

Report on an announced inspection of
HMP & YOI Thorn Cross

13–17 February 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary	9
1 Safety	17
<hr/>	
2 Respect	27
<hr/>	
3 Purposeful activity	39
<hr/>	
4 Resettlement	45
<hr/>	
5 Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	53
<hr/>	
Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	59
II Prison population profile	60
III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	62

Introduction

This is the latest in a series of good inspection reports of the open establishment, HMP & YO1 Thorn Cross, near Warrington. In recent years, the population profile of the establishment has altered and it now holds young adult prisoners from the age of 18 up to 25. Change, however, does not appear to have effected performance and our findings suggest that this is one of the better establishments in the prison estate.

Thorn Cross continued to be a safe prison. Prisoners reported feeling safe and levels of violence were low and were reducing further still. Far from there being any sense of complacency about this, instances of anti-social behaviour were properly challenged with a number of meaningful interventions or options to address violent or bullying behaviour. Incidents of self-harm were similarly low, but again, those in crisis were well cared for.

Security was appropriate and proportionate to the requirements of an open prison environment and abscond rates were low. However, the application of some rules was unnecessary and, in our view, formal disciplinary procedures were too easily invoked. The segregation unit was a good facility, and although the level of throughput was high, stays were not excessive.

The general environment was reasonably good, although some facilities could have benefitted from refurbishment. Overall, our assessment of the quality of staff-prisoner relationships was positive, but it was the repeated view of a significant minority that staff were often petty in their attitudes towards some prisoners. Arrangements to promote diversity were mixed with some aspects being weak. The persistent negative perceptions held by some black and minority ethnic prisoners, required more enquiry and attention. We were also concerned about the needless and excessive practice of segregating foreign national prisoners when they first arrived in order to check their status again, which were issues that should have been dealt with prior to allocation.

Prisoners' complaints and applications were dealt with adequately but quality assurance arrangements could have been better. The provision of health care was good. Prisoners' perceptions about the food were poor despite some reasonable menus and opportunities to dine in association.

The provision of activity was very good. Learning and skills management was effective, with a clear focus on resettlement. There was sufficient activity to occupy all and recent increases in the amount of vocational training on offer. The number of prisoners able to work out in the community had also increased significantly with up to 60 working out daily. The majority of prisoners were engaged in some form of learning and skills, and the quality of what was on offer was good with an increase of just under a third in the number of learners achieving qualifications.

Resettlement provision seemed to have improved since our last visit. There was a reasonable strategic focus on resettlement despite an only partial analysis of specific prisoner need. All prisoners had a sentence plan, although these concentrated more on matching individuals to what was on offer in the establishment rather than a more sophisticated assessment of risk and a plan to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. Provision across the resettlement pathways was reasonably good despite limited offending behaviour work, and the prison was confident in its use of temporary release to support resettlement. There was also some effective through the gate mentoring support for a number of released prisoners.

As indicated on our last inspection, Thorn Cross continues to be a high performing and effective prison. In three of our four healthy prison assessments, we have awarded our highest marking, and managers and staff should be commended for this. This report highlights a small number of important issues requiring improvement and our recommendations will, hopefully, assist in that process.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2012

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Thorn Cross is an integrated open establishment holding adult and young adult men between 18 and 25.

Prison status

Public

Region

North West

Number held

4.1.12: 304

Certified normal accommodation

322

Operational capacity

322

Date of last full inspection

18–22 April 2005

Brief history

Thorn Cross opened in December 1985 as an open youth custody centre on a former Royal Naval air station site that had been converted into an open prison for adults after the war. It held juveniles until May 2008 when it was re-roled to take young adults aged 18–25. It now operates regimes for young adults aged 18–21, adults aged 21–25, and the high intensity training (HIT) unit, which opened in July 1996.

Short description of residential units

Unit 1 – 18–21-year-olds

Unit 2 – 18–21-year-olds, mandatory drug testing unit

Unit 3 – 21–25-year-olds, induction unit

Unit 4 – 21–25-year-olds

Unit 5 – 18–21-year-olds, HIT unit

Unit 6 - care and separation unit

Independent living unit (ILU)

- top floor – 18–21-year-old HIT unit
- ground floor – adults working outside

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and provider

Commissioner: Warrington Health Consortium

Provider: Bridgewater Community Healthcare NHS Trust

Learning and skills provider

The Manchester College

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

HP1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, immigration detention facilities and police 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 The reception had been refurbished and was welcoming. Some prisoners reported inappropriate staff banter and frustration at confiscation of property allowed by other prisons. Levels of violence had reduced and there was an impressive range of interventions to tackle antisocial behaviour. Most prisoners said they felt safe. Prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm were well cared for. Security was generally proportionate. Some adjudications should have been dealt with less formally, and warnings were too often used for trivial matters. The segregation unit was a decent and well-managed area. There was little evidence of a significant drugs problem and substance use services were good. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were good.
- HP6 Prisoners were generally positive about their treatment by escort staff, but some had long waits on vehicles outside reception during the lunch period. Reception had recently been refurbished to a good standard and was welcoming, and the reception process was quick. Some prisoners reported rudeness and inappropriate banter by reception staff. There was also much frustration that items approved in other prisons were not allowed at Thorn Cross. Some new arrivals had been strip searched, and at least one member of staff wrongly thought that it was policy to do so. Initial needs and risk assessment was adequate and first night arrangements were thorough. Peer mentors were available on all units. Induction was multidisciplinary and thorough.
- HP7 Prisoners generally reported feeling safe at Thorn Cross. Levels of violence were reasonably low and reducing. Antisocial and violent behaviour was robustly challenged. The range of interventions was impressive, and included mediation and a violence reduction workshop. Victims were well supported. Violence reduction and antisocial behaviour data were appropriately collated and analysed.
- HP8 There were few incidents of self-harm. Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents reflected good support through a multidisciplinary approach, and there was effective quality assurance of ACCTs. Follow-up support and access to peer mentors were also good.
- HP9 Security was broadly proportionate. A good number of security information reports was submitted and efficiently processed. Required actions, including searching and suspicion drug testing, were reasonably successful. Relationships with the local police were constructive and abscond rates were reasonably low. The mandatory drug test positive rate was also relatively low. Recent concerns over the misuse of anabolic steroids and some newer drugs had been addressed proactively and effectively.

- HP10 There was some frivolous use of warnings under the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, and it was unacceptable that prisoners on basic regime had their room power switched off as a matter of policy. All IEP boards were now quality assured monthly.
- HP11 Adjudication procedures were overused and some charges should have been dealt with less formally. Records of adjudications were mostly good but a minority suggested insufficient exploration before a finding of guilt. Quality assurance lacked rigour.
- HP12 Force was little used and most documentation was completed reasonably well. However, paperwork did not always reflect efforts to de-escalate, and quality assurance was not rigorous enough.
- HP13 The segregation unit provided a decent living environment with an adequate regime. Staff were knowledgeable about residents and engaged positively with them. The average length of stay was not excessive, but throughput was high, particularly for offences pending adjudication that did not always warrant segregation. For those segregated for reasons of order or discipline, reviews were multidisciplinary, but paperwork often lacked detail. It was inappropriate that visits took place on the unit, even for some residents who did not pose an abscond risk. Strip searching on entry to the unit was not always appropriately justified.
- HP14 A well-integrated and responsive clinical substance use service provided well for the needs of the population.

Respect

- HP15 The environment was relatively clean, but some areas needed refurbishment. The independent living unit was a good resource but had unmet potential. Staff-prisoner relationships were variable and some prisoners complained of disrespectful staff behaviour. Some rules were inappropriate for the population. Strategic management of diversity and equality was underdeveloped, although there was some good work to support minority groups. Faith provision was excellent. Replies to complaints were generally good. There was effective health services provision. We received many complaints about the quality of food. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- HP16 Residential units were generally clean and free from graffiti, but toilets on unit 2 needed deep cleaning and refurbishment. There was inadequate drainage in the unit shower blocks. There was only one washing machine and dryer for most units, and machines regularly broke down. The prison grounds were well kept and attractive. Applications were normally responded to quickly and courteously. Some rules, such as prisoners not being able to wear their own clothes, were inappropriate for an open prison. Additional telephones had been installed on most units but the one on the independent living unit (ILU) had been out of order for some time. The independent living unit did not provide enough opportunities for practising independent living – for example, prisoners were not allowed to cook for themselves despite the unit's fully equipped kitchens – and there was no clear selection process for the unit.

- HP17 In our survey,¹ 61% of respondents said most staff treated them with respect. We saw some good staff-prisoner interactions and there was evidence of a caring staff approach in many parts of the prison. Attendance at prisoner consultation meetings had improved and actions were generally progressed. Most prisoners knew their personal officers and found them helpful. However, we received consistent reports of disrespectful and petty behaviour by some staff. Managers were attempting to address the problem and acknowledged that the staff culture had not kept up with the fact that an older population was now held in open conditions designed to encourage independent living. Most staff inappropriately used surnames alone in addressing prisoners.
- HP18 The diversity and equality policy was weak. The action plan was not comprehensive and not systematically followed up. Not all strands of diversity were discussed at the diversity and equality action team meetings. Consultation arrangements with prisoner diversity representatives were good and some had received training. They saw all new arrivals, but their profile among prisoners was often low thereafter. Diversity incident reports were infrequent and the quality of investigations was reasonably good.
- HP19 In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners were more negative than white prisoners about a number of issues, including feelings of safety and respectful treatment. This required longer-term investigation and action by the establishment. Ethnic monitoring had revealed a significant under-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners released on temporary licence, a disparity that had persisted for most of the previous two years without adequate investigation leading to action. A support network for the small number of Gypsy/Traveller prisoners was a promising recent development.
- HP20 Foreign nationals were rarely held but it was unacceptable that they were routinely located in the segregation unit on arrival pending confirmation of their status. There was effective identification of prisoners with disabilities, and particularly good support and outcomes for prisoners with learning difficulties. There had been good one-to-one support for a gay prisoner, and there was evidence that homophobic language and behaviour was actively challenged.
- HP21 Significantly fewer prisoners than the comparator (44% against 52%) said their religious beliefs were respected in the establishment. However, prisoners were very positive about the work of the chaplaincy and the provision for different faiths. Major religious festivals were well celebrated and community engagement was good. The

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

integration of the chaplaincy team, particularly in safer custody and some of the resettlement pathways, was a positive feature.

- HP22 Prisoners were positive about the speed and fairness of the response to complaints. In those we sampled, replies were generally respectful and addressed the complaint, but there were significant delays in completing quality assurance procedures. There was no trend analysis or discussion of patterns in complaints.
- HP23 Health services were good. The health care environment was clean, tidy and well equipped. There was effective health promotion and good consultation with prisoners on health issues. There was good access to primary care, and no substantial waiting lists. Dental and pharmacy services were effective. Prisoners could access secondary care in the community without difficulty. Mental health provision was appropriate and counselling was available.
- HP24 In our survey and prisoner groups, perceptions of food were overwhelmingly negative. There was inadequate food for those working out of the prison, and food sometimes ran out altogether as a result of poor supervision of servery. Menus appeared balanced and varied, and opportunities to dine in association were good. Consultation arrangements on the food and prison shop were effective, and the shop provided a reasonable range of goods.

Purposeful activity

HP25 Time out of room opportunities were good. There was good management of learning and skills and a clear focus on the resettlement needs of prisoners. There were enough purposeful activity places for the population. The range of vocational training had increased significantly, as had the amount of work available outside the prison. The quality of teaching and learning in vocational training and education was good. There had been a significant increase in the number of qualifications achieved. The library delivered a reasonable service. PE provision was good. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were good.

HP26 Prisoners were able to spend most of their time out of their rooms. Some unnecessary restrictions on their movement during the 'quiet time' had recently been lifted. Opportunities to exercise outside were limited during weekdays but good at weekends.

HP27 The learning and skills strategy was well informed and had a strong focus on employability. A wide range of external links provided a high quality work experience that supported prisoners' resettlement needs effectively. The education and vocational training areas were well managed. Teachers were well qualified and experienced, and workshops were properly equipped and maintained. Self-assessment was well embedded but data analysis was not sophisticated enough to inform managers about access to activities and achievement by different groups of prisoners.

HP28 There were sufficient purposeful activity places and the range of vocational training places had increased since the previous inspection to 172 full-time places. The number of working out spaces had also increased from 13 to 60. Three-quarters of the prison population participated in learning and skills, and a third were in work

activities internally or externally. Induction was satisfactory overall but prisoners received insufficient information about the activities available to them. The allocation process was sometimes ineffective at letting prisoners know the reasons for placing them in specific programmes. Some of the most popular vocational courses had such long waiting lists that prisoners had no realistic chance of starting them.

- HP29 The quality of learning in education was good. Art provision was particularly impressive and an excellent range of enrichment activities contributed towards the development of personal and life skills. The quality of teaching, coaching and learning in the vocational training workshops was good. The use of individual learning plans to recognise, record and monitor learners' progress was not consistently effective. Some prisoners were frustrated at the lack of opportunities to progress beyond level 1 qualifications, and a wider range at level 2 was due to be introduced. Learners benefited from good information, advice and guidance at different stages of their sentence, and good literacy and numeracy support.
- HP30 Achievement across the vast majority of programmes was high and the number of qualifications achieved had increased in the previous three years by approximately 30%. The development of personal and employability skills was good, and prisoners often worked to a higher level than required by the qualification. Most vocational training learners completed work to a good commercial standard. The quality of completed community projects reflected a high level of skills application and development. Attendance was good, although punctuality in a few sessions was poor.
- HP31 The library was satisfactory and offered adequate access. Around three-quarters of prisoners were library members and half were regular users. Library stock was satisfactory but the range of texts to support learning and skills provision was limited. Prisoners had insufficient access to computer-based learning resources. No orderlies worked in the library.
- HP32 Prisoners had good access to an effectively managed gym, which promoted healthy living well. Success rates for prisoners undertaking PE qualifications were high. There were adequate links with external partners and employers.

Resettlement

- HP33 There was reasonable strategic management of resettlement, and a whole-prison approach to supporting resettlement outcomes. A stronger focus was needed on meeting specific offending-related needs and evaluating outcomes. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used well and many prisoners worked outside the prison. Offender management and planning were generally effective. Public protection arrangements were sound. There was some good provision on most resettlement pathways, and excellent support for employment and training needs and for those in need of substance use services. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were good.
- HP34 The reducing reoffending delivery plan was reasonably comprehensive. A supporting needs analysis gave useful information on pathway need, but did not incorporate offender assessment system (OASys) information or evaluation of the offending behaviour requirements of the population. The bimonthly reducing reoffending policy committee was appropriately constituted and reasonably well attended. There had

been some promising evaluation of post-release outcomes for those on the high intensity training (HIT) unit, and more was under way. Such evaluation had not extended to the rest of the population.

- HP35 The HIT unit provided a disciplined environment and good incentives for prisoners working towards resettlement. However, some prisoners said they were poorly prepared for the rigours of the unit before arrival. The independent living unit had unmet potential (see paragraph HP16).
- HP36 All prisoners were assessed by, and allocated to, an offender supervisor, with around 98% subject to OASys assessment. Probation staff appropriately managed higher risk prisoners. All prisoners had a sentence plan, although contributions from departments across the prison were inconsistent and often concentrated on conduct rather than risk. Targets often focused on the provision available rather than what was needed. Despite these limitations, there was a clear focus on resettlement, supported by good use of ROTL and community work placements where possible. ROTL assessments were thorough and ROTL failure was commendably low.
- HP37 Public protection arrangements were appropriate. All prisoners were screened on arrival, and bimonthly inter-departmental risk management meetings reviewed all cases. Arrangements for prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP) were reasonable. All were allocated to probation staff and had early contact with an IPP prisoner mentor who offered guidance, information and support.
- HP38 Discharge meetings and exit surveys were used to plan and improve outcomes. Few prisoners had a significant housing issue and no one had been released without accommodation in the previous year. However, it was not clear what proportion had returned to settled rather than temporary accommodation. Around 30% of the population had identified debt problems, and a recently started Shelter contract now offered them help. Financial management courses were available through the education department and prisoners were able to open bank accounts.
- HP39 All prisoners received appropriate information, advice and guidance from a range of employment, training and education organisations, and there was a job club. Prisoners on the HIT unit received good support from New Bridge, including a mentoring service on release. The education department provided a useful employability course and there was a wide variety of external placements to introduce prisoners to the demands of employment on release. About a quarter of the population were on work experience through ROTL. In the previous six months, 15% of prisoners released entered education or training and 42% employment.
- HP40 Information on community health services was given to prisoners before release, and appropriate medication if needed. Nurses went to the discharge board and also saw prisoners individually. All components of the prison's strategic response to drugs and alcohol were innovative and well integrated with a wide range of services and interventions, both in the prison and in the community. Prisoners praised the committed CARAT workers.
- HP41 Most prisoners were able to maintain contact with their families through ROTL, town and home leave. Visits arrangements were good and the visits area was comfortable, although weekday visits were too short. Family links courses and regular family days were positive initiatives for those who needed them.

HP42 A significant number of prisoners were now transferred to Thorn Cross having undertaken little work on their offending behaviour, and many more required reinforcement of work previously completed. The thinking skills and short duration drug programmes were the only accredited offending behaviour courses. An anger management course was also delivered twice a year. Over half the population were currently convicted of a violent offence with no specific programme to meet potential needs. Some useful victim awareness and restorative justice work had been developed.

Main concerns and recommendations

HP43 **Concern:** We received many reports of disrespectful staff behaviour and the staff culture did not adequately acknowledge that an older population was held in open conditions and being prepared for return to the community.

Recommendation: Staff behaviour towards prisoners should reflect a positive and respectful culture that actively supports prisoners in their attempts to prepare for independent living on release.

HP44 **Concern:** A number of prisoners came to Thorn Cross needing offending related interventions. There was only limited evaluation of post-release offending outcomes and the extent to which offending related needs had been met.

Recommendation: The prison should meet prisoners' offence-related needs and undertake ongoing post-release analysis to assess the impact of the various aspects of its resettlement work.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Prisoners were generally positive about their escorts, although some experienced long delays waiting on vans outside reception. Escort records had been fully completed. Vans were clean but not all cameras functioned.
- 1.2 Prisoners reported generally good experiences of escorts, although some had long delays waiting on vans outside reception when it was closed over the lunch period. In our survey, 32% of respondents said they had spent more than two hours on a van, which was significantly more than the 18% in 2005. Prisoners confirmed they had been offered refreshments during journeys, as well as toilet stops on longer journeys. The prisoner escort records we saw had been fully completed. The cellular vans we inspected were clean, although on one, five of the six cameras were not working.

Recommendation

- 1.3 Reception should be able to receive prisoners throughout the day, including at lunchtimes.

Housekeeping point

- 1.4 Escort contractors should ensure that vehicle cameras are in working order.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.5 The reception had been refurbished and was welcoming, and the booking-in process was quick. Prisoners reported inappropriate banter by staff and frustration at the removal of property allowed in other prisons. Some new arrivals were strip searched, and there was insufficient privacy for changing into prison clothes. The initial needs and risk assessment was adequate and first night arrangements were thorough. Induction was multidisciplinary and thorough.

- 1.6 Reception staff reported that prisoners generally arrived with all the necessary paperwork. The reception process was relatively quick, and included a private interview to establish any initial concerns and a medical screening in the new health care room.
- 1.7 The reception had recently been refurbished and was clean, tidy and welcoming, and now had a holding room with a television. A comprehensive and helpful information booklet was given to all new arrivals. In our survey, 59% of respondents said they were treated well in reception, which was similar to the comparator but worse than the 82% response in 2005. In our groups prisoners consistently reported inappropriate banter and rudeness from reception staff.
- 1.8 All new arrivals received a rubdown search, but some prisoners reported being strip searched on arrival and at least one member of staff wrongly thought that strip searching on arrival was prison policy. The information booklet also stated that new arrivals could expect a strip search, which was inappropriate for category D prisoners. We saw no strip searches during the inspection, but the lack of clarity was a concern (see recommendation 1.43). There were three cubicles with stable doors for new arrivals to change into prison-issue clothing. These provided limited privacy and we saw one prisoner changing in sight of a female member of escort staff.
- 1.9 New arrivals were not always able to keep duvets they had bought in their previous establishment and had to buy new ones, which caused frustration. This was as a result of fire regulations, but it was unclear why the same regulations were not consistently applied across different establishments. There were no showers in reception but new arrivals could use those on their allocated unit. Shop advances and emergency telephone credit were available. In our survey, only a third of respondents said they had been given a free telephone call when they arrived, half the comparator of 67%. Although most prisoners transferring in from other prisons had immediate access to their telephone account and numbers, some prisoners transferring in from privately run prisons had to wait several days for numbers to be added to their account and to make calls.
- 1.10 There was no designated first night accommodation. Rooms for new arrivals were clean. The initial needs and risk assessment was adequate. Night staff completed an observation form in discussion with the prisoner. Those we looked at were of a reasonable quality. Peer mentors were available on all units. In our survey, 87% of respondents said they felt safe on their first night.
- 1.11 Induction for those on the high intensity training (HIT) programme lasted two weeks. For all other prisoners there was a rolling two-day induction programme delivered twice weekly. Both were comprehensive, relevant and multidisciplinary, although those on the HIT were more positive about the usefulness of induction (70% compared with 51% of other respondents in our survey). Overall, prisoners were less positive about induction than in 2005 (54% compared with 85%).

Recommendations

- 1.12 Reception staff should treat prisoners courteously.
- 1.13 New arrivals should be able to keep items they have bought in previous establishments and make one free telephone call in private.

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.

- 1.14 The prison was safe with a reasonably low and reducing number of violent incidents. Bullying and antisocial behaviour were effectively identified and challenged through an impressive range of interventions. Victims were well supported and follow-up care was good.
- 1.15 Prisoners generally regarded Thorn Cross as a safe place and this was reflected in positive responses to our survey. However, victimisation by staff was cited as a concern by prisoners in our groups and throughout the inspection, and was reported by 32% in our survey, against the comparator of 25%.
- 1.16 A safer custody committee met every two months to monitor overall progress of the violence reduction and suicide prevention strategies. Meetings were well attended and properly focused, with evidence of scrutiny of indicators of violent and antisocial behaviour. A weekly violence reduction meeting, with multidisciplinary attendance, discussed a range of cases beyond just those where bullying or antisocial behaviour had been identified, and shared information, identified problems or concerns and followed them up.
- 1.17 Formal arrangements to deal with violence and antisocial behaviour were good and the collection of data on incidents was comprehensive. There had been efforts to reduce the level of violence, which was now relatively low (five assaults and 20 fights between July and December 2011). Although the reported incidence of bullying was not high, verbal bullying had been identified through an internal survey in June 2011 and this was reflected in the safer custody action plan. However, other issues identified in the survey had not been added to the plan.
- 1.18 Victims and perpetrators of violent or antisocial behaviour were effectively identified and monitored. Between July and December 2011, 29 perpetrators and 21 victims had been subject to antisocial behaviour procedures. The unit manager generally carried out initial investigations but the recording of these was often poor. Prisoners were not set any specific targets and staff entries in documentation were mostly observational, although actions to challenge behaviour were robust.
- 1.19 In addition to sanctions under formal disciplinary procedures and the incentives and earned privilege (IEP) scheme, there was an impressive range of interventions to tackle antisocial behaviour, including a violence reduction workshop, antisocial behaviour workbook, restorative justice/mediation conferences for any fight or assault that resulted in an adjudication, and victim impact presentations. Support for victims was good and there was effective follow up for both victims and perpetrators.

Recommendation

- 1.20 The prison should investigate and address prisoner perceptions of staff victimisation.

Housekeeping points

- 1.21 All areas of concern identified in the internal violence reduction survey should be included in the safer custody action plan and monitored for progress.
- 1.22 Investigations into incidents of alleged bullying or antisocial behaviour and entries into ongoing monitoring documents should be properly recorded.

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.

- 1.23 The number of self-harm monitoring documents and incidents of self-harm were low. Documents were of a high standard and quality assurance was effective. Access to peer mentors was good.
- 1.24 Although relatively low, the number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents were increasing slightly, as were actual incidents of self-harm. In 2011, there had been nine acts of self-harm and 27 ACCT documents opened, although none were open at the time of the inspection. There had been no self-inflicted deaths.
- 1.25 The safer custody team focused appropriately on all issues that could lead to self-harm, and effectively identified, closely monitored and engaged with those at increased risk. Self-harm was discussed at the safer custody committee and there was evidence of progress against identified actions on the integrated safer custody action plan.
- 1.26 ACCT documents were completed to a high standard with effective, individualised care plans and multidisciplinary case reviews, and evidence of regular engagement by mental health services. However, some night observations were too predictable. Ongoing records mostly reflected positive staff engagement. There was a commitment to ACCT foundation and regular refresher training for staff. Staff demonstrated a caring approach to prisoners who were in crisis or in need of additional support. Quality assurance systems were effective.
- 1.27 In 2011, five prisoners spent time in the safer cell (see segregation section below). This cell was used sparingly and as a last resort. We were told that anyone located there was automatically subject to CCTV monitoring, but the ACCT documents were unclear about whether prisoners were also constantly observed by staff and why this method of observation was risk assessed as appropriate.
- 1.28 There was no Listener scheme but 30 trained peer mentors offered a similar, but not totally confidential, support service. Although prisoners had free access to the mentors, who were used frequently, some were not aware who they were. Counselling services were frequently used and appreciated.

Recommendation

- 1.29 The CCTV in the safer cell should only be used to monitor those at risk of suicide or self-harm when appropriately risk assessed, and not replace direct staff engagement and observation.

Housekeeping points

- 1.30 Staff observing and engaging with those at risk of self-harm should do so at frequent but irregular intervals.
- 1.31 Peer mentors should be easily identifiable and their role more widely publicised.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.32 The prison had a policy for managing adults at risk. Assessment procedures were appropriate and, where necessary, there were reviews by a multidisciplinary team.
- 1.33 There was a clear policy for the management of prisoners at risk of harm because of mental or physical health problems or learning difficulties. Individuals were identified primarily through the offender management unit (OMU). All new arrivals were also screened by health care staff, and the public protection department also reviewed all prisoners. There were good links between both departments as well as with the education department, which could support prisoners with learning disabilities.
- 1.34 Where particular concerns were identified, care plan or sentence plans (depending on the specific needs and/or issues) were formulated and reviewed through the public protection and/or safer custody departments. The individual needs of prisoners at risk were reviewed at weekly multidisciplinary violence reduction meetings. Appropriate sanctions, including governor's reports and the IEP scheme, were used to manage prisoners identified as bullying, harassing or exploiting prisoners at risk.

Recommendation

- 1.35 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.

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

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.

- 1.36 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate. Dynamic security was well managed and responsive. Mandatory drug testing arrangements were good, and drug supply and demand initiatives well integrated
- 1.37 Security arrangements were generally proportionate and did not unnecessarily restrict prisoner access to the regime. The elements of dynamic security were in place. Around 800 security information reports (SIRs) had been submitted between July and December 2011, and were processed efficiently. Required outcomes, including searches and suspicion mandatory drug tests (MDT), were completed within time and with relatively good results.
- 1.38 The security committee was reasonably well attended and supported by a comprehensive intelligence report. Appropriate security objectives were set and monitored, and this information was shared across the prison.
- 1.39 Although most security arrangements were proportionate, some prisoners were strip searched on reception and on entry to the segregation unit with no intelligence to support this (see also paragraphs 1.8 and 1.67).
- 1.40 The prison was focused on the abscond risk posed by some prisoners – there had been 25 absconds since April 2011. In the previous six months, 58 prisoners had been returned to closed conditions, and all appeared justified (see paragraph 4.23). The prison had a good relationship with the local police who sought prosecution for all absconders.
- 1.41 In our survey, 33% of respondents, against the comparator of 18%, said it was easy to get drugs in the prison. The prison was, however, taking a positive and well-coordinated approach to address drug use and MDT rates were relatively low. The positive MDT rate from August 2011 to January 2012 was 4.93% against a target of 8%. The suspicion test rate for the same period was 46.23%, which suggested reasonable targeting.
- 1.42 The MDT suite was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. Concerns over the misuse of anabolic steroids and other substances had been addressed through drug tests for steroids, and there was a well-integrated programme of information, group work and one-to-one sessions for prisoners identified as involved or at risk.

Recommendation

- 1.43 Strip-searching of prisoners should be intelligence-led or based on specific suspicion.

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.

- 1.44 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had been revised. There was some evidence of frivolous use of IEP warnings. All IEP boards were quality assured monthly. Prisoners on basic had their room power switched off, and prisoner pay differed according to their IEP status.
- 1.45 The IEP scheme had been revised and was set out in a detailed policy. Following a report on exit surveys between February and June 2011 that showed that 13% of prisoners did not understand the IEP scheme and 25% thought it was unfair, details had been included in the information booklet for new arrivals and on the televisions in the unit foyers. The subsequent report of exit surveys between July and November 2011 showed an improvement in understanding (6%) and a slight improvement in perceptions of fairness (22%). In our groups, some prisoners perceived little difference between standard and enhanced levels, with additional town visits cited as the main benefit.
- 1.46 An IEP board was convened on the third warning, or for one incident of a more serious nature. Warning periods lasted 14 days for those on the HIT programme, in recognition of the longer day and different regime, and for 28 days on all other units. All IEP boards were quality assured by the residential manager each month, and we saw evidence that this had led to progressive action. IEP board documentation now incorporated a section for prisoner comments. Demotion to standard level was for a minimum of four weeks, and demotion to basic level for a minimum of a week. There was an appeal process.
- 1.47 There was no structured system to monitor the number of, or reason for, warnings. Many prisoners complained to us of frivolous use of IEP warnings, and there was some evidence of this in the documentation – for example, warnings issued for doing press-ups during the quiet period (when prisoners had been required to be behind their doors) and having a wash after 9pm. The issuing of warnings for ‘petty reasons’ was also the main reason given by prisoners in their exit surveys for why they considered the scheme unfair. Although accurate records were not available from all units, the number of warnings for the previous three months ranged from 43 on unit 1 to 293 on unit 5 (HIT).
- 1.48 Prisoners undertaking the same job received different pay depending on their IEP status. Prisoners demoted to basic level had the electricity in their room switched off, which was unacceptable.

Recommendations

- 1.49 Managers should ensure that the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme is applied fairly and that warnings are not issued for petty or frivolous reasons.
- 1.50 Prisoners undertaking the same job should receive the same pay, whatever their IEP status.

- 1.51 Prisoners on basic level should retain electricity in their room.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.52 Use of formal disciplinary procedures was high. Use of force was low but we were not assured that the application of handcuffs was always justified. The segregation unit provided a decent living environment but throughput was high. Data on disciplinary procedures, use of force and segregation were collated but not sufficiently analysed.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.53 Between July and December 2011, there had been 505 adjudications, and it was clear that some could have been dealt with less formally. Prisoners were given sufficient time to prepare for their hearings, and received legal advice when requested. Records were mostly of a good standard but a minority did not demonstrate sufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt. Punishments were broadly fair. Quality assurance procedures were not robust enough.
- 1.54 Despite the collation of a reasonable amount of data on adjudications that informed the adjudication standardisation meeting, there was insufficient trend or pattern analysis.

Recommendations

- 1.55 Adjudications should only be used when less formal measures are not appropriate.
- 1.56 All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with decisions that are clearly evidenced and subject to rigorous quality assurance.
- 1.57 Information collated for all disciplinary procedures, including segregation, should be analysed and used effectively.

The use of force

- 1.58 Recorded use of force was low. Between July and December 2011 there were 15 incidents, of which only two involved full control and restraint. Others mostly involved the planned handcuffing of prisoners who were moved to the care and separation unit (CSU).
- 1.59 Documentation was of a reasonable standard, although some lacked sufficient detail and did not include efforts to de-escalate situations. We were not assured that the use of handcuffs was always justified.
- 1.60 The use of force committee met quarterly and was well attended. There was some quality checking of documentation but this was insufficient. This meeting was informed by some useful data. The camera available to film planned interventions was not used.

Recommendations

- 1.61 Handcuffs should only be used when necessary for reasons of safety or security.
- 1.62 Use of force documentation should be completed thoroughly and subject to rigorous quality assurance.
- 1.63 Planned use of force interventions should be filmed and routinely reviewed.

Segregation

- 1.64 The care and separation (segregation) unit (CSU) had two distinct parts. On one side, there were the four main segregation cells, and on the other was a designated safer cell and nine other more comfortable rooms used for locating a disparate range of prisoners, including those returning to closed conditions and some prisoners awaiting spaces in normal location.
- 1.65 The environment in the unit was very good. All cells were clean and well equipped, and the 10 general use cells and communal areas were carpeted and welcoming. The exercise yard was large and clean with a seating area, but otherwise stark.
- 1.66 Throughput of the unit was high. Between July and December 2011, 157 prisoners were located in the CSU, but the average stay of 5.9 days was not excessive. However, approximately half the prisoners located in the unit were there pending adjudication and records did not always justify this. Prisoners serving cellular confinement in starker cells progressed to a more comfortable room following a period of compliant behaviour.
- 1.67 We were told that all prisoners located to the group of four cells for reasons of order or discipline were strip searched, but records did not always justify the reasons for this (see recommendation 1.43). Documentation authorising location to the CSU was often poorly completed and lacked any meaningful behaviour targets for residents, but reviews were timely and multidisciplinary.
- 1.68 Residents could access a reasonable regime, including daily showers, exercise and telephone calls plus regular engagement with education staff. Some prisoners were permitted to leave the unit to attend offending behaviour courses, and those located in the general use cells could leave the unit and had access to a full regime. Although infrequent, some prisoners had to receive visits on the unit when there was no information to suggest they were an abscond risk.
- 1.69 Relationships between unit staff and prisoners were friendly and relaxed, but this was not reflected in daily history sheets or electronic case notes. The booklet for prisoners about the unit was out of date and had insufficient information about its regime, progression and dual purpose.
- 1.70 The segregation monitoring and review group (SMARG) met quarterly and was well attended. It was informed by a reasonably comprehensive report but there was no evidence that this data was used meaningfully to analyse trends and patterns in the use of the CSU (see recommendation 1.57).

Recommendation

- 1.71 Prisoners should only be located in the care and separation unit when there is sufficient reason to justify this.

Housekeeping points

- 1.72 Documentation authorising location to the care and separation unit (CSU) should be completed properly and thoroughly.
- 1.73 Visits for residents in the CSU who do not pose an abscond risk should take place in the visits hall.
- 1.74 The CSU information booklet should be updated and reflect the regime available.

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.

- 1.75 Clinical drug services were very well integrated with other services in the prison.
- 1.76 The clinical service was more than adequate for the age and needs of the population, although no prisoners were receiving opiate substitution at the time of the inspection and only four had been through opiate substitution treatment since the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) started in April 2010.
- 1.77 IDTS was well integrated and the clinical drug treatment staff, health care and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service held daily multidisciplinary meetings, and co-facilitated group work and joint prisoner case reviews.

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 Units were relatively clean and free from graffiti. Some toilets required refurbishment, and showers had inadequate drainage. Laundry facilities regularly broke down. Some rules were disproportionate and led to warnings and loss of privileges. There were additional telephones but prisoners' calls were sometimes cut short.
- 2.2 In addition to the four units holding different age groups (see fact page), unit 5 housed young adults on the high intensity training (HIT) programme – a 'boot camp' style programme with prisoners spending the final eight weeks before release working near and living at home on weekdays. There was also an independent living unit (ILU) that housed six adults working out and six young adults on the HIT programme. The ILU was not used to best effect. There was no process for identifying prisoners for entry to the unit and they received little support for independent living on release. Prisoners could not even cook for themselves, although there was a fully functional kitchen on both floors.
- 2.3 All rooms were single accommodation, except those on the ILU which were double, and prisoners had room keys. Rooms were furnished appropriately, and clean bedding was issued weekly.
- 2.4 All units were relatively clean although some areas, such as stairwells, looked worn. There was very little graffiti following the introduction of unit paint parties that painted over graffiti as soon as it appeared. Toilets were reasonably well maintained, although those on unit 2 needed deep cleaning and refurbishment. There were sufficient showers, but inadequate drainage in all unit shower blocks resulted in pools of water on the floor. The prison grounds were well kept and attractive.
- 2.5 The main entrance doors to all units, excluding the ILU, were kept locked throughout the day resulting in prisoners regularly banging loudly on them for staff to let them in. The rationale was that this ensured that staff were aware of who was coming in or out of the unit and reduced the potential for bullying. However, there was no evidence to show that this practice was necessary, and both prisoners and staff expressed frustration at it.
- 2.6 Prisoners knew how to make applications and forms were easily accessible and collected daily. The replies we saw were prompt, mostly informative and all had been signed and dated. In our survey, 61% of respondents thought applications were dealt with quickly, which was better than the comparator of 46% although worse than the 75% in 2005.
- 2.7 Some unit rules were disproportionate and unnecessary. For example, no more than two prisoners were allowed in the bathroom after 8pm, and prisoners were only allowed one toilet roll a week, a rule that was changed by managers during the inspection. Breaching the rules could lead to warnings and loss of important privileges. Staff told us about one prisoner given

an incentives and earned privileges (IEP) warning for waiting in the corridor outside the toilet because two people were already using the facilities.

- 2.8 Additional telephones had been installed since the last inspection, and there were now four, with privacy hoods, on each unit. In our survey, only 20% of respondents said they had problems accessing telephones, against the comparator of 35%. There was a policy of restricting calls to a maximum of 30 minutes from Thursday to Sunday, when demand was at its highest, and prisoners said they were cut off mid-conversation. The one telephone on the ILU had not been working for some time. There were no restrictions on the amount of mail a prisoner could send or receive, and prisoners reported few problems with receiving mail on time.
- 2.9 Prisoners were not permitted to wear their own clothes except to attend external appointments or when working out. There was only one washing machine and dryer for most units, and they regularly broke down.

Recommendations

- 2.10 The independent living unit should enable prisoners to build the skills for independent living on release, and there should be a targeted selection process for residents.
- 2.11 All toilets and showers should be kept clean, adequately maintained and have sufficient drainage.
- 2.12 Unit rules should be proportionate and appropriate for a category D population, and prisoners should be given the option of wearing their own clothes.
- 2.13 There should be sufficient working laundry machines for the population.

Housekeeping point

- 2.14 All telephones should be kept in working order, and calls should not be cut off without warning.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.15 Prisoners were positive about engagement with their personal officer, but a number said that staff were disrespectful and treated them like children. Attendance at prisoner consultation meetings had improved and actions were being progressed.
- 2.16 In our survey, 61% of all respondents said most staff treated them with respect, similar to the comparator, but fewer black and minority ethnic prisoners held this view (see paragraph 2.25). There was a generally relaxed and caring atmosphere and we saw some good staff-prisoner interactions. However, we received many comments from prisoners about disrespectful and petty behaviour by some staff, and prisoners often said that staff too often treated them like children. Not all staff addressed prisoners by their preferred name, and first names were rarely

heard. This was not appropriate for a prison preparing people for release and intending to encourage independent living (see main recommendation HP43). Managers acknowledged that this was a problem. Some training in pro-social modelling had taken place but was not routine.

- 2.17 There were monthly prisoner consultative meetings with four representatives from each unit. Minutes indicated reasonable multidisciplinary attendance, with resulting action points that were usually progressed. Unit 5 also had a separate monthly meeting.
- 2.18 A high percentage of prisoners in our survey (93%) knew who their personal officer was and most (71%) found them helpful, both more than the comparators. The electronic case notes we examined showed frequent staff contact with prisoners and generally detailed entries.

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

- 2.19 The management of equality and diversity was satisfactory but some aspects were underdeveloped. The diversity policy was not comprehensive and had significant gaps for most diversity strands but outcomes for most prisoners, particularly those with learning difficulties, were good. Black and minority ethnic prisoners were more negative about a range of issues than white prisoners. Some disparities identified through ethnic monitoring had not been promptly investigated or resulted in action. Consultation arrangements were generally good. There were good external links to promote equality and diversity and improve outcomes for prisoners.

Strategic management

- 2.20 The diversity, equality and inclusion (DEI) policy was weak. It had significant gaps for all the protected characteristics, was not underpinned by individual policies (except for disability), and was primarily staff focused. The DEI action plan was perfunctory and not monitored effectively or discussed at monthly senior management team meetings. It did not include action points from four impact assessments completed in 2011.
- 2.21 The diversity and equality action team (DEAT) met monthly, was chaired by the deputy governor and attendance was satisfactory. Meetings had been moved to Fridays to facilitate attendance by the Muslim chaplain, which had been successful. Ethnic monitoring was routinely discussed (see below). Some reports were provided by diversity leads, but this was irregular and not all the diversity strands were covered.
- 2.22 Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were not often submitted (37 in 2011). They were investigated by the race equality officer (REO), who was allocated 19 hours a week for the role. The quality of investigations was reasonably good and outcomes were appropriate,

with some action taken against staff and prisoners. Cheshire police completed external quality checks.

- 2.23 Consultation arrangements with prisoners were good. Psychology assistants had produced two comprehensive reports at the end of 2011, one evaluating the diversity needs of the population and the other looking at prisoners' views on exit. However, the recommendations had not yet been discussed or taken forward. The Muslim chaplain held regular forums with Muslim prisoners after prayers, and the Catholic chaplain had recently begun meeting with the small number of Gypsy, Romany and Traveller prisoners, but there was nothing similar for other minority groups.
- 2.24 Eight prisoner diversity representatives had received accredited diversity training and 94% of staff had completed 'challenge it change it' diversity training. Faith awareness training had not yet begun.

Protected characteristics

- 2.25 Black and minority ethnic prisoners accounted for 22% of the population. In our survey they were more negative than white prisoners across a number of indicators, including feeling unsafe, being treated with respect by staff and access to work. SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment) data showed there had been a longstanding under-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners accessing release on temporary licence (ROTL) going back about two years. This was the only consistent under-representation and had been identified by managers, but there had been no meaningful investigation into the reasons or into the perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners generally.
- 2.26 There were six prisoners convicted of racially motivated offences. The REO was informed and there was evidence that the REO or offender supervisor had spoken to each in connection with their offences. Alerts were flagged on electronic case notes.
- 2.27 The prison did not often hold foreign national prisoners and there was no separate foreign national policy. There was a short paragraph in the DEI policy with a brief explanation about eligibility to receive telephone calls, information on translation services and links with the UK Border Agency (UKBA). Foreign national prisoners should only have been sent to the prison if assessed as suitable in sending prisons. However, they were inappropriately located in the care and separation unit (CSU) without access to the full regime until their status had been confirmed again by UKBA after arrival. In the previous six months, two foreign national prisoners had been located in the CSU on arrival and then returned to closed conditions on the advice of UKBA, both within seven days. However, in one case the UKBA documentation received by the establishment had already indicated that the prisoner had leave to stay in the UK and was not being deported at the end of his sentence. Despite this, UKBA was contacted and he was transferred back to closed conditions. This inconsistency was unnecessary and punitive to foreign nationals who thought they were cleared for open conditions before arrival.
- 2.28 Muslims comprised about 13% of the population. In our survey, only a third said that staff treated them with respect, compared with two-thirds of non-Muslims. They reported similarly to non-Muslims across most other areas. There was no specific policy or action plan relating to religion.
- 2.29 Health care staff effectively screened new arrivals for disability, and information was shared between health care, education staff and the disability liaison officer (DLO), who was allocated four hours a week for the role. The DLO saw all prisoners who had declared a disability, most

of whom had a learning difficulty or disability. Since October 2010, 94 prisoners had been identified with a learning difficulty or disability and 62 had gone on to achieve at least a level 1 accreditation. Four prisoners had been identified as requiring a personal emergency and evacuation plan (PEEP), although none had mobility problems. They were known to residential staff but their PEEPs were not in place. This was resolved during the inspection.

- 2.30 An access assessment report in 2011, assisted by a wheelchair user from Warrington Disability Partnership, had made some recommendations. Two accessible cells had been identified on units 1 and 3 but no adjustments had yet been made. A portable hearing loop system had been acquired, telephones had been lowered on units 1 and 3, shower accessibility had been improved, and a disabled-accessible toilet had been installed. The DLO regularly surveyed a random selection of prisoners with a disability to ensure their needs were being met. He had also reviewed the disability policy but this had not yet been published.
- 2.31 There was no policy on meeting the needs of gay or bisexual prisoners, but good support for this group had been established and a comprehensive action plan had recently been developed. Information and advice for staff on gay, bisexual and transgender issues was published on the intranet, and information for prisoners was widely displayed. At the time of our visit, the establishment was celebrating gay, bisexual and transgender awareness month. The lead officer for this area was also the GALIPS (Gays and Lesbians in the Prison Service) representative. We saw evidence that the officer had given good individual support for a prisoner who had declared his sexuality to a member of the chaplaincy and was referred on. She had also taken a lead in challenging homophobic language and expressions of homophobic views.

Recommendations

- 2.32 **Managers should investigate the negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners identified in our survey to help increase communication and understanding.**
- 2.33 **All disparities identified by ethnic monitoring should be promptly investigated and acted upon.**
- 2.34 **Foreign national prisoners should not be routinely located in the segregation unit on arrival.**

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.

- 2.35 The chaplaincy team was fully integrated into the prison and faith provision catered for the needs of the population. Areas dedicated to worship were good. Faith classes were available and prisoners could celebrate the major religious festivals. The chaplaincy was involved in resettlement pathways, and the involvement and attendance of community faith organisations for the benefit of prisoners was excellent.

- 2.36 The chaplaincy reflected the faith requirements of the population. Only the coordinating chaplain was full time but he was supported by a range of part-time and sessional chaplains. The chaplain saw new arrivals within 24 hours of arrival and gave them a leaflet on chaplaincy services.
- 2.37 In our survey, only 44% of respondents, against the comparator of 52%, said their religious beliefs were respected. However, 66%, against 57%, said they could speak to a religious leader of their faith, and during our inspection, prisoners were positive about the work of the chaplaincy. All the major religious festivals were celebrated.
- 2.38 Chaplaincy facilities were good. There was a well-equipped multi-faith room although it did not have washing facilities. The chapel was sometimes used for Muslim Friday prayers.
- 2.39 A range of faith-based classes were available for predominantly Christian and Muslim prisoners. The team organised two educational events a year for up to 10 prisoners on a non-faith basis, such as visits to a Catholic cathedral, a mosque, the national arboretum and a Sikh gurdwara. There was good pastoral care for prisoners who had experienced significant events, including bereavement, and the Muslim chaplain was a trained counsellor.
- 2.40 The team was fully integrated into the life of the prison and had a positive involvement in some of the resettlement pathways and safer custody provision. The team had delivered 11 Sycamore Tree restorative justice courses, which provided up to level 2 accreditation for 20 prisoners, facilitated chaplaincy town visits for prisoners estranged from their family or who had limited family contact, and planned and managed up to eight family days a year.
- 2.41 The chaplaincy had well-established links with the community and volunteer organisations. The coordinating chaplain, a professional musician, had involved several faith-based musical groups, and the brass section of the Halle orchestra provided regular music tuition and held popular concerts open to all prisoners.

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.

- 2.42 Prisoners were positive about the complaints process and the timeliness and fairness of responses. Quality assurance was thorough but not sufficiently regular.
- 2.43 The number of prisoner complaints had risen slightly in 2011 from 2010. However, in our survey, more respondents than the comparator who had made a complaint said they were dealt with quickly and fairly. Complaint forms were freely available.
- 2.44 The replies we examined were generally respectful and dealt with the complaint, although some were curt and did not address the complainant by name. The deputy governor carried out quality assurance with a 10% sample of complaints made each month, but only did this twice a year, which diminished the effectiveness of feedback. Information on the patterns and trends of complaints was collected but not analysed or discussed.

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.

- 2.45 There were two trained legal services officers who had compiled a comprehensive list of relevant organisations and specialist lawyers. Prisoners could receive legal visits weekly, but some had to wait up to a month to get their solicitor's telephone number added to their account.
- 2.46 There were two legal services officers, who had both undergone relevant training. They had compiled a comprehensive list of Legal Services Commission organisations and lawyers specialising in particular areas of law, including immigration and childcare proceedings, and provided details to prisoners as required. They had also assisted prisoners to contact the Community Legal Advice helpline, and information was available on the Legal Ombudsman.
- 2.47 Prisoners could receive legal visits weekly in a dedicated room. However, in our survey only 31% of respondents said it was easy to attend legal visits, against the comparator of 51%. The reasons for this were not clear. In our groups some prisoners said they had to wait up to a month to get their solicitor's telephone number added to their telephone account. Reception staff explained licence conditions to prisoners leaving the establishment.

Recommendation

- 2.48 Telephone numbers should be added to prisoners' telephone accounts promptly to enable communication with their lawyer.

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.

- 2.49 Prisoners had timely access to a wide range of health services, including excellent primary care from in-house and visiting health professionals, and were able to use some services in the community. Nursing and medical staff were well qualified and competent. Dental services were very good with minimal waiting lists. The pharmacy was also good but lacked pharmacist input. Mental health professionals provided good support to prisoners.

Governance arrangements

- 2.50 Bridgewater Community Healthcare NHS Trust provided health services to the prison. There had been a health needs analysis in 2011 followed by an offender health delivery plan. The

governor and the head of offender health attended regular prison partnership meetings. The clinical manager attended the senior management team meetings. Health care staff took part in appropriate meetings throughout the prison, including safer custody and discharge boards. An annual service definition report was completed, and a health care representative attended regular prisoner forums. There was strong support from the Trust for health services.

- 2.51 The staff group comprised full and part-time appropriately qualified and in-date registered general (RN) and mental health (RMN) nurses. The clinical manager was a registered nurse with qualifications in nurse prescribing and as a nurse practitioner. Staffing levels were low at the time of the inspection as a result of illness, but this was mitigated to some extent by sharing staff with the partner prison, HMP Risley, to ensure prisoners received the care they needed. Staff could access appropriate clinical courses, and clinical supervision was supported and encouraged. All mandatory and statutory training was completed. An administrator provided excellent support to the team.
- 2.52 The health care department had appropriately equipped clinical areas. There were no health facilities on the units. The health care room in reception was clean, tidy and suitable. The main health care reception area was bright, clean and accessible to prisoners with disabilities, with health promotion material available for waiting prisoners. However, a prisoner cleaned the department and had to be supervised by a member of staff when cleaning clinical areas. The dental surgery had been closed for the installation of a decontamination room and was due to reopen. All areas had had a recent infection control audit. Specialist clinical equipment was available through the Trust. Emergency equipment was checked daily and documented. The SystemOne clinical IT system was in place and there were plans to introduce an electronic prescribing programme. Old paper clinical records were stored securely.
- 2.53 In the clinical practice we observed prisoners were treated with respect. Health care staff wore name badges. New arrivals were given verbal and written information on how to access services during the reception screening. Information was available in pictorial form for those with reading difficulties. Prisoners were asked to sign information-sharing protocols during their reception health screening.
- 2.54 Only four complaints about health services were made in 2011 and these were resolved in house. Health complaints were made through prison forms, which were not confidential – this did not follow NHS procedure. Prisoners could use the Patient Advice and Liaison Service (PALS) if they wished to take their complaints higher.
- 2.55 The management of communicable disease was very good and there were appropriate links with local NHS services to address any issues promptly. Disease prevention measures were in place and NHS national disease prevention and screening programmes were followed. Health promotion was strongly supported with annual health fair days, which included external NHS partners. A member of the health team regularly attended the health improvement group, where themes included smoking, sexual health and healthy eating.
- 2.56 All prisoners could access full immunisation programmes during reception screening. Measles, mumps and rubella immunisations were offered as well as screening for blood-borne viruses. A full health screening was undertaken and chlamydia screening was also offered. If appropriate, prisoners were referred to other health professionals. Barrier protection was available to prisoners, with appropriate health advice on their use.

Recommendations

- 2.57 A professional contract cleaner should be employed to clean all health care areas regularly.
- 2.58 Health care complaints should be dealt with confidentially in line with NHS guidelines.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.59 The health care department was open on weekdays between 7.30am and 5.30pm and on weekends from 7.30am until 12.15pm. On-call nurse managers were available to support prison officers outside these hours. If necessary, officers could call the Trust out-of-hours service for guidance.
- 2.60 The level of health services was at least equal to that in the community. Access was very good with no significant waiting lists for any health professional. Prisoners who reported sick were seen by a nurse for an initial triage to determine further action. There were no standard triage algorithms but they were being introduced. Referrals to other health practitioners were made where relevant, or the nurse could initiate treatment at the time.
- 2.61 The GP service was excellent with access every weekday, although the timing of GP clinics and medication times clashed with breakfast, and prisoners complained that this often left them without either breakfast or their medication. All prisoners were seen within a week and, if necessary, the same day. If nursing staff felt that a prisoner should be seen outside the GP times they could access a GP through the local NHS community practice. In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said it was easy to see the doctor and that the GP service was good.
- 2.62 The health care department informed prisoners of their appointments through slips delivered to the units. Despite this, the non-attendance rate was unacceptable and deprived other prisoners of appointments.
- 2.63 There were few prisoners with long-term conditions but there were some asthmatics and one prisoner with diabetes. Community specialists visited the prison to monitor patients and discuss their ongoing care with them and health staff. The nurse practitioner held her own clinics but liaised with visiting professionals where appropriate. Physiotherapy and podiatry were provided through community services. An optician visited monthly or when the waiting list became lengthy. Genitourinary specialists held a fortnightly clinic. If the referral was urgent the prisoner was taken out to the community clinic.
- 2.64 One of the nurses ran stop smoking clinics. The waiting list was long with 39 prisoners waiting to start the 12-week course. Nicotine patches and lozenges were offered to support prisoners.
- 2.65 Prisoners in the care and separation unit were seen by a nurse at least once a day and by the GP three times a week. Those on medication were given this at the prescribed time. CSU staff felt well supported by health care staff. There was no mental health awareness training for CSU staff, other than that provided in their initial training (see recommendation 2.81).
- 2.66 Most prisoners requiring access to community health outpatient appointments did so themselves, if they were risk assessed as suitable to go unescorted. If they were not, they were escorted.

Recommendations

- 2.67 There should be triage algorithms to ensure continuity of care.
- 2.68 Health care should liaise with the catering and residential departments to ensure prisoners on morning medication do not miss their breakfast as a result of receiving medication.
- 2.69 The prison should investigate and address the high level of prisoners failing to attend health appointments.

Pharmacy

- 2.70 The management of the pharmacy was very good. There was no on-site pharmacy, pharmacist or pharmacy clinics. Supplies came from HMP Risley and nurses handled the ordering, stocktaking and day-to-day management of pharmaceutical items. Medicines were stored in secure cabinets and the keys were kept securely. Stock levels were appropriate and were checked regularly. Medicine refrigerators were well maintained.
- 2.71 The age group of the prisoners meant that few required medication. Most medicines were given in possession following a comprehensive risk assessment, and health care staff were vigilant in monitoring prisoners on in-possession medicines. Prisoners were never given more than seven days supply, and had to produce the empty boxes and strips before they were given any more medicine. The GP always reviewed the patient after 28 days of medication.
- 2.72 Prescribed medicines were administered daily, weekly or monthly in possession, and were given out in the health care centre through a hatch from the pharmacy room on to the waiting room. Where diversion was considered a risk, the administration was supervised, with a single dose for in-possession overnight. No prescribed hypnotics were in use at the time of the inspection, and there was little use of medicines of dependence. Prisoners had lockable cabinets in their rooms to hold their medicines.
- 2.73 Following a positive in-possession risk assessment, prisoners could keep 16 paracetamols in their rooms. A special sick policy allowed nurses to administer simple medicines, and a minor ailment scheme allowed them to administer agreed treatments. Patient group directions were in place and used by nursing staff where necessary.
- 2.74 There was a joint drugs and therapeutics committee with Risley, which met regularly. Comprehensive standard operating procedures for the pharmacy were held in health care.

Recommendation

- 2.75 There should be a greater pharmacist input to provide regular support to staff and patients.

Dentistry

- 2.76 Dental services were provided by the Trust, and the dentist and dental nurse delivered an all-day surgery once a week. In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said that access to and treatment from the dentist were good.

- 2.77 Prisoners could apply to see the dentist through the application system. At the time of the inspection, with the refurbishment of the surgery, there was a two to three week wait for initial assessment. Dental emergencies were seen at the next available session or, if necessary, at the local NHS dental access centre. Prisoners were usually seen at the next available clinic and received a full dental examination. Those requiring ongoing treatment were booked into another clinic, usually within three weeks. A full range of NHS treatments was available.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.78 There was little incidence of mental illness at Thorn Cross. A part-time RMN visited three days a week and could be accessed through the application system, referral from prison staff or self-referral. The RMN and GP saw all new arrivals already on psychotropic medicines and/or under psychiatric care or taking psychiatric medicines in the community. Referrals to a psychiatrist were made where appropriate.
- 2.79 The current caseload was low at up to 15 prisoners. Diagnoses included drug-induced psychosis, depression, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Prisoners on ACCTs were always seen to offer support. All referrals were seen quickly and a full mental health assessment and care plan initiated. The care plan was shared with unit officers, where appropriate, to enable them to support the prisoner. Prisoners could continue to engage with the RMN for as long as was necessary. Generic counselling was provided for prisoners experiencing anxiety or the need for anger management. The RMN attended all ACCT reviews when possible, as well as safeguarding and violence reduction meetings.
- 2.80 There was no regular mental health awareness training for officers or other support staff.

Recommendation

- 2.81 Mental health awareness training should be available to all prison staff.

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.

- 2.82 Prisoners' views of the food were overwhelmingly negative, although menus were balanced and varied. Prisoners dined in association and meals were served at appropriate times, but staff supervision of serveries was inadequate. Consultation arrangements were good.
- 2.83 In our survey, only 9% of respondents said the food was good, which was far worse than the comparator of 24% and the response of 45% at the last inspection. Throughout the inspection, prisoners were overwhelmingly negative about the food.
- 2.84 It was difficult to understand these perceptions during our inspection as menus were balanced and varied, and healthy options and fresh fruit were offered each day. However, while the food we sampled was adequate, we were concerned about the lack of staff supervision on some serveries, which led to some inappropriate use of halal tools and food going cold and running

out. Special diets were catered for, although food for those working outside the prison was less substantial. The kitchen was clean, well equipped and well managed.

- 2.85 Prisoners dined in association and meals were served at appropriate times. There were few opportunities to self-cater. There was good consultation on the food through regular surveys, the prisoner consultative committee and a newly introduced forum, but resulting changes were not widely publicised. Food comment books were not always available or entries responded to.

Recommendations

- 2.86 The prison should investigate and address prisoners' negative perceptions of the food, and staff supervision of serveries should be improved.
- 2.87 There should be better food provision for prisoners working outside the prison.

Housekeeping points

- 2.88 Changes to menus resulting from prisoner consultation should be more widely publicised.
- 2.89 Food comment books should be freely available and there should be constructive responses to comments.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.90 Prisoners were consulted about changes to the prison shop list, but this was smaller than in similar prisons. Goods reflected the diverse needs of the population.
- 2.91 In our survey, black and minority ethnic respondents were more negative than white prisoners about the range of goods in the prison shop to meet their needs. However, in our conversations, complaints commonly centred on the lack of food supplements and sport aids rather than cultural items.
- 2.92 The shop list of 362 items was slightly smaller than those we have seen in similar establishments but was drawn from the national list and included items to reflect the diverse needs of the population. Prisoners were involved in making changes to the local product list and the shop was discussed at prisoners' consultative meetings. Prisoners could order other goods from a range of catalogues, subject to their incentive level, with no administration charge.

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.³

- 3.1 Prisoners had good opportunities to spend time out of their cells. They were purposefully engaged during unlock, and association was rarely cancelled. The only regular outside exercise opportunities were at weekends.
- 3.2 In our survey, more respondents than the comparators said they had more than 10 hours out of their room a day and access to association at least five times a week. Prisoners achieved an average of approximately 13.75 hours a day out of their room and were mostly purposefully engaged during periods of unlock.
- 3.3 Unlock was between 7.30am and 7.45pm but had until very recently included two periods of 'quiet time' (to facilitate staff meals) where movement was restricted. During the inspection this restriction had been lifted for a trial period. Prisoners were permitted to use the bathrooms for a further period until 10pm. Unlock arrangements on the HIT unit and ILU were even better. Association took place every evening and at weekends and has never been cut.
- 3.4 There was no period for exercise on weekdays, except during summer evenings. At weekends there were opportunities for outside association in the attractive and well-maintained grounds.

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 There were sufficient places to occupy prisoners fully in purposeful activities. The range of activities had been increased and there was a strong focus on employability and supporting prisoner skill needs. There were high pass rates in most programmes and learners developed good personal and vocational skills. The experienced and well-qualified tutors delivered good teaching and learning across all activities. Learners with literacy and numeracy needs and learning difficulties had intensive and individual support. The library was satisfactory, although provision to support learning and skills activities was limited.
- 3.6 Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: Good

³ 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.

Quality of learning and skills and work provision:	Good
Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:	Good

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.7 The prison had a strong focus on prisoner employability supported by a well-informed learning and skills strategy. The development plan reflected the economy and labour market conditions, as well as the employability needs of prisoners. A wide range of external links provided learners with a high quality experience that supported their resettlement needs effectively. The prison worked particularly well with The Manchester College to ensure that prisoners with very short sentences could also access courses to increase their employability.
- 3.8 The education and vocational training areas were well managed. Teachers were well qualified and experienced and workshops were well equipped and maintained. The analysis of data was not sufficiently developed to inform management on how different groups of learners accessed the provision and achieved qualifications. In our survey, a significant percentage of respondents from the HIT unit felt that it was not easy to access learning and skills and work activities.
- 3.9 There had been many improvements since the previous inspection to address identified areas. The self-assessment process and development planning were well embedded, and the prison had placed great importance on developing the range and amount of vocational and work provision. The quality improvement group brought together different parts of the prison and worked very effectively to tackle the priorities for improvement in purposeful activity. Quality assurance arrangements were comprehensive, although there had been a few areas where the prison had not observed the quality of teaching and learning in the last year.

Recommendation

- 3.10 The prison should further develop the analysis of educational and vocational data to inform performance management of different groups of learners.

Provision of activities

- 3.11 There were sufficient purposeful activities to meet the needs of the population. The prison offered the equivalent of 63 full-time spaces in education. Prisoners attended education part time and could also go to the gym, work or vocational training during the day, allowing them to be occupied full time. Education provision included literacy and numeracy courses from entry level to level 2, and prisoners who required support at pre-entry level benefited from individual tuition with specialist tutors. Prisoners could also undertake a qualification in art, media, customer services or business enterprise. Education was offered every weekday and for two hours in the evenings. Sixty-six per cent of prisoners took part in education.
- 3.12 Since the last inspection, the range of vocational training had increased to the equivalent of 172 full-time places. Courses included bricklaying, motor mechanics, industrial cleaning, painting and decorating, fitted interiors, plastering, catering and rail engineering. Prisoners could also go on car valeting courses that ran every two weeks to meet demand. There were a further five spaces in the prison kitchen and five in the conference centre. Most vocational courses were currently offered at level 1, although several qualifications at level 2 were due to

be launched. Thirty-three per cent of prisoners were engaged in work activities in or outside the prison.

- 3.13 There were no contract workshops. Six prisoners worked as orderlies in the prison and 30 as cleaners across the units. The number of prisoners who could work outside the prison had increased from 13 to 60. During the inspection, 43 prisoners worked in the community, there were 25 spaces for work in the gardens and farm and 24 in the gym. A further six prisoners were on work-based training in their placements in the community and 4 were on distance learning doing a qualification through the Open University.
- 3.14 There were waiting lists for most of the popular vocational programmes. Although allocations to activities were consistent and addressed prisoners' needs highlighted in their sentence plans, the process was not sufficiently effective. Prisoners did not receive sufficient feedback to understand why they had been placed on specific courses or their chances of joining their preferred courses.

Recommendation

- 3.15 **The prison should ensure that prisoners have a better understanding of the available learning and skills provision and the timescales for joining their preferred activity.**

Quality of provision

- 3.16 The quality of learning in education was good. In art, an excellent range of enrichment activities contributed to the development of further personal and life skills, such as literacy and numeracy. The use of information learning technology was good in education lessons, but not all learners had adequate access to computer-based learning material in vocational training workshops. Teaching, coaching and learning in the vocational training workshops were good. In most cases, learners could competently demonstrate the application of theory to a range of practical situations. Tutors made good use of extension tasks to challenge the more able learners, and there was good adherence to health and safety. Prisoners received an adequate and timely assessment of their literacy and numeracy needs.
- 3.17 Prisoner achievement of social and employability skills was not fully recognised and recorded in vocational training and work. In education, most programmes made excellent use of learner and tutor feedback to monitor progress, but this was not always consistent across the learning and skills and work provision.
- 3.18 The prison was due to extend the range of level 2 qualifications to aid progression for prisoners. Learners benefited from good information, advice and guidance at different stages of their sentence. A wide range of support agencies had good links with the prison. Induction into learning and skills and work activities was prompt and satisfactory overall, but it was too short. Prisoners received insufficiently detailed information about the learning and skills and work provision. Learners received good individual daily support with their literacy and numeracy needs and learning difficulties and disabilities. Specialist tutors enabled learners to develop their own learning strategies to manage their individual needs. Staff across all areas motivated learners well to succeed.

Recommendation

- 3.19 All individual learning plans should effectively recognise the prisoner's wider achievements and promote progress.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.20 Pass rates in education and vocational training were very high on most courses. Teaching staff and management had identified the lower performing enterprise course and had made the necessary improvements to ensure learners achieved their awards. Learners made good progress with their literacy and numeracy qualifications and improved their confidence while developing their communication skills. The rail track course at national vocational qualification (NVO) level 2 had an impressive success rate of 98%, and 68% of those who took it obtained employment on release. Qualifications achieved by prisoners had increased by 30% in the last three years.
- 3.21 Learners developed good life and employability skills and often worked to a higher level than required by the qualification. Most vocational training learners completed work to a good commercial standard, particularly in the construction crafts. The quality of completed community projects reflected a high level of skills application and development, and prisoners made very good contributions to the community through their involvement. Attendance was good in all activities, although punctuality in a few sessions during the inspection was poor. Learners felt safe undertaking purposeful activities and they enjoyed learning. They showed good behaviour in the classes and built respectful relationships with their tutors.

Library

- 3.22 The library provision had been improved since the previous inspection and was satisfactory. The library was welcoming, well maintained and offered adequate access, including two weekday evenings and Saturday morning. Provision was based on an annual survey of the prison population, of whom around three-quarters were library members and half regular users. Library stock included a large non-fiction section, easy reads, DVDs and illustrated novels. All prisoners had ready access to current Prison Service Orders and legal texts. English newspapers were available. The needs of foreign language users were addressed appropriately. However, the range of texts to support learning and skills provision was limited, and prisoners had insufficient access to computer-based learning resources. There were no library orderly posts for prisoners to gain work experience.

Recommendations

- 3.23 The library should have a better range and variety of material to support learning and skills provision.
- 3.24 The prison should provide more computer-based learning resources.

Housekeeping point

- 3.25 The prison should allow prisoners to gain library-based work experience as orderlies.

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.

- 3.26 The promotion of healthy living to prisoners was good. Prisoners had good access to a wide range of activities and PE facilities. The range of programmes was good, and pass rates were high.
- 3.27 All prisoners received an appropriate induction to the gym that included manual handling and lifting training. Gym staff used prisoners' self-declared health issues appropriately to plan activities, and there were relevant referrals to health care for additional assessments. Health promotion was good and included themed events to reinforce the benefits of exercise and healthy lifestyles. Partnership work between the gym and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs) effectively emphasised the dangers of drug abuse. There were also programmes for those with specific injuries or personal problems, such as low confidence or excess body weight. The gym also offered acupuncture to improve prisoners' general well-being.
- 3.28 The gym was well managed. Access was good and facilities were well advertised. Approximately 83% of prisoners used the gym four or more times a week. Recreational sessions were available on weekday evenings and at weekends. Prisoners on the HIT regime undertook compulsory early morning circuit training. The range of courses was good and included sports leader, gym instructor, and diet and nutrition qualifications. Retention and success rates on all courses were high. However, learners did not receive gym-based learning support when participating in courses.
- 3.29 PE accommodation and the range of equipment were good. A large sports hall was used for a variety of sports and a field area provided facilities for cricket, rugby and football. Staffing levels were adequate with an appropriately trained and experienced team. Shower facilities were satisfactory, and accidents were appropriately recorded and investigated.
- 3.30 External links were satisfactory and included community organisations supporting adults with physical disabilities. Prisoners competed in the local football league, and there was rugby training for participation in external leagues. The prison made good use of its external links to provide prisoners with relevant experience relating to the sports and leisure industry before release.

Recommendation

- 3.31 Prisoners should receive gym-based learning support when participating in courses.

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 reducing reoffending delivery plan was comprehensive but did not include offender management or public protection. The needs annual analysis was also useful but limited because it did not include data from OASys assessments. The prison's primary focus was on release on temporary licence (ROTL) and, in particular, on working out, at which it was extremely successful, but this needed to be complemented by a greater emphasis on addressing offending behaviour. There had been no research on the impact of this work post release.
- 4.2 The reducing reoffending delivery plan was up to date and reasonably comprehensive, covering each of the seven resettlement pathways. An eighth pathway, victims of crime, had also been included, which reflected recent work by the prison. Each pathway also had an action plan with identified key objectives for the year September 2012/13. Progress against objectives was monitored through the bimonthly reducing reoffending policy committee. The delivery plan did not include any outline or objectives for offender management or public protection, despite planned developments in both areas.
- 4.3 There was an annual needs analysis, the most recent in September 2011. It was based on self-reporting questionnaires handed out to all prisoners, although only 41%, 119, had completed it. While the questionnaire gave useful information on pathway need, there was no analysis or evaluation of OASys (offender assessment system) data, which would give valuable and more objective information on the offending behaviour needs of prisoners. OASys also covered 98% of the prison's population and had a good completion rate (see paragraph 4.11).
- 4.4 The reducing reoffending policy committee was appropriately constituted and meetings were generally well attended. Pathway leads and service providers usually attended and there was a useful focus on developing services to meet the resettlement needs of the population.
- 4.5 The primary focus of the prison was on developing release on temporary licence (ROTL) for prisoners to maintain family links and, where possible, to work out. In this the prison was extremely successful with a significant increase in numbers over the last three years. However, many prisoners arrived without having undertaken any significant offending behaviour work, and for those who had or who attended the TSP at Thorn Cross there was insufficient focus on reinforcing learning and building on newly acquired skills. Because of the lack of analysis of OASys data, it was impossible to establish the extent of this problem. Although staff across the prison tried to ensure that planning focused on the opportunities provided by ROTL, this did not extend to the broader work of the offender management unit (OMU). Some OMU staff had little knowledge of sentence planning targets or risk associated with prisoners in their care.

- 4.6 The high intensity training (HIT) unit continued to offer a structured and disciplined environment for prisoners working towards resettlement, and working out arrangements for this group were good. There had been some provisional, and positive, evaluation of the longer-term impact of the programme on reoffending rates, and a more detailed analysis was due. However, there was no wider analysis across other units to look at the effectiveness of ROTL and working out on reconviction and offending rates post release (see main recommendation HP44). Nevertheless, in our survey 62% of respondents, against the comparator of 56%, said that they had done or experienced something at the prison that would make them less likely to offend again in the future, although this was not as good as the 80% response in 2005.

Recommendations

- 4.7 The reducing reoffending delivery plan should include information about and objectives for offender management, and there should be a comprehensive analysis of OASys (offender assessment system) data to complement the annual self-reporting needs analysis.
- 4.8 There should be a prison-wide approach to resettlement and offender management, and managers should ensure that all staff are appropriately knowledgeable and supportive of its function.

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.

- 4.9 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor and most were also subject to OASys assessment. Sentence planning was variable and other departments rarely contributed to it. There was insufficient focus on reducing the risk of reoffending and little one-to-one offence-focused work. Quality assurance beyond OASys was limited and there was no regular casework supervision. ROTL arrangements were good, and a commendable number of prisoners worked out of the establishment with success. Many prisoners had delays in getting release on home detention curfew. Public protection arrangements were well organised and work with indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was good.
- 4.10 All prisoners at Thorn Cross were allocated an offender supervisor and most were also subject to OASys assessment (only six were not during the inspection). The probation officer and both probation service officers were allocated prisoners assessed as higher risk or subject to indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP). Only 58 prisoners were in scope for offender management, although other longer sentenced and complex cases were also allocated to these offender supervisors. Four officer offender supervisors were allocated the 16 prisoners serving less than 12-month sentences and the low or medium risk cases serving over 12 months. Offender supervisors managed caseloads of around 40. This division of cases was broadly appropriate given the levels of experience and knowledge.
- 4.11 All but one OASys assessment was up to date at the time of the inspection, and quality assurance was appropriate and well managed. In our survey, 87% of respondents, against the comparator of 59%, said that they had a sentence plan. However, sentence planning

arrangements were variable. Although the 65% of survey respondents who said that they had been involved in the completion of their plan was similar to the comparator, it was significantly worse than the 100% response in 2005. Contributions to sentence plan meetings from departments outside the OMU were erratic. Some departments, such as CARATs, regularly contributed when they had been involved with prisoners, but others rarely did. Offender supervisors told us that unit staff, employers, education and others rarely submitted written contributions. Our analysis of documentation showed that most information obtained from unit staff, including personal officers, reported conduct and institutional behaviour and rarely the risk of reoffending. Sentence planning meetings often included only the offender supervisor and prisoner, especially for low or medium risk prisoners. Offender managers, even when they were nearby, did not often attend sentence planning meetings. The prison was temporarily without video conferencing facilities and had no teleconferencing equipment.

- 4.12 Targets set during sentence planning reviews too frequently focused on what was available at the prison rather than what was needed to reduce the risk of reoffending. We saw some examples of individuals with outstanding offending behaviour work from previous prisons, such as the CALM (controlling anger and learning to manage it) programme, which was subsequently dropped in favour of the provision available at Thorn Cross. Offending behaviour work was rarely one-to-one to address outstanding issues or reinforce factors identified in previous work.
- 4.13 A review of high risk case files by probation inspectors showed that knowledge about cases and engagement with community-based offender managers was generally good. Although officer offender supervisors also had good knowledge of their cases, they had less understanding of risk and reoffending issues. The frequency of offender supervisor contact with prisoners was also varied and usually determined by individuals. There was little training for officer offender supervisors, who were often limited to work with OASys. Prisoner contact and management varied in consistency and effectiveness, and little was done to raise standards through, for example, quality checking of work and staff supervision.
- 4.14 The prison was involved in several initiatives to develop and support the reintegration of prisoners into the community. These included a new project working with young adults leaving care, along with developing a team of peer mentors to support other prisoners in various work. The independent living unit did not meet its full potential (see paragraph 2.2 and recommendation 2.10).
- 4.15 Despite these limitations, the establishment was very successful at making good use of ROTL to facilitate links back to the community and, where possible, to paid or voluntary employment. Over 69,000 working-out hours had been achieved in 2011 and an average of around 55 prisoners a week worked out. Of these, 15 worked in paid employment, around eight from the HIT unit worked in their home areas during the week (see paragraph 2.2), and the rest undertook voluntary work. This was around a fivefold increase in the number working out since our last inspection. The prison's approach was commendably ambitious, and only a few prisoners had breached their licence in the last six months – 12 had failed to return and a further eight had returned late or been in contravention of a licence condition.
- 4.16 ROTL arrangements were good overall. All prisoners had a comprehensive assessment and evaluation before their first town leave, and all cases were subject to risk assessment by one of the probation staff. Risk assessments were generally well considered and reviewed the specific risk of likely adherence to ROTL conditions. We saw many cases where individuals had initially been declined a town leave but received it later once they had achieved a sustained period of acceptable behaviour.

- 4.17 There were significant delays for many prisoners applying for release on home detention curfew (HDC). Although 71% of those who applied between June 2011 and January 2012 were successful, only 44% (90 of the 207 applicants) were completed on time. In some cases, this was because prisoners had been transferred into the prison when the process had been started elsewhere, but in others it was because of delays in completing reports.

Recommendations

- 4.18 All staff and departments having contact with prisoners, especially those who are high risk, should be actively involved in sentence planning focused on issues of risk. Sentence planning targets should focus on need rather than available provision.
- 4.19 Offender supervisor work with prisoners should be consistent. Staff should receive sufficient training, guidance, supervision and support to meet the needs of prisoners in reducing their risk of reoffending.
- 4.20 There should be no delays in the internal completion of home detention curfew applications.

Housekeeping point

- 4.21 There should be appropriate facilities for all sentence planning meetings, including teleconferencing and video conferencing.

Public protection

- 4.22 Public protection arrangements were well organised. A separate public protection policy covered all aspects of management appropriately. The prison did not accept multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level three cases, and at the time of the inspection there were just three level two prisoners. Despite their low number, the establishment reviewed all prisoners serving sentences over four years along with MAPPA level twos and prolific and priority offenders (PPOs), which was appropriate. The bimonthly interdepartmental risk management meeting reviewed all such cases but any case could be reviewed at short notice if needed. The cases we looked at had been appropriately considered.

Categorisation

- 4.23 A small number of prisoners were recategorised at Thorn Cross and returned to closed conditions. In the previous six months 58 prisoners had been recategorised and returned to closed conditions. Our review of these cases showed they were usually in response to a pattern of behaviour rather than a single incident. Responses were proportionate and reviews conducted fairly.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.24 The prison did not hold life-sentenced prisoners, although it did hold a few IPPs. There were six prisoners on IPPs at the time of the inspection, who were each allocated to a probation offender supervisor with whom they had reasonably frequent contact. An IPP prisoner mentor had been identified and offered advice, guidance and support to the others. He saw all IPP

new arrivals to ensure they knew about facilities and support at the prison.

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.

4.25 All prisoners were reviewed by offender supervisors before their release and discharge boards sat approximately two weeks before release. Exit surveys were used effectively to inform regime developments. Accommodation provision and financial support work had recently been taken over by Shelter and initial indications were positive, although the prison's needs analysis indicated a significant need for debt advice. Prisoners received appropriate information, advice and guidance on training, education and employment opportunities and many successfully achieved jobs or placements on release. Health care arrangements for released prisoners were appropriate. There were innovative and integrated services for prisoners with substance use needs. Support for prisoners to maintain family ties was appropriate and visits were broadly sufficient, although weekday sessions were too short. A number of prisoners arrived without having done sufficient offending behaviour work, though many were then able to attend accredited programmes at Thorn Cross.

4.26 All prisoners were reviewed against their resettlement needs before release by their offender supervisor as part of the sentence planning process. A weekly discharge board was also held, chaired by the deputy governor, and was usually attended by prisoners a fortnight before discharge. The board was an opportunity to offer some motivation and support for prisoners. It was not designed to pick up outstanding discharge issues, although this could be facilitated in an emergency. As part of this board, prisoners were also asked to complete exit surveys covering all aspects of their experience at Thorn Cross. Information from these surveys was analysed twice a year, and there was evidence that some concerns identified by prisoners had been subsequently acted upon. In our survey, 30% of respondents, against the comparator of 20%, said that a member of staff had helped them prepare for release.

Accommodation

- 4.27 Relatively few prisoners had major accommodation problems. In the prison's last needs analysis in September 2011, only 3% of respondents anticipated they would have housing problems on their discharge. Most returned home to a parent or partner.
- 4.28 Until January 2012, the accommodation service had been provided directly by uniformed staff in the prison, but was now provided by Shelter under an area contract for two days a week. The contract also covered support on debt management and advice (see paragraph 4.40). There were about two to three referrals a month.
- 4.29 No prisoner had been released without accommodation in the previous 12 months, but it was unclear how many were released to temporary accommodation as there was no distinction between prisoners released to temporary or settled housing. Prisoners due to be released on HDC but without suitable housing were referred to Stonham, which provided the bail accommodation support service (BASS) scheme. Eight prisoners had achieved supported housing in the previous six months.

- 4.30 As the contract with Shelter was so new it was too early to assess its impact, although some cases had already been picked up. Nine prisoners were currently identified with no fixed accommodation, although they were not anticipated to leave the establishment without housing to go to.

Recommendation

- 4.31 The prison should monitor whether the accommodation that prisoners are due to be released to is settled rather than temporary, and should ensure that all prisoners are offered settled accommodation on release.

Education, training and employment

- 4.32 All prisoners received appropriate information, advice and guidance on education, training and employment from the specialist careers support agencies, Working Links and Next Step, at the prison and before release. New Bridge ensured that, five weeks before release, prisoners following the HIT regime participated in useful work experience in their resettlement area. All prisoners could apply for education, employment or training places before release.
- 4.33 There was no formal pre-release course as prisoners were introduced to relevant aspects of resettlement throughout their stay. The education department provided a non-mandatory employability course that allowed learners to practise job search skills, including CV writing, application completion and mock interviews. A job club met monthly. The prison made very good use of a wide variety of external placements to prepare prisoners for employment on release. Prisoners and placements were suitably vetted and assessed. External links with employers and education/training providers were good.
- 4.34 Approximately 25% of the population went on work experience through ROTL. In the previous six months, 15% of released prisoners entered education or training and 42% employment. The few who moved to other establishments received appropriate encouragement to continue their learning programme, which was supported by accurate transfer records.

Health care

- 4.35 Health care was covered in the weekly discharge board. Health care staff saw prisoners two weeks before their release. They gave them a letter with information about the care they received in prison, up to seven days supply of medication where necessary, and advice on how to register with a GP.
- 4.36 There was minimal need for palliative care support within this age group, however if such support was needed, specialist services within the Trust and the Macmillan organisation were contacted to provide advice and guidance to individual patients. There was no inpatients facility at the prison.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.37 The up-to-date drug and alcohol strategy was informed by two comprehensive analyses that looked at clinical and psychosocial needs. All components of the prison's strategic response to drugs and alcohol were innovative and well integrated with a wide range of services and interventions, both in the prison and in the community. Joint working between the counselling,

assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team, OMU and resettlement team was well organised.

- 4.38 Prisoners praised the CARAT workers in relation to drugs work and many other areas of resettlement. Six CARAT peer mentors played an effective role in the overall drug strategy, with their support structures linked to other peer mentors across the prison. In our survey, 90% of respondents said that the support they had received for drug and alcohol problems was helpful.
- 4.39 The prison had good links with drug intervention programmes (DIPs) in the community, although as the majority of prisoners at Thorn Cross were not local there were fewer chances of DIP workers from their home area visiting them before release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.40 Work under this pathway remained underdeveloped. In the prison's last needs analysis, 29% of respondents said that they were currently in debt, yet there had been no debt management provision until the recent Shelter contract. A few prisoners had already been referred to Shelter, which was working with three prisoners with debts of more than £10,000. The full extent of debt across the establishment was not yet known. Jobcentre Plus provided a benefits advice service.
- 4.41 The prison facilitated prisoners to open bank accounts before their release. The education department also ran a two-week budget and money management course as part of the National Open College Network level 1 life and social skills programme

Recommendation

- 4.42 **All prisoners with debt problems should be able to access appropriate debt management support.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.43 In our survey, 55% of respondents said that they had been supported in maintaining links with their family, against the comparator of 42%. ROTL, home and town leaves were the primary means for prisoners to maintain family ties. In the six months prior to the inspection over 2,600 ROTL days had been granted to facilitate home and town leaves.
- 4.44 All prisoners were entitled to two weekend visits a month. There were further privilege visits for prisoners on enhanced level, although these could only be taken for a one-hour weekday evening visit rather than additional two-hour weekend visits. Prisoners had mixed views about these arrangements. Some said they would prefer extra contact at weekends, although many liked the evening visits because they were quiet, with usually no more than eight to 10 visits. Nevertheless, one-hour evening sessions were impractical for visitors travelling long distances.
- 4.45 There was no visitors' centre although the waiting area in the gate was appropriate and there was sufficient information to advise visitors. Staff were on hand to offer advice and give information where necessary, and there were vending machines for refreshments. Visitors were not routinely searched except where there was intelligence to support this.

- 4.46 The visits hall was large, bright and reasonably relaxed. A play area and refreshment bar were staffed by volunteers at the weekend. Free hot drinks were provided during evening visits and there was a vending machine with snacks.
- 4.47 There were nine family days a year, and prisoners with young children could spend time playing and eating a meal together. The days were popular and, although there was no formal support for the session, there were a wide range of staff to give advice and guidance.
- 4.48 The family links programme was delivered through the education department on a four-week cycle, although participants could join it at any time. The key modules were parenting craft, family literature and family relationships. The library provided Storybook Dads.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.49 Given that the prison's needs analysis was not based on an analysis of OASys assessments or progress by prisoners against previously identified offending behaviour targets, it was not clear whether the available offending behaviour programmes met the needs of the population. The short duration drug programme (SDP) was broadly appropriate for the prison's population. The other accredited course was the thinking skills programme (TSP).
- 4.50 The prison's annual TSP target was 80 starts and 63 completions, which it appeared likely to exceed. Nevertheless, this was a high target for such a small population, and raised questions about why so many prisoners arrived at Thorn Cross with a need to undertake such work. There were also many prisoners who required such work but who fell short of the programme's attendance threshold, and for whom there was no alternative provision. We saw little or no evidence of post-programme work, for instance by offender supervisors, to reinforce what was learned during the programme.
- 4.51 There was little to address the needs of the 56% of the population convicted of a violent offence, including robbery, with 140 MAPPA level one prisoners. The prison delivered two anger management programmes a year, but again it was not clear if this was sufficient to meet need.
- 4.52 The prison had put significant resources into developing work on restorative justice and victim empathy. It had run victim impact sessions regularly for two years, and the Sycamore Tree restorative justice course had been delivered twice a year for three years. Some prisoners also completed victim awareness booklets through their offender supervisors, but with varying emphasis and focus. While positive, the impact of such initiatives on reducing prisoners' risk of reoffending remained unclear.

Recommendation

- 4.53 The prison should provide sufficient offending behaviour work to meet the needs of the population before their release.

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 Staff behaviour towards prisoners should reflect a positive and respectful culture that actively supports prisoners in their attempts to prepare for independent living on release. (HP43)
 - 5.2 The prison should meet prisoners' offence-related needs and undertake ongoing post-release analysis to assess the impact of the various aspects of its resettlement work. (HP44)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.3 Reception should be able to receive prisoners throughout the day, including at lunchtimes. (1.3)

Early days in custody

- 5.4 Reception staff should treat prisoners courteously. (1.12)
- 5.5 New arrivals should be able to keep items they have bought in previous establishments and make one free telephone call in private. (1.13)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.6 The prison should investigate and address prisoner perceptions of staff victimisation. (1.20)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.7 The CCTV in the safer cell should only be used to monitor those at risk of suicide or self-harm when appropriately risk assessed, and not replace direct staff engagement and observation. (1.29)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.8 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.35)

Security

- 5.9 Strip-searching of prisoners should be intelligence-led or based on specific suspicion. (1.43)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.10 Managers should ensure that the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme is applied fairly and that warnings are not issued for petty or frivolous reasons. (1.49)
- 5.11 Prisoners undertaking the same job should receive the same pay, whatever their IEP status. (1.50)
- 5.12 Prisoners on basic level should retain electricity in their room. (1.51)

Disciplinary procedures

- 5.13 Adjudications should only be used when less formal measures are not appropriate. (1.55)
- 5.14 All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with decisions that are clearly evidenced and subject to rigorous quality assurance. (1.56)
- 5.15 Information collated for all disciplinary procedures, including segregation, should be analysed and used effectively. (1.57)

The use of force

- 5.16 Handcuffs should only be used when necessary for reasons of safety or security. (1.61)
- 5.17 Use of force documentation should be completed thoroughly and subject to rigorous quality assurance. (1.62)
- 5.18 Planned use of force interventions should be filmed and routinely reviewed. (1.63)

Segregation

- 5.19 Prisoners should only be located in the care and separation unit when there is sufficient reason to justify this. (1.71)

Residential units

- 5.20 The independent living unit should enable prisoners to build the skills for independent living on release, and there should be a targeted selection process for residents. (2.10)
- 5.21 All toilets and showers should be kept clean, adequately maintained and have sufficient drainage. (2.11)
- 5.22 Unit rules should be proportionate and appropriate for a category D population, and prisoners should be given the option of wearing their own clothes. (2.12)

- 5.23 There should be sufficient working laundry machines for the population. (2.13)

Equality and diversity

- 5.24 Managers should investigate the negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners identified in our survey to help increase communication and understanding. (2.32)
- 5.25 All disparities identified by ethnic monitoring should be promptly investigated and acted upon. (2.33)
- 5.26 Foreign national prisoners should not be routinely located in the segregation unit on arrival. (2.34)

Legal rights

- 5.27 Telephone numbers should be added to prisoners' telephone accounts promptly to enable communication with their lawyer. (2.48)

Health services

- 5.28 A professional contract cleaner should be employed to clean all health care areas regularly. (2.57)
- 5.29 Health care complaints should be dealt with confidