was very well managed. Both libraries provided a pleasant environment with space for prisoners to browse, sit, and read. Opening hours for most were reasonable although restrictive for prisoners on some house blocks.
- 3.26 Over half of prisoners were regular users and learners on education courses had good access during the core day. Storybook Dads and a book club were well established in Castington, but were not available to prisoners at the Acklington site. Free books were also offered to prisoners in Castington through a national library scheme to encourage reading.
- 3.27 The range of materials available in Castington was very good and carefully selected, with a wide variety of 'easy read' and large print books, as well as a good choice of 'spoken word' books and CDs. In Acklington the range of materials was more limited but adequate to meet prisoners' needs.
- 3.28 Book requests through the Northumberland County Council library service were generally dealt with promptly. A daily newspaper was available for prisoners in Castington and a small range of magazines was available in both. Prison Service Orders were readily available to prisoners.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.29 **Access to the library should be improved for prisoners on those house blocks with restricted visiting times.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.30 **The sharing of best library practices between Castington and Acklington should be improved.**

# 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.**

- 3.31 Physical education (PE) provision was good and well used to improve the physical fitness of prisoners. Facilities and equipment were mostly good and maintained to high standards, although the showers and changing room in gym 2 were poor. Healthy living and personal fitness were effectively promoted. The PE timetable was well planned and managed. The range of accredited PE courses was small and, although the quality of teaching was good, there was insufficient vocational training above level 1.
- 3.32 Physical education (PE) provision was well managed and promoted. PE staff were highly experienced and well qualified, with several being fully qualified teachers. Regular prisoner surveys were undertaken to identify improvements to the provision and prisoners were fully informed of the results.
- 3.33 The sports halls on both sites were spacious, weights and cardiovascular training areas well equipped and the outdoor sports pitches well used and appropriately maintained, providing good facilities for PE. Changing rooms and showers in most areas were good, although the changing room in gym 2 was too cramped and the shower facility poor.
- 3.34 All prisoners received a robust introduction to the gymnasium during their first week in the prison, including clear information on the range of courses and programmes available. Healthy living and the importance of exercise were well promoted at induction.
- 3.35 Allocation to PE was fair and approximately 65% of prisoners accessed the provision regularly. There was a good variety of recreational PE available with well identified provision for those aged over 50 and weekly sports clinics for those with a physical disability or those who required remedial sport activity. Recreational PE sessions included weights and cardiovascular training, as well as a good choice of racquet and ball sports. Appropriate clothing was available in the gymnasium when necessary, although many used their own kit. Clean towels were provided.
- 3.36 The range of accredited PE courses was limited and only gym orderlies were able to access gym instructor qualifications up to national vocational qualification level 2. No vocational training was available above level 1 for other prisoners. However, the quality of teaching and instruction was good and lessons were well planned. Achievement rates were excellent.
- 3.37 Staff had developed strong links with the health care unit and the drug and alcohol recovery team and provided well structured training programmes for prisoners who were unfit or required remedial PE. There were excellent links with the resettlement unit, with PE staff running a 'job ready' programme in the workshops for prisoners 12 weeks prior to release. This equipped prisoners with a useful variety of qualifications to help with employment, such as first aid at work, health and safety and the use of defibrillators.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.38 **PE courses above level 1 should be developed and introduced for all prisoners.**

3.39 **The changing room and shower facilities in gym 2 should be improved.**

# Section 4: Resettlement

## Strategic management of resettlement

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The needs analysis and reducing reoffending strategy did not detail how the needs of all specific groups would be managed. The action plan was too broad to drive individual pathway development. Prisoners were not consulted about resettlement services and comments in wing records showed that wing staff had little awareness of prisoners' resettlement needs. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was underused.
- 4.2 The reducing reoffending strategy was based around resettlement pathways. A needs analysis undertaken in August 2011 identified the needs of vulnerable prisoners, but not those of specific groups of prisoners such as lifers, those serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPPs) or recalled prisoners. The reducing reoffending action plan was too broad to sufficiently drive forward individual pathway development.
- 4.3 Services were monitored by pathway leads at monthly reducing reoffending meetings, chaired by the deputy governor. These had re-started in January 2012 having previously lapsed and minutes demonstrated steps to develop the strategy and services. A voluntary sector coordinator had been identified and meetings were soon to include representation from partnership agencies. There were no exit surveys to canvas prisoners' experiences and the resettlement provision was not an agenda item at prisoner consultation meetings. Pre-discharge interviews were undertaken inconsistently (see section on reintegration planning).
- 4.4 There was not yet a 'whole prison' approach to resettlement. Personal officers' comments in wing records showed little awareness of prisoners' resettlement needs or evidence of officers' involvement in sentence management (see section on offender management and planning). Staff in the offender management unit (OMU) suggested that colleagues outside the unit had only a limited understanding of its activities. Senior managers recognised the need to raise the profile of the OMU within the prison.
- 4.5 ROTL had not been used at all before the merger of the two prisons and was still greatly underused. Although there were over 50 category D prisoners, only one man was currently receiving daily ROTL (to clean the car park), and only two prisoners had received ROTL in 2011 for one-off visits. There was a published ROTL policy and advanced plans to increase ROTL opportunities using some creative placements.
- 4.6 Out of the 27 prisoners on home detention curfew (HDC) release in May 2012, only three had been released on their HDC eligibility date; others had been released an average of 21.6 days late. Although the prison retained information about the number of prisoners assessed for HDC each month, it did not collate how many were being released late or the reasons why.

- 4.7 Prisoners could apply to live in the Gateway resettlement unit during their last year in prison (see paragraph 4.49). The unit had a good focus on employment, education and training, but did not meet its full potential as a resettlement unit promoting independent living. There was little apparent joint planning or work between the Gateway unit and the OMU.
- 4.8 Programme provision was sufficient and included accredited sex offender treatment programmes (SOTP), the thinking skills programme (TSP), and a programme for controlling anger and learning to manage (CALM). There were insufficient SOTP places to meet the demand and referral and assessment processes for all programmes were inefficient (see section on offender management and planning and on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).

## Recommendations

---

- 4.9 **The reducing reoffending strategy should reflect the resettlement needs of all categories of prisoner, based on an appropriate needs analysis, and subject to ongoing prisoner consultation and review.**
- 4.10 **The action plan should include steps to develop services across all pathways.**
- 4.11 **ROTL should be used in appropriate cases to support resettlement.**
- 4.12 **The numbers of prisoners released late on HDC should be routinely interrogated and the reasons behind this logged. The reasons for any undue delays in the process should be communicated to prisoners.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.13 Joint planning and work between the OMU and the Gateway unit should be improved.

## 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.**

- 4.14 The OMU was still developing and there was a clear commitment from senior managers to drive the work forward. Caseloads were very high and had an impact on the quality and amount of work undertaken; many prisoners were seen on an irregular basis and were negative about support from the OMU. There was a need for supervisors to receive effective case management oversight. Risk management plans needed improvement and links between the OMU and security staff needed strengthening. Services for indeterminate sentenced prisoners were developing.
- 4.15 The OMU, established following the merger of two previously separate units, operated in three pods and was still developing. Two pods at the Acklington site had been in place for approximately one year, and the pod at Castington for six months. The OMU consisted of 18 offender supervisors (including six seconded probation service officers and uniformed and

non-uniformed offender supervisors) and 14 case administrators. The pods were not yet fully staffed and there were a number of long-term sickness absences.

- 4.16 The OMU was managed by the strategic head of offender management and public protection, a probation manager, and the operational head of offender management, a prison governor. There was a clear commitment from senior managers to drive forward and develop the work; managers had reviewed the skills across the pods and established a range of practice meetings to support the different team roles. In order to support links with the integrated offender manager units in the area, the prison had seconded two prison staff to local community integrated offender management teams.
- 4.17 There were 710 prisoners who were in scope of offender management (that is those serving more than 12 months and considered to pose a serious risk of harm). One hundred and thirty-two were in Castington and 578 were in Acklington. Among them were a total of 56 prolific or priority offenders (PPO). Offender supervisors worked with in-scope and out-of-scope prisoners (those not subject to offender management arrangements) irrespective of their sentence length. Probation offender supervisors managed prisoners serving life sentences and those posing more complex risk issues.
- 4.18 Most prisoners said that they had an offender supervisor, but were negative about contact with them and about their ability to progress. We found the quality and consistency of offender supervisor work varied greatly, from poor to excellent. Caseloads were very high, around 80-90 per supervisor, including 50-60 high risk cases. Some staff managed cases for absent colleagues which meant even greater caseloads. Only probation offender supervisors received formal casework supervision. Offender supervisors often worked in isolation from other departments. Prisoners and offender supervisors often attended sentence planning boards and there was input from the offender manager either by phone or in person. Supervisors often obtained information from personal officers, health care staff and others before board meetings, but family members were not invited.
- 4.19 There was an expectation that supervisors would see in-scope prisoners every three months, but many were only seen on an irregular basis. Supervisors on the Castington site, who had fewer high risk cases, saw prisoners more regularly than those on the Acklington site. Out-of-scope prisoners were often only seen at annual reviews unless they asked to be seen. Records showed that staff redeployment had led to a loss of 388 hours from the OMU since November 2011, an average of 12 hours a week (see main recommendation HP53).
- 4.20 Inspectors read case files relating to 20 in-scope prisoners. The quality of information provided by offender managers was variable and supervisors often had to interpret non-specific sentence plans. An accredited programme was required in 14 of the 20 cases. In three cases, the programme had been delivered; in 10 there was a plan to deliver the programme but no way of knowing when this might happen and in one case there were plans to deliver the programme in the community. Some prisoners were reaching the end of their prison sentence without enough time left in which to complete the programme.
- 4.21 In all cases a referral had been made to the TSP, but there was no guidance to advise supervisors if this was appropriate. Prisoners who needed to attend the SOTP were also referred to the TSP but there was no discussion with tutors to identify those who might benefit from this as part of pre-course preparation.
- 4.22 With the exception of the SOTP, supervisors had no access to programme databases to track progress and were not involved in programme prioritisation. Prisoners were left uncertain

about whether they would get onto the programme (see also section on attitudes thinking and behaviour).

- 4.23 There were deficiencies in the thoroughness of assessment, planning and delivery of offender management. These included failure to fully deliver objectives, poor quality reviews which lacked consultation with either the prisoner concerned or his offender manager, and failure to prioritise prisoners classified as prolific offenders.
- 4.24 In our survey 77% of all prisoners said that they had a sentence plan, significantly more than in comparator prisons, but fewer felt involved in its development; 39% of all prisoners said that their offender supervisor was helping them achieve their sentence plan targets but 40% of prisoners said that nobody was helping them.
- 4.25 There were 43 outstanding offender assessment system (OASys) documents for which the prison was responsible. Some assessments were only just outside the eight-week completion window but a minority were older. The quality of OASys documents was generally good and they were quality checked. Sentence plan targets were generally appropriate and included timescales for their completion, but those responsible were not named.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.26 **Sentence plans and OASys documents should be completed thoroughly and on time for all prisoners.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 4.27 Offender supervisors should work more closely with offender managers on sentence planning to ensure that plans are specific and that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.
- 4.28 Where appropriate, family members should be invited to sentence plan review boards.
- 4.29 Individual named staff should be responsible for supporting sentence plan targets.

## Public protection

---

- 4.30 There was a public protection manager supported by administrative staff on each site, who promptly identified concerns relating to new prisoners and maintained the register of violent and sexual offenders. Prison staff had access to the VISOR database of high risk nominals and could update the system with information from the prison.
- 4.31 There were 524 prisoners who fell under the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) criteria, of whom eight were assessed at the highest risk level. Public protection work was covered by Probation offender supervisors who liaised with the MAPPA group and reviewed high risk prisoners six months before their release. However, we found cases where risk management plans prepared by offender managers in the community did not specify how risks were to be managed on release.
- 4.32 We found deficiencies in more than half of the risk of harm analyses prepared by offender managers in the community, which we examined. Many did not indicate how risks could be managed in the prison, leaving offender supervisors frustrated and lacking direction.



- 4.33 Arrangements had been put in place to support and protect prisoners in most of the cases where this was necessary. Security information shared with the OMU was restricted and supervisors were not automatically informed of the outcome of incidents or issues to be pursued.
- 4.34 Not all staff in the OMU had received child protection training; of those who had, most were based on the Acklington site.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.35 **Risk management plans should be of a good standard and victim safety issues should be considered in all relevant cases.**
- 4.36 **The full outcomes of security information reports and any action taken should always be forwarded to offender supervisors.**
- 4.37 **All OMU staff should receive child protection training.**

## Categorisation

---

- 4.38 All prisoners serving four years or more were reviewed annually and those serving shorter sentences every six months. Offender supervisors completed re-categorisation assessments for prisoners for whom they were responsible.
- 4.39 Prisoners were able to make progressive moves, but difficulties accessing programmes meant that some were refused recategorisation because they had not undertaken any offending behaviour work (see section on attitude thinking and behaviour).

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

---

- 4.40 There were 53 prisoners serving life sentences and 124 prisoners serving IPPs. Probation officer supervisors on the Acklington site only managed life-sentenced prisoners, while those on the Castington site managed the six lifers and 17 serving IPPs on that site. Prisoners did not receive any published information to explain how their sentences would be managed. There was a lack of strategic planning to meet the needs of these prisoners.
- 4.41 Of a total of 398 uniformed officers, 63 (15.8%) had received training to manage indeterminate sentenced prisoners; 47 had undertaken life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century training and 16 managing indeterminate sentences and risk (MISaR) training.
- 4.42 Lifer forums for prisoner lifer representatives had recently been introduced on the Acklington site only, but not all prisoners or staff were aware of the meetings or the representatives. These meetings excluded prisoners on IPPs. There were no specific events to help those serving indeterminate sentences understand risk reduction and eventual reintegration, although this was planned. Some prisoners spoke positively of the support they had received from staff, but many others did not feel well supported or informed.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.43 **There should be regular events to enable life sentenced prisoners and those on IPPs to progress towards eventual reintegration.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.44 All life sentenced prisoners should be aware of lifer representatives and meetings should include prisoners on the Castington site.

## Reintegration planning

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.45 Screening on induction was adequate but pre-discharge interviews were inconsistent. The Gateway unit did not meet its full potential as a resettlement unit. A good range of support was provided for accommodation and finance, benefit and debt issues but services were poorly advertised. Arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work were satisfactory. Prisoners with health needs received appropriate information and assistance. Links with local drug intervention programme (DIP) teams were good but a lack of signposting to other agencies was a concern. Provision under the children and families pathway was inconsistent and ROTL was not used to promote family ties. Visits booking arrangements were poor and visits did not start on time. The range of offending behaviour programmes was sufficient but demand exceeded supply. The new restorative justice project was promising.
- 4.46 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor who completed an OASys document and sentence plan. An initial needs assessment was undertaken on arrival and peer workers completed a screening form that covered accommodation, finance benefit and debt. Referrals were made as appropriate to Shelter and Jobcentre Plus.
- 4.47 Pre-discharge interviews were inconsistent. While the offender supervisors carried out interviews on the Castington site, this was not the case on the Acklington site, where one member of staff interviewed prisoners three or four weeks before being discharged but only to gather data rather than plan for their release. This meant that in some cases immediate pre-release issues such as homelessness might not have been addressed.
- 4.48 The Veterans in Custody scheme was developing some good links with community based provision, for example, the About Turn project provided an excellent support network. However, links with projects in other areas of the country were not well developed causing difficulties in maintaining support for prisoners released to areas outside of Northumberland.
- 4.49 Prisoners could apply to live in the Gateway resettlement unit during their last year in prison. The unit provided excellent accommodation and facilities and had a good focus on employment, training and education (ETE), but did not meet its full potential as a resettlement unit promoting independent living. Case management of prisoners on the unit was good, with

regular reviews of resettlement pathways and detailed recording, but we were not assured that this work was fully integrated with the work of the offender supervisor.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.50 **All prisoners should have a pre-release plan developed in good time for any outstanding issues to be addressed.**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.51 The role of Gateway as a resettlement unit should be developed with improved links with the offender supervisor.

## Accommodation

---

- 4.52 A needs analysis undertaken in 2011 revealed that there was a significant level of housing need among the population, with just over half requiring help with an accommodation problem. Shelter workers were in post and worked with, on average, 70 prisoners every month. However, the provision was not well advertised on all wings and in our survey, significantly fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons said that they knew where to get help with accommodation.
- 4.53 The action plan for this pathway was not comprehensive and failed to set clear objectives and timescales. Three months before release, Shelter staff interviewed all those previously seen to identify and resolve any outstanding issues. However, the number of prisoners released without settled accommodation or helped to secure accommodation was not yet routinely recorded. We were told that an estimated 7% of prisoners were being released without accommodation.
- 4.54 Shelter workers had developed good links with community based providers. The range of support and advice on offer included closing down tenancies, accessing housing benefit, securing new tenancies and accessing supported housing. Further support was available through Aquila Way, a charitable organisation providing a wide range of help, including assistance with accommodation and support for men during custody and through a volunteer mentor for up to two years following release.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.55 **The number of prisoners released without settled accommodation or helped to secure accommodation should be routinely monitored and the information used to inform future priorities and provision.**

## Education, training and employment

---

- 4.56 Arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work were satisfactory. A reasonably high proportion of prisoners who were discharged, around a quarter, had gone into full-time education, training or employment.

- 4.57 Prisoners had appropriate access to well taught employability programmes including a course on self-employment and business development. Although links with employers and the use of work ROTL to get prisoners into jobs were underdeveloped, the prison was actively working with a variety of organisations to improve this.
- 4.58 The virtual campus was used well to assist in work searches. There were productive relationships between staff in the resettlement unit, Jobcentre Plus, A4E and the careers information and advice support provider, and information was effectively shared between them. The prison had made a good attempt to extend the working day for prisoners employed in areas such as horticulture, and had plans to further expand this into other work areas.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.59 **The prison should further develop productive links with employers.**

## Health care

---

- 4.60 The health care department was notified of the release dates of prisoners in advance and staff were invited to attend individual pre-release appointments. Harm minimisation information, take home medication and assistance to locate a GP were provided where appropriate.
- 4.61 A palliative and end-of-life care policy was in place using the Macmillan cancer support approach; there was a register of people who required care. One patient who had undergone palliative surgery expressed satisfaction with his care and had received parole on compassionate grounds. Patients requiring high dependency care were transferred to HMPs Durham or Holme House.

## Drugs and alcohol

---

- 4.62 Links between drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) workers and local DIP teams were good, with some DIP teams providing gate pick-up services for newly released prisoners. However, there was concern among DART workers that some DIPs in the north east were no longer signposting prisoners to other agencies working with non-class A drug users.

## Finance, benefit and debt

---

- 4.63 In our survey, significantly more prisoners on the Acklington site than on the Castington site said that they had a problem with finances when they first arrived at HMP Northumberland. Information about finance and debt was provided during induction. Jobcentre Plus and Shelter provided an adequate range of help and a money management course was available on both sites through the education department.
- 4.64 Bank accounts could be set up during the custodial period and opened on the day of release. However, the number of applicants had been low and a log of successful applicants was not maintained. The provision was not well advertised on the wings and few prisoners we spoke to knew about this opportunity.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.65 The number applying and successfully setting up a bank account prior to release should be recorded and monitored.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

---

- 4.66 The strategic vision for the children and families pathway was underdeveloped. The action plan was not comprehensive; it omitted some important aspects of the work and lacked clear objectives and timescales. The needs analysis was limited in scope and did not include a survey of prisoners' views. Provision was better developed at the Castington site, where a Storybook Dad's scheme and KIDS VIP courses were available; there were no activities at the Acklington site.
- 4.67 In our survey significantly more prisoners on the Castington site compared with the Acklington site said that they had been encouraged to maintain contact with family and friends. ROTL to promote family ties was not yet available on either site. Prisoners who did not receive visits could not exchange unused visiting orders for extra telephone credit but could send extra letters.
- 4.68 There was no email booking system for visits and they could not be booked at the visitors' centre. The only way to make a booking was by telephone and there was only one line available. While the opening hours for this had been extended, the provision was very poor. Most of the visitors we spoke to, and the vast majority of those making an entry in the comments book, complained about difficulties accessing the visits booking clerk. The line was busy throughout the period when we tried to call (see main recommendation HP54).
- 4.69 The North East Prison After Care Society (NEPACS) managed the visitors' centre, play facilities and refreshment bars. The provision was impressive and visitors and prisoners were very positive about the support provided. NEPACS staff were appropriately qualified and another family support worker was available through the IDTS.
- 4.70 A log of when the last visitor entered the visits room was maintained on the Acklington site and showed that some experienced long delays before they could enter the room. On one recent occasion, the last visitor had not entered the hall until 3pm despite having arrived in the visits centre in time for the 2pm start. Visitors arriving late were allowed to continue with their visit.
- 4.71 The searching of visitors we observed was done respectfully, but we were concerned to hear that visitors would be strip-searched by prison rather than police officers if evidence indicated the possible possession of drugs. We also found other disproportionate aspects in security. For example, prisoners were not allowed to go to the toilet during a visit session without ending their visit and 10% were randomly strip-searched after a visit on the Castington site (see main recommendation HP54).
- 4.72 Prisoners arrived in the visits room first followed by their visitors. We spoke to one prisoner in the Acklington site whose visitor had not arrived. Staff did not try to contact the visitor and the prisoner was left in the main visits hall for almost one hour. Staff on the Castington site said that they would call the visitor to find out what had happened to reduce the prisoners' anxieties and prevent him from waiting in the visits hall unnecessarily.

- 4.73 Both visits rooms were of a good quality and the provision of a supervised play area every day was an excellent facility. Valued and popular family and father/child visits were held regularly on both sites. The KIDS VIP project provided education about child development through play and had been run three times since April 2011 at the Castington site. The Storybook Dad's scheme had a good level of take-up and involved over 300 prisoners from the Castington site over the last year.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.74 **Provision under the children and families pathway should be further developed and applied consistently across the two sites.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 4.75 Prisoners should be able to exchange unused visiting orders for extra telephone credit.
- 4.76 Visits staff should attempt to contact visitors who are late to reduce the prisoner's anxieties or prevent him from waiting in the visits hall.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 4.77 A restorative justice project was in its early stage of implementation and was a promising development. Restorative principles also underpinned some work within the workshops, for example, building bird boxes for community based projects. A number of prisoners had been assessed for a conferencing project and some had completed the initial offending behaviour work but none had yet been involved in a face to face meeting with their victim. The project was carefully managed with good attention to the needs of victims.
- 4.78 The range of accredited offending behaviour programmes was sufficient, with the recent addition of CALM to complement the TSP, and a number of SOTPs. However, the demand for SOTP places consistently exceeded the number of places and staff shortages meant that fewer places were due to be available this year.
- 4.79 The referral and assessment processes for all programmes were inefficient and over 200 prisoners were waiting to be assessed for the TSP. Assessments were only carried out in order to fill spaces in the next group, so it was difficult to know how many who were waiting to be assessed were suitable.
- 4.80 Staff shortages had led to 124 sex offenders waiting to be assessed; some had waited far too long, in some cases over six months. Offender supervisors were not involved in making an initial judgement about the eligibility of prisoners for programmes, which resulted in a large number of unsuitable referrals. For example, out of 25 referrals to the SOTP, all but one were judged not ready to take part. In one case, the prisoner's total denial of their offence had been noted by the offender supervisor, but a referral for assessment was nevertheless made (see section on offender management and planning).
- 4.81 The programmes' database was underdeveloped and did not capture information to confirm the number being released without completing their required programme. This was a particular concern in the case of those assessed for SOTPs. Furthermore, little analysis of waiting times was undertaken to identify issues and take appropriate action.

- 4.82 There was good support for diversity. This included an adapted SOTP (Becoming a new me) for intellectually disabled prisoners. The Helping Others Programmes Explained scheme, which provided prisoners with mentoring through the sex offender treatment programme, was also a positive way of promoting offender engagement. Excellent support was given to one prisoner with an intellectual disability who was preparing for and attending his parole hearing. The parole report was written in a way that enabled him to understand it and used language and concepts he had learnt through the SOTP.
- 4.83 A couple of motivational programmes were being tested to see which one was more appropriate for sexual offenders in denial of their offending behaviour and there was a developing strategy for working with deniers.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.84 **The number of places on SOTPs should meet demand.**
- 4.85 **The programme referral and assessment processes should be reviewed to develop a more efficient and effective service.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 4.86 The programme database should be improved to include information on the number of prisoners released without completing the required programmes.
- 4.87 A regular analysis of programme waiting lists and lengths of wait should be undertaken and appropriate action taken to rectify issues.





# Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

## Main recommendations

To the governor

- 
- 5.1 Sufficient activity places should be provided to ensure all prisoners are purposefully engaged during the core day, and existing activity spaces should be fully used. (HP57)
  - 5.2 The work of the OMU should be properly resourced and effectively integrated with the work of other departments, and all offender supervisors should receive formal supervision and support. (HP58)
  - 5.3 Visitors should be able to book visits quickly and easily, have the full amount of visit time each session. Both visitors and prisoners should experience proportionate security in the visits area. Strip-searching of visitors by prison staff should cease. (HP59)

## Recommendation

To NOMS

- 
- 5.4 Funding should be made available, nationally, for prisons to conduct CDBT on prisoners involved in recovery-focused programmes and accommodation. (1.96)

## Recommendations

To the governor

### Courts, escorts and transfers

- 
- 5.5 Vulnerable prisoners should be correctly identified during escort. They should only be integrated into the mainstream population on the basis of individual care planning. (1.4)

### Early days in custody

- 
- 5.6 Prisoners should not be routinely strip-searched in reception. (1.15)
  - 5.7 All newly arrived prisoners should be able to make a free, private telephone call on the day of arrival, and have an opportunity to see a peer support worker and a chaplain in private. Night staff should follow clear first night procedures. (1.6)
  - 5.8 Induction should provide a consistent and good quality introduction to the prison and offer all prisoners sufficient occupation. (1.7)

### **Bullying and violence reduction**

---

- 5.9 Movement of prisoners between the two sites to help support the safer custody strategy should be better facilitated. (1.29)
- 5.10 Investigations of violent and antisocial behaviour should be thorough and quality assured. (1.30)
- 5.11 Greater support should be given to prisoners who are victimised and efforts made to promote confidence in procedures. (1.31)

### **Self-harm and suicide prevention**

---

- 5.12 A review of release plans should be completed where prisoners die shortly after release. (1.43)
- 5.13 Prisoners subject to ACCT procedures should have a consistent case manager. (1.44)
- 5.14 Sufficient first aid trained staff should be available at night. (1.45)
- 5.15 Prisoners who are solely at risk of self-harm and in need of close supervision should not be held in the SACU. (1.46)
- 5.16 The use of strip clothing should be monitored by the safer prisons meeting. (1.47)

### **Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)**

---

- 5.17 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 for both sites. (1.52)

### **Security**

---

- 5.18 Restrictive security practices should be reviewed in the context of the prison's category C remit. (1.59)
- 5.19 MDT should be appropriately staffed to ensure tests are completed within prescribed timescales. (1.60)
- 5.20 Prisoners should not be placed on closed visits for reasons unrelated to visits and reviews should genuinely consider whether someone can have this sanction withdrawn. (1.61)

### **Incentives and earned privileges**

---

- 5.21 Monitoring of the IEP scheme should be extended to cover vulnerable prisoners, older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities. (1.67)
- 5.22 All prisoners should have equal access to prison meals. (1.68)

## **The use of force**

---

- 5.23 Video footage of incidents involving the planned use of force should be routinely reviewed by managers. (1.77)
- 5.24 There should be effective governance of special accommodation, use of strip conditions and the gated cell to ensure that all are used to the minimum possible extent. (1.78)

## **Segregation**

---

- 5.25 The segregation unit should be subject to more effective governance and monitoring. (1.83)
- 5.26 There should be clear reintegration and care planning. Regimes should be assessed on an individual basis and target setting should address the reasons why prisoners are in segregation. (1.84)

## **Substance misuse**

---

- 5.27 Prescribing regimes for substance dependent prisoners should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidelines. (1.93)
- 5.28 Waiting times for secondary detoxification should be significantly reduced. (1.94)
- 5.29 There should be sufficient services to address the needs of prisoners with alcohol problems. (1.95)

## **Residential units**

---

- 5.30 Cells should have screened toilets with lids, curtains and lockable storage. (2.12)
- 5.31 Prisoners should be provided with privacy keys to their cells. (2.13)
- 5.32 Residential managers should regularly audit the records of responses to cell call bells and investigate the reasons for prisoners' negative views of response times. (2.14)
- 5.33 Prisoners should be provided with prison clothing in the appropriate size and in a good state of repair. (2.15)
- 5.34 There should be a consistent application system which provides prisoners with free access to application forms and is monitored for timeliness and quality of responses. (2.16)

## **Staff-prisoner relationships**

---

- 5.35 Personal officers should support prisoners' achievement of sentence plan targets. (2.24)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.36 Equality and diversity work should be informed by a needs analysis. (2.31)

- 5.37 DIRFs should be freely available to prisoners in all residential areas and subject to external scrutiny. (2.32)
- 5.38 Foreign national prisoners should be made aware of free telephone and mail provision for maintaining contact with family, and extended visits should be in place for visitors from abroad. All staff should be aware of interpretation services and able to use them as necessary. (2.43)
- 5.39 There should be systematic identification of prisoners with disabilities, and thorough, properly resourced support, including regular group meetings. (2.44)
- 5.40 Prisoners over retirement age should not be locked in their cells during the core day and there should be regular, predictable group meetings and sufficient activities to keep them occupied. (2.45)

### **Faith and religious activity**

---

- 5.41 All prisoners should have access to corporate worship/faith meetings every week, without having to give up other regime activities. (2.52)

### **Complaints**

---

- 5.42 All responses to complaints should show that a full investigation of the facts had taken place. (2.57)

### **Legal rights**

---

- 5.43 Information about legal services should be made available to prisoners. (2.62)

### **Health services**

---

- 5.44 Patients should not wait excessive periods of time in waiting rooms prior to and following their health care appointments. (2.77)
- 5.45 Waiting rooms should be made more comfortable and be used to promote health. (2.78)
- 5.46 The partnership board should coordinate strategies for the provision of AEDs, checking of equipment, training and deployment of trained staff. (2.79)
- 5.47 There should be active and systematic health promotion throughout the prison. (2.80)
- 5.48 Action should be taken to reduce time lost due to patients failing to attend appointments. (2.90)
- 5.49 All pharmacy staff should have access to SystemOne to ensure they can obtain information about a patient's medication and treatment when they are in the house blocks. (2.100)
- 5.50 Pharmacy staff should be supported to develop pharmacy services such as pharmacy led clinics and medicine use reviews for the prison population. (2.101)
- 5.51 The in-possession policy should identify high risk medications and how they should be administered. (2.102)

- 5.52 An additional CD cabinet should be placed in the pharmacy to ensure the storage of methadone is compliant with the regulations. (2.103)
- 5.53 The NEOHCU should commission sufficient dental services to meet the needs of the population. (2.112)
- 5.54 Patients should have access to a full range of support for mental health problems including counselling and group therapies. (2.121)
- 5.55 The transfer of patients to external health care beds should be expedited and occur within Department of Health transfer target timescales. (2.122)

### **Catering**

---

- 5.56 Catering should meet a wider range of cultural needs. (2.130)

### **Purchases**

---

- 5.57 Prisoners should be able to place a shop order the day after reception. (2.134)
- 5.58 Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.135)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 5.59 All prisoners should spend more time out of their cells and should be gainfully occupied during the working day. (3.4)

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

---

- 5.60 Allocation to activities should follow transparent procedures that are clear to all staff and prisoners. (3.10)
- 5.61 Course progression routes for learners should be improved, particularly above level 2. (3.16)
- 5.62 Appropriately risk assessed vulnerable prisoners should be able to access the full range of vocational training. (3.17)
- 5.63 The prison should reduce the proportion of house block cleaners. (3.23)
- 5.64 Access to the library should be improved for prisoners on those house blocks with restricted visiting times. (3.29)

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

---

- 5.65 PE courses above level 1 should be developed and introduced for all prisoners. (3.38)
- 5.66 The changing room and shower facilities in gym 2 should be improved. (3.39)

## **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 5.67 The reducing reoffending strategy should reflect the resettlement needs of all categories of prisoner, based on an appropriate needs analysis, and subject to ongoing prisoner consultation and review. (4.9)
- 5.68 The action plan should include steps to develop services across all pathways. (4.10)
- 5.69 ROTL should be used in appropriate cases to support resettlement. (4.11)
- 5.70 The numbers of prisoners released late on HDC should be routinely interrogated and the reasons behind this logged. The reasons for any undue delays in the process should be communicated to prisoners. (4.12)

## **Offender management and planning**

---

- 5.71 Sentence plans and OASys documents should be completed thoroughly and on time for all prisoners. (4.26)
- 5.72 Risk management plans should be of a good standard and victim safety issues should be considered in all relevant cases. (4.38)
- 5.73 The full outcomes of SIRs and any action taken should always be forwarded to offender supervisors. (4.39)
- 5.74 All OMU staff should receive child protection training. (4.40)
- 5.75 There should be regular events to enable life sentenced prisoners and those on IPPs to progress towards eventual reintegration. (4.46)

## **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.76 All prisoners should have a pre-release plan developed in good time for any outstanding issues to be addressed. (4.53)
- 5.77 The number of prisoners released without settled accommodation or helped to secure accommodation should be routinely monitored and the information used to inform future priorities and provision. (4.58)
- 5.78 The prison should further develop productive links with employers. (4.62)
- 5.79 Provision under the children and families pathway should be further developed and applied consistently across the two sites. (4.78)
- 5.80 The number of places on SOTPs should meet demand. (4.87)
- 5.81 The programme referral and assessment processes should be reviewed to develop a more efficient and effective service. (4.88)

## Housekeeping points

---

### **Courts, escorts and transfers**

---

- 5.82 Procedures for moving prisoners between the two sites should be simplified. (1.5)
- 5.83 Prisoners should be given civilian clothing for outside hospital appointments. (1.6)

### **Early days in custody**

---

- 5.84 Prisoners should be given accurate information about the price of canteen packs in reception. (1.18)
- 5.85 All holding cells should be clean; they should contain reading material and offer other activities to occupy prisoners while they wait. (1.19)

### **Bullying and violence reduction**

---

- 5.86 Attendance at violence reduction meetings should be improved. (1.32)

### **Self-harm and suicide prevention**

---

- 5.87 Attendance at the safer prisons meeting should be improved. (1.48)

### **Security**

---

- 5.88 Security objectives should be publicised among staff. (1.62)

### **Segregation**

---

- 5.89 Normal cells should be fully equipped for occupancy. (1.85)

### **Substance misuse**

---

- 5.90 Long daily waits for methadone on the Acklington site should be addressed. (1.97)

### **Residential units**

---

- 5.91 The number of telephones on house block 14 should be increased to meet the ratio of one to 20 prisoners. (2.17)
- 5.92 The email service for prisoner correspondence should be publicised around the prison and during induction. (2.18)
- 5.93 Purchases should be issued to prisoners within a day of arrival. (2.19)

## **Staff-prisoner relationships**

---

- 5.94 Representatives from the security department should attend prisoner consultation meetings, and notes of the meetings should be displayed on residential units prominently and promptly. (2.25)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.95 Equality and diversity minutes should be freely available to prisoners. (2.33)
- 5.96 Staff training on religious and cultural diversity should be delivered as planned. (2.46)

## **Complaints**

---

- 5.97 Low level complaints about domestic issues should be dealt with quickly by residential staff. (2.58)

## **Health services**

---

- 5.98 Feedback from patient consultation exercises should be better distributed in the house blocks. (2.81)
- 5.99 The medication hatch in house block 9 should be redesigned. (2.82)
- 5.100 The availability of condoms should be advertised in all house blocks. (2.83)
- 5.101 Prisoners should be better informed about waiting times in health care. (2.91)
- 5.102 Triage algorithms should be used to support and standardise nurses' clinical decision making. (2.92)
- 5.103 Telemedicine should be reviewed to increase the range of consultations for which it is used. (2.93)
- 5.104 Clear, retrievable records of the date checks that take place should be kept in the pharmacy. (2.104)
- 5.105 A record of the supply of 'special' products should be kept and include the details of the person to whom the product was supplied. (2.105)
- 5.106 Refrigeration facilities must be available to prisoners who have in-possession medication that requires storage at low temperatures. (2.106)
- 5.107 A review of patient group directions should take place to enable the supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.107)
- 5.108 Out of date pharmacy reference materials should be discarded. (2.108)



- 5.109 The prison should take professional advice on the range of oral hygiene products available to prisoners via the canteen list. (2.113)

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

---

- 5.110 The quality and consistency of ILPs should be improved, particularly to record learners' progress. (3.18)
- 5.111 The sharing of best library practices between Castington and Acklington should be improved. (3.30)

### **Strategic management of resettlement**

---

- 5.112 Joint planning and work between the OMU and the Gateway unit should be improved. (4.13)

### **Offender management and planning**

---

- 5.113 Offender supervisors should work more closely with offender managers on sentence planning to ensure that plans are specific and that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. (4.27)
- 5.114 Where appropriate, family members should be invited to sentence plan review boards. (4.28)
- 5.115 Individual named staff should be responsible for supporting sentence plan targets. (4.29)
- 5.116 All life sentenced prisoners should be aware of lifer representatives and meetings should include prisoners on the Castington site. (4.47)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.117 The role of Gateway as a resettlement unit should be developed with improved links with the offender supervisor. (4.54)
- 5.118 The number applying and successfully setting up a bank account prior to release should be recorded and monitored. (4.68)
- 5.119 Prisoners should be able to exchange unused visiting orders for extra telephone credit. (4.78)
- 5.120 Visits staff should attempt to contact visitors who are late to reduce the prisoner's anxieties or prevent him from waiting in the visits hall. (4.79)
- 5.121 The programme database should be improved to include information on the number of prisoners released without completing the required programmes. (4.89)
- 5.122 A regular analysis of programme waiting lists and lengths of wait should be undertaken and appropriate action taken to rectify issues. (4.90)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Hindpal Singh-Bhui	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Rosemarie Bugdale	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Michael Calvert	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Hayley Cripps	Researcher
Nalini Sharma	Researcher
Olayinka Macauley	Researcher
Chloe Flint	Researcher

### **Specialist inspectors**

Paul Roberts	Drugs inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Helen Jackson	Pharmacist
Colin Wilson	Care Quality Commission
Neil Edwards	Ofsted inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Simon Cutting	Ofsted inspector
Nick Crombie	Ofsted inspector
Yvonne McGuckian	Probation inspector
Vivienne Clarke	Probation inspector
Caroline Nicklin	Probation inspector
Richard Pearce	Probation inspector

## Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	1	1,190	94.3
Recall		67	5.3
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand			
Civil prisoners			
Detainees			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,257</b>	<b>99.6</b>

+ 5 Other - over 21 years 0.4% = 1,263 (100% total)

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		2	0.2
Less than 6 months		8	0.6
6 months to less than 12 months		19	1.5
12 months to less than 2 years		157	12.4
2 years to less than 4 years		295	23.4
4 years to less than 10 years	1	566	44.9
10 years and over (not life)		37	2.9
ISPP		124	9.8
Life		54	4.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,262</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age <b>20</b>		
Under 21 years	1	0.1
21 years to 29 years	478	37.8
30 years to 39 years	343	27.2
40 years to 49 years	228	18.1
50 years to 59 years	114	9.0
60 years to 69 years	76	6.0
70 plus years	23	1.8
Please state maximum age <b>84</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,263</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	1	1,163	92.2
Foreign nationals		7	0.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,170</b>	<b>92.7</b>

+ 92 Not stated - over 21 years 7.3% = 1,263 (100% total)

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced		1	0.1
Cat A			
Cat B		1	0.1
Cat C	1	1,200	95.1
Cat D		55	4.3
Other		5	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,262</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	1	1,196	94.8
Irish		1	0.1
Other white		8	0.6
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean		3	0.2
White and black African		2	0.2
White and Asian		1	0.1
Other mixed		1	0.1
Asian or Asian British			
Indian		4	0.3
Pakistani		8	0.6
Bangladeshi		3	0.2
Other Asian		3	0.2
Black or black British			
Caribbean		5	0.4
African		2	0.2
Other black		3	0.2
Chinese or other ethnic group			
Chinese		0	0
Other ethnic group		1	0.1
Not stated		21	1.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,262</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		1	0.1
Church of England		511	40.4
Roman Catholic	1	194	15.4
Other Christian denominations		78	6.1
Muslim		28	2.2
Sikh		2	0.2

Hindu		0	0
Buddhist		21	1.7
Jewish		0	0
Other		12	1.0
No religion		415	32.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,262</b>	<b>100</b>

#### Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			95	7.5
1 month to 3 months	1	0.1	1,163	92.1
3 months to 6 months				
6 months to 1 year				
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more			2	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1,260</b>	<b>99.8*</b>

#### Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			1	0.1
1 month to 3 months			1	0.1
3 months to 6 months				
6 months to 1 year				
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
<b>Total</b>			<b>2</b>	<b>0.2*</b>

Note: Length of stay due to PNomis bringing HMPs Acklington and Castington together in March 2012. Unable to do precise length of stays as no information for separate prisons available.

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		268	21.2
Sexual offences		385	30.5
Burglary		166	13.1
Robbery		135	10.7
Theft and handling		25	2.0
Fraud and forgery		16	1.3
Drugs offences		116	9.2
Other offences	1	151	12.0
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1262</b>	<b>100</b>

# Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

---

## Prisoner survey methodology

---

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

### Choosing the sample size

---

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

At the time of the survey on the 6 June 2012 the prisoner population at Northumberland was 1272. The sample size was 230. Overall, this represented 18% of the prisoner population.

### Selecting the sample

---

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

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

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

## Methodology

---

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

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

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

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

## Response rates

---

In total, 208 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 16% of the prison population. The response rate was 90%. In addition to the 13 respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, seven questionnaires were not returned and two were returned blank.

## Comparisons

---

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in category C trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 37 category C trainer prisons since April 2007.
- 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 the VP wings (house blocks 6, 7, 8, and 9) and the rest of the establishment.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the Acklington site and the Castington site.

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

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

## Summary

---

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question as well as examples of comments made by prisoners. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%. No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages to certain responses within the summary, for example 'Not sentenced' options across questions, may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates

across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data is excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data is cleaned to be consistent.

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



# Survey results

## Section 1: About you

<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	<i>Under 21</i> .....	1	(0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i> .....	79	(38%)
	<i>30 - 39</i> .....	63	(30%)
	<i>40 - 49</i> .....	26	(13%)
	<i>50 - 59</i> .....	21	(10%)
	<i>60 - 69</i> .....	16	(8%)
	<i>70 and over</i> .....	2	(1%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	182	(88%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i> .....	26	(13%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i> .....	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i> .....	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i> .....	0	(0%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	0	(0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i> .....	2	(1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i> .....	8	(4%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i> .....	32	(16%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i> .....	41	(20%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i> .....	82	(41%)
	<i>10 years or more</i> .....	10	(5%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i> .....	20	(10%)
	<i>Life</i> .....	7	(3%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	5	(2%)
	<i>No</i> .....	200	(98%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	206	(100%)
	<i>No</i> .....	0	(0%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	206	(99%)
	<i>No</i> .....	2	(1%)
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish) ....</i>	192 (93%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	2 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> ..... 1 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i> .....	6 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> .....
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....	1 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i> ....	1 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> ..... 0 (0%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> .....	3 (1%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i> .....	1 (0%)		

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	5 (2%)
<i>No</i> .....	198 (98%)

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

<i>None</i> .....	65 (31%)	<i>Hindu</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i> .....	86 (41%)	<i>Jewish</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i> .....	31 (15%)	<i>Muslim</i> .....	6 (3%)
<i>Protestant</i> .....	7 (3%)	<i>Sikh</i> .....	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i> .....	5 (2%)	<i>Other</i> .....	4 (2%)
<i>Buddhist</i> .....	4 (2%)		

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

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i> .....	202 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i> .....	3 (1%)
<i>Bisexual</i> .....	2 (1%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	39 (19%)
<i>No</i> .....	169 (81%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	11 (5%)
<i>No</i> .....	197 (95%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	81 (39%)
<i>No</i> .....	127 (61%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	104 (50%)
<i>No</i> .....	104 (50%)

**Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts**

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	130 (63%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	69 (33%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	9 (4%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i> .....	130 (63%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	45 (22%)
<i>No</i> .....	29 (14%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3 (1%)

<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i> .....	130 (63%)
	Yes.....	14 (7%)
	No.....	61 (29%)
	Don't remember.....	3 (1%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes.....	144 (70%)
	No.....	52 (25%)
	Don't remember.....	11 (5%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes.....	178 (86%)
	No.....	28 (14%)
	Don't remember.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	56 (27%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	97 (47%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	41 (20%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	4 (2%)
	Don't remember.....	7 (3%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i> .....	133 (64%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i> .....	24 (12%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i> .....	49 (24%)
	Don't remember.....	5 (2%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes.....	192 (92%)
	No.....	12 (6%)
	Don't remember.....	4 (2%)

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

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	121 (58%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	71 (34%)
	Don't remember.....	15 (7%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes.....	180 (87%)
	No.....	22 (11%)
	Don't remember.....	5 (2%)
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	54 (26%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	98 (47%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	38 (18%)

<i>Badly</i> .....	11 (5%)
<i>Very badly</i> .....	3 (1%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	3 (1%)

**Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

<i>Loss of property</i> .....	23 (11%)	<i>Physical health</i> .....	15 (7%)
<i>Housing problems</i> .....	15 (7%)	<i>Mental health</i> .....	30 (15%)
<i>Contacting employers</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> .....	7 (3%)
<i>Contacting family</i> .....	31 (15%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> .....	32 (16%)
<i>Childcare</i> .....	2 (1%)	<i>Other</i> .....	6 (3%)
<i>Money worries</i> .....	20 (10%)	<b><i>Did not have any problems</i></b> .....	100 (50%)
<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> ..	28 (14%)		

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	40 (20%)
<i>No</i> .....	62 (31%)
<b><i>Did not have any problems</i></b> .....	100 (50%)

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

<i>Tobacco</i> .....	161 (78%)
<i>A shower</i> .....	55 (27%)
<i>A free telephone call</i> .....	111 (54%)
<i>Something to eat</i> .....	116 (56%)
<i>PIN phone credit</i> .....	113 (55%)
<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i> .....	97 (47%)
<b><i>Did not receive anything</i></b> .....	13 (6%)

**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> .....	121 (60%)
<i>Someone from health services</i> .....	151 (75%)
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> .....	60 (30%)
<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i> .....	44 (22%)
<b><i>Did not have access to any of these</i></b> .....	27 (13%)

**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> .....	105 (53%)
<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> .....	88 (44%)
<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> .....	102 (51%)
<i>Your entitlement to visits</i> .....	97 (49%)
<i>Health services</i> .....	111 (56%)
<i>Chaplaincy</i> .....	103 (52%)
<b><i>Not offered any information</i></b> .....	56 (28%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	180 (87%)
<i>No</i> .....	20 (10%)
<i>Don't remember</i> .....	6 (3%)

<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	15 (7%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	142 (69%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	42 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	7 (3%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	15 (7%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	136 (67%)
	<i>No</i> .....	36 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	15 (7%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i> .....	39 (20%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	56 (28%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	77 (39%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	27 (14%)

## Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to:</b>						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	27 (14%)	67 (34%)	33 (17%)	31 (16%)	14 (7%)	26 (13%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	29 (16%)	70 (39%)	25 (14%)	7 (4%)	4 (2%)	44 (25%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	9 (6%)	19 (12%)	31 (19%)	16 (10%)	11 (7%)	74 (46%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters</i> .....						36 (18%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....						66 (33%)
	<i>No</i> .....						97 (49%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						73 (37%)
	<i>No</i> .....						7 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....						120 (60%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	148 (73%)	55 (27%)	1 (0%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	199 (98%)	5 (2%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	177 (88%)	24 (12%)	1 (0%)			

<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	135 (67%)	65 (32%)	2 (1%)
<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	73 (36%)	60 (29%)	71 (35%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	141 (69%)	61 (30%)	2 (1%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	67 (33%)	58 (29%)	78 (38%)

**Q4.5 What is the food like here?**

<i>Very good</i> .....	4 (2%)
<i>Good</i> .....	44 (22%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	52 (26%)
<i>Bad</i> .....	64 (32%)
<i>Very bad</i> .....	39 (19%)

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

<i>Have not bought anything yet/don't know</i> .....	5 (2%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	93 (46%)
<i>No</i> .....	105 (52%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	104 (51%)
<i>No</i> .....	21 (10%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	78 (38%)

**Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	94 (47%)
<i>No</i> .....	16 (8%)
<i>Don't know/N/A</i> .....	91 (45%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	134 (66%)
<i>No</i> .....	2 (1%)
<i>Don't know/N/A</i> .....	67 (33%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i> .....	69 (34%)
<i>Very easy</i> .....	48 (24%)
<i>Easy</i> .....	32 (16%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	8 (4%)
<i>Difficult</i> .....	6 (3%)
<i>Very difficult</i> .....	4 (2%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	37 (18%)

## Section 5: Applications and complaints

**Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	154 (76%)
<i>No</i> .....	39 (19%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (4%)

<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications:</b> (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		<b>Not made one</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	24 (13%)	107 (57%)	58 (31%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	24 (13%)	85 (46%)	77 (41%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....			114 (57%)
	No .....			25 (13%)
	Don't know .....			61 (31%)
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints:</b> (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		<b>Not made one</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	110 (55%)	42 (21%)	49 (24%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	110 (57%)	42 (22%)	42 (22%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>			
	Yes .....			24 (13%)
	No .....			163 (87%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>			
	<b>Don't know who they are</b> .....			80 (40%)
	Very easy .....			17 (9%)
	Easy .....			37 (19%)
	Neither .....			35 (18%)
	Difficult .....			15 (8%)
	Very difficult .....			15 (8%)

## Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)</b>			
	<b>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</b> .....			9 (4%)
	Yes .....			109 (54%)
	No .....			64 (32%)
	Don't know .....			19 (9%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)</b>			
	<b>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</b> .....			9 (5%)
	Yes .....			93 (47%)
	No .....			75 (38%)
	Don't know .....			20 (10%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&amp;R)?</b>			
	Yes .....			9 (4%)
	No .....			193 (96%)

<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i> .....	171 (88%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	6 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	3 (2%)

## Section 7: Relationships with staff

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	167 (82%)
	<i>No</i> .....	37 (18%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	164 (81%)
	<i>No</i> .....	38 (19%)
<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	62 (30%)
	<i>No</i> .....	142 (70%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	7 (3%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	23 (11%)
	<i>Rarely</i> .....	50 (25%)
	<i>Some of the time</i> .....	69 (34%)
	<i>Most of the time</i> .....	33 (16%)
	<i>All of the time</i> .....	22 (11%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	57 (28%)
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	85 (41%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	30 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	33 (16%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i> .....	57 (30%)
	<i>Very helpful</i> .....	57 (30%)
	<i>Helpful</i> .....	37 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	19 (10%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i> .....	14 (7%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i> .....	6 (3%)

## Section 8: Safety

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	54 (27%)
	<i>No</i> .....	148 (73%)



<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>		
	Yes .....	16 (8%)	
	No .....	178 (92%)	
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<b>Never felt unsafe</b> .....	148 (74%)	<b>At mealtimes</b> .....
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	13 (7%)	<i>At health services</i> .....
	<i>Segregation unit</i> .....	2 (1%)	<i>Visits area</i> .....
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	24 (12%)	<i>In wing showers</i> .....
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	5 (3%)	<i>In gym showers</i> .....
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	10 (5%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	16 (8%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....
	<i>At work</i> .....	6 (3%)	<i>In your cell</i> .....
	<i>During movement</i> .....	20 (10%)	<i>At religious services</i> .....
	<i>At education</i> .....	7 (4%)	
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>		
	Yes .....	42 (21%)	
	No .....	158 (79%)	
<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> .....	17 (9%)	
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	12 (6%)	
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	5 (3%)	
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	26 (13%)	
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	5 (3%)	
	<i>Medication</i> .....	5 (3%)	
	<i>Debt</i> .....	11 (6%)	
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	7 (4%)	
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	2 (1%)	
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	3 (2%)	
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	1 (1%)	
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	5 (3%)	
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	2 (1%)	
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	1 (1%)	
	<i>Your age</i> .....	1 (1%)	
	<i>You have a disability</i> .....	2 (1%)	
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	7 (4%)	
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	13 (7%)	
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	6 (3%)	
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>		
	Yes .....	42 (21%)	
	No .....	157 (79%)	
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> .....	18 (9%)	
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	6 (3%)	
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)	
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	18 (9%)	
	<i>Medication</i> .....	7 (4%)	
	<i>Debt</i> .....	5 (3%)	
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	5 (3%)	

Your race or ethnic origin .....	1 (1%)
Your religion/religious beliefs .....	2 (1%)
Your nationality .....	1 (1%)
You are from a different part of the country than others.....	6 (3%)
You are from a traveller community .....	0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation .....	1 (1%)
Your age.....	1 (1%)
You have a disability .....	2 (1%)
You were new here.....	5 (3%)
Your offence/ crime .....	10 (5%)
Gang related issues .....	4 (2%)

**Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?**

<b>Not been victimised</b> .....	139 (76%)
Yes .....	13 (7%)
No .....	31 (17%)

### 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	24 (12%)	13 (6%)	58 (29%)	26 (13%)	64 (32%)	16 (8%)
The nurse	19 (10%)	36 (19%)	84 (43%)	32 (16%)	21 (11%)	2 (1%)
The dentist	47 (25%)	6 (3%)	20 (11%)	14 (7%)	44 (23%)	59 (31%)

**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	34 (17%)	21 (10%)	62 (31%)	22 (11%)	43 (21%)	20 (10%)
The nurse	22 (11%)	37 (19%)	68 (35%)	34 (18%)	22 (11%)	11 (6%)
The dentist	65 (35%)	21 (11%)	32 (17%)	22 (12%)	19 (10%)	28 (15%)

**Q9.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?**

<b>Not been</b> .....	19 (9%)
<b>Very good</b> .....	18 (9%)
<b>Good</b> .....	64 (32%)
<b>Neither</b> .....	27 (13%)
<b>Bad</b> .....	41 (20%)
<b>Very bad</b> .....	33 (16%)

**Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?**

Yes .....	93 (46%)
No .....	110 (54%)

**Q9.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?**

<b>Not taking medication</b> .....	110 (54%)
Yes, all my meds.....	70 (34%)
Yes, some of my meds .....	11 (5%)
No .....	12 (6%)

**Q9.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?**

Yes .....	48 (24%)
No .....	153 (76%)

<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison</b> (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<b>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</b> .....	153 (77%)
	Yes .....	25 (13%)
	No .....	20 (10%)

## Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	49 (24%)
	No .....	154 (76%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	46 (23%)
	No .....	157 (77%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy .....	52 (26%)
	Easy .....	24 (12%)
	Neither .....	16 (8%)
	Difficult .....	6 (3%)
	Very difficult .....	8 (4%)
	Don't know .....	94 (47%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy .....	29 (15%)
	Easy .....	26 (13%)
	Neither .....	20 (10%)
	Difficult .....	9 (5%)
	Very difficult .....	14 (7%)
	Don't know .....	101 (51%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	26 (13%)
	No .....	176 (87%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	13 (7%)
	No .....	186 (93%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<b>Did not/do not have a drug problem</b> .....	141 (72%)
	Yes .....	30 (15%)
	No .....	25 (13%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<b>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</b> .....	157 (79%)
	Yes .....	24 (12%)
	No .....	18 (9%)

<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i> .....	158 (80%)
	Yes .....	33 (17%)
	No .....	7 (4%)

## Section 11: Activities

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	
						<i>Very difficult</i>	
	Prison job	18 (9%)	22 (11%)	59 (30%)	24 (12%)	48 (24%)	27 (14%)
	Vocational or skills training	38 (20%)	13 (7%)	50 (27%)	23 (12%)	44 (24%)	18 (10%)
	Education (including basic skills)	26 (14%)	19 (10%)	68 (37%)	23 (13%)	35 (19%)	13 (7%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	55 (30%)	5 (3%)	26 (14%)	19 (10%)	37 (20%)	44 (24%)

<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i> .....	34 (17%)
	Prison job .....	104 (52%)
	Vocational or skills training .....	30 (15%)
	Education (including basic skills) .....	66 (33%)
	Offending behaviour programmes .....	18 (9%)

<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	34 (20%)	51 (31%)	74 (44%)	8 (5%)
	Vocational or skills training	42 (31%)	48 (36%)	37 (27%)	8 (6%)
	Education (including basic skills)	33 (21%)	69 (43%)	48 (30%)	9 (6%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	54 (39%)	38 (28%)	35 (26%)	10 (7%)

<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	47 (23%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	50 (25%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....	42 (21%)
	<i>About once a week</i> .....	57 (28%)
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....	5 (2%)

<b>Q11.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>	
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....	80 (40%)
	Yes .....	68 (34%)
	No .....	51 (26%)

<b>Q11.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	58 (29%)
	0 .....	35 (18%)
	1 to 2 .....	32 (16%)
	3 to 5 .....	51 (26%)
	More than 5 .....	24 (12%)

<b>Q11.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	17 (9%)
	0 .....	30 (15%)
	1 to 2 .....	63 (32%)
	3 to 5 .....	40 (20%)
	More than 5 .....	50 (25%)
<b>Q11.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	3 (2%)
	0 .....	5 (3%)
	1 to 2 .....	7 (4%)
	3 to 5 .....	14 (7%)
	More than 5 .....	171 (86%)
<b>Q11.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	36 (18%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....	22 (11%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....	29 (14%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....	55 (27%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....	30 (15%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....	23 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	6 (3%)

## Section 12: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	78 (39%)
	No .....	121 (61%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes .....	94 (47%)
	No .....	105 (53%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes .....	31 (16%)
	No .....	166 (84%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	39 (19%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	24 (12%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	50 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	18 (9%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	39 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	29 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	3 (1%)

## Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	0 (0%)
	Yes .....	177 (90%)
	No .....	19 (10%)
Q13.2	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced/NA</i> .....	19 (10%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	47 (24%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	63 (32%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	36 (18%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	81 (41%)
Q13.3	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	152 (77%)
	No .....	45 (23%)
Q13.4	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	0 (0%)
	Yes .....	135 (77%)
	No .....	40 (23%)
Q13.5	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	40 (20%)
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	24 (12%)
	<i>Involved</i> .....	39 (20%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	20 (10%)
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	31 (16%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	46 (23%)
Q13.6	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	40 (21%)
	<i>Nobody</i> .....	60 (31%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i> .....	59 (31%)
	<i>Offender manager</i> .....	49 (26%)
	<i>Named/personal officer</i> .....	24 (13%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i> .....	25 (13%)
Q13.7	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	40 (20%)
	Yes .....	84 (43%)
	No .....	34 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	39 (20%)
Q13.8	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	40 (20%)
	Yes .....	19 (10%)
	No .....	92 (46%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	48 (24%)

**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* ..... 40 (20%)  
 Yes ..... 35 (18%)  
 No ..... 51 (26%)  
 Don't know ..... 72 (36%)

**Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?**  
 Yes ..... 11 (6%)  
 No ..... 76 (39%)  
 Don't know ..... 108 (55%)

**Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?**  
 Yes ..... 35 (18%)  
 No ..... 158 (82%)

**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	52 (28%)	55 (30%)	76 (42%)
Accommodation	49 (26%)	52 (28%)	84 (45%)
Benefits	44 (24%)	62 (34%)	79 (43%)
Finances	46 (26%)	40 (23%)	90 (51%)
Education	61 (35%)	45 (26%)	68 (39%)
Drugs and alcohol	68 (38%)	51 (29%)	59 (33%)

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

*Not sentenced* ..... 0 (0%)  
 Yes ..... 103 (55%)  
 No ..... 84 (45%)

## Main comparator



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Northumberland 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 Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>208</b>	<b>5615</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	3%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	13%	9%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%	6%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	10%	10%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	3%	26%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	3%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	16%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	39%	35%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	50%	52%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	33%	44%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	58%	66%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	18%	8%
2.4	Was the van clean?	70%	67%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	86%	81%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	64%	62%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	12%	16%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	88%



## Main comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	59%	48%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	73%	71%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	51%	62%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	11%	16%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	7%	16%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	15%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	10%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	14%	13%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	7%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	15%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	16%	21%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	39%	40%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	78%	82%
3.6	A shower?	27%	35%
3.6	A free telephone call?	54%	44%
3.6	Something to eat?	56%	72%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	55%	56%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	47%	37%

## Main comparator

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>		
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	60%	53%
3.7 Someone from health services?	75%	75%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	30%	39%
3.7 Prison shop/canteen?	22%	17%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	53%	52%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	44%	46%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	51%	43%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	49%	46%
3.8 Health services?	56%	58%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	52%	50%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	87%	83%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	93%	93%
For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	73%	65%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	80%	87%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>		
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	48%	48%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	55%	53%
4.1 Get bail information?	18%	16%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	42%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	37%	45%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	73%	62%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	91%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	88%	81%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	67%	74%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	41%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	69%	70%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	33%	30%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	24%	29%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	46%	45%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	51%	59%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	54%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	58%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	39%	55%

## Main comparator

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator	
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse			
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details			
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference			
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	86%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	65%	62%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	53%	51%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	66%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	46%	34%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	50%	40%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	13%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	27%	32%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	54%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	47%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	5%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	42%	45%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	76%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	81%	74%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	30%	32%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	27%	19%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	72%	76%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	71%	62%

## Main comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	27%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	13%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	21%	19%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	11%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	3%

## Main comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	21%	24%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	30%	40%

## Main comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	36%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	62%	59%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	14%	14%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
9.2	The doctor?	49%	50%
9.2	The nurse?	61%	64%
9.2	The dentist?	43%	44%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	45%	45%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	46%	45%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	87%	85%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	24%	25%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	56%	49%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	24%	22%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	23%	16%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	38%	29%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	28%	16%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	13%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	7%	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?	55%	65%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	57%	68%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	82%	81%

## Main comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	41%	47%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	34%	40%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	47%	52%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	19%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	52%	63%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	15%	19%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	33%	29%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	9%	16%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	80%	86%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	38%	46%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	69%	78%
	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?	52%	65%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	79%	83%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	55%	67%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	61%	77%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	46%	58%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	31%	49%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	34%	49%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	38%	36%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	45%	48%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	86%	77%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	12%	15%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	39%	37%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	47%	43%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	16%	27%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	37%	27%

## Main comparator

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Northumberland 2012	Cat C trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	90%	83%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	27%	32%
13.2	Contact by letter?	36%	39%
13.2	Contact by phone?	20%	26%
13.2	Contact by visit?	46%	36%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	77%	68%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	77%	71%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	39%	57%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	40%	44%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	39%	35%
13.6	Offender manager?	32%	29%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	16%	14%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	17%	19%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	54%	70%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	12%	23%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	22%	30%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	18%
	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?	42%	39%
13.12	Accommodation?	38%	45%
13.12	Benefits?	44%	44%
13.12	Finances?	31%	35%
13.12	Education?	40%	41%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	46%	50%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	55%	56%



## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Northumberland 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
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>169</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	2%	3%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	99%	98%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	0%	4%	0%	4%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	2%	3%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	4%	0%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			26%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	13%	4%	16%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	34%	40%	59%	34%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	69%	75%	76%	73%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	63%	65%	76%	62%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	88%	84%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	71%	74%	82%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	82%	43%	58%	49%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	68%	76%	75%	75%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	91%	84%	88%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	84%	95%	92%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	48%	56%	46%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	62%	75%	87%	69%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	98%	98%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	38%	35%	41%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	11%	26%	30%	22%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	31%	49%	47%	45%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	46%	52%	74%	46%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	37%	49%	69%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	68%	71%	65%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	56%	81%	89%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	57%	50%	59%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	29%	59%	45%	56%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	43%	48%	54%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	4%	0%	5%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	86%	90%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	69%	84%	95%	78%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	16%	29%	37%	25%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	74%	72%	87%	69%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	19%	21%	28%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	40%	2%	6%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	53%	14%	19%	22%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	33%	9%	14%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	1%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	3%	0%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	0%	3%	1%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	43%	17%	16%	22%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	20%	7%	8%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	3%	0%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	3%	0%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	6%	0%	3%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	29%	37%	29%	37%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	67%	61%	68%	61%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	74%	39%	72%	40%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	47%	18%	16%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	51%	35%	17%	43%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	43%	54%	53%	52%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	19%	14%	21%	14%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	33%	37%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	10%	10%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	17%	34%	29%	31%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%	40%	13%	43%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	40%	46%	43%	45%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	88%	73%	88%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	8%	12%	18%	10%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	58%	45%	40%	49%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	14%	22%	14%



## Prisoner survey responses HMP Northumberland 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	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		80	127
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	8%	16%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	8%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	14%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	1%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	4%	3%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	3%	3%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	6%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	24%	16%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	9%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	61%	25%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	42%	55%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	42%	27%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	84%	88%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	67%	63%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	89%	95%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	59%	58%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	71%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	59%	45%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	9%	13%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	5%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	19%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	8%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	21%	10%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	11%	6%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	20%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%	14%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	69%	84%
3.6	A shower?	30%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	59%	51%
3.6	Something to eat?	62%	53%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	40%	64%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	55%	42%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	54%	64%
3.7	Someone from health services?	72%	76%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	41%	23%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	24%	21%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	55%	51%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	45%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	46%	55%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	45%	51%
3.8	Health services?	53%	58%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	47%	55%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	91%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	91%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	78%	82%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	51%	46%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	49%	59%
4.1	Get bail information?	18%	17%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	32%	34%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	37%	36%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	80%	68%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	95%	83%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	72%	63%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42%	32%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	78%	64%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	42%	27%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	24%	23%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	51%	42%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	74%	37%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	39%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	73%	62%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	41%	38%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	77%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	60%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	10%	14%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	39%	20%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	49%	58%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	57%	41%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	5%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	86%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	86%	78%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	41%	24%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	29%	26%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	84%	65%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	34%	22%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	9%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	31%	15%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	3%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	21%	8%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	14%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	2%



**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	19%	22%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	12%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	3%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	1%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	33%	37%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	66%	59%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	15%	13%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	61%	36%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	28%	21%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	14%	31%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	18%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	26%	46%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	17%	34%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	19%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%	6%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	53%	33%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	37%	32%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	53%	44%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	23%	13%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	63%	45%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	13%	17%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	34%	32%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	14%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	23%	36%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	34%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	30%	42%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	36%	51%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	82%	88%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	14%	10%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	44%	36%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	44%	50%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	16%	16%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	30%	41%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP Wings	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	82%	74%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	5%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	18%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Northumberland 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

		Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	13%	12%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	7%	4%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	7%	11%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	2%	4%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	3%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	32%	42%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	62%	45%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	22%	38%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	94%	84%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	78%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	65%	64%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	94%	92%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	70%	54%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	92%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	70%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	40%	55%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	11%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	10%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	8%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	7%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	10%	16%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	5%	8%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	7%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	13%	17%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	85%	75%
3.6	A shower?	30%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	68%	48%
3.6	Something to eat?	48%	60%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	70%	49%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	52%	45%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	66%	57%
3.7	Someone from health services?	75%	75%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	20%	34%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	24%	21%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	45%	56%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	36%	48%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	52%	51%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	41%	52%
3.8	Health services?	55%	56%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	52%	52%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	97%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	93%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	90%	76%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:			
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	47%	48%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	62%	52%
4.1	Get bail information?	18%	17%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	33%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	47%	32%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:			
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	78%	71%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	90%	87%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	69%	66%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	36%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	69%	69%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	28%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	32%	20%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	48%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	19%	65%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	40%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	73%	63%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	49%	35%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	88%	71%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	63%	55%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	7%	15%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	21%	30%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	61%	51%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	42%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	6%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	90%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	85%	80%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	26%	32%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	36%	23%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	70%	73%



## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	23%	28%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	9%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	16%	23%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:			
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	4%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	7%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	15%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	3%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	13%	25%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	9%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	52%	29%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	67%	60%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	15%	13%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	40%	48%
9.6	Do you have any emotional wellbeing or mental health problems?	16%	27%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	25%	24%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	19%	24%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	47%	34%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	41%	22%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	19%	10%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	8%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	39%	42%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	42%	31%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	59%	42%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	19%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	45%	55%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	20%	13%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	31%	34%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	43%	26%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	43%	31%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	45%	35%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55%	41%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	89%	84%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	13%	11%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	45%	37%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	48%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	16%	16%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	44%	34%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Castington Site	Acklington Site
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	91%	90%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	21%	29%
13.2	Contact by letter?	42%	33%
13.2	Contact by phone?	17%	22%
13.2	Contact by visit?	48%	45%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	73%	79%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	83%	75%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	42%	38%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	30%	44%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	39%	39%
13.6	Offender manager?	34%	32%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	14%	17%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	18%	16%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	57%	52%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	17%	10%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	19%	24%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	2%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	15%	19%
	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?	46%	41%
13.12	Accommodation?	41%	38%
13.12	Benefits?	49%	42%
13.12	Finances?	32%	30%
13.12	Education?	39%	40%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	52%	44%
	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?	56%	55%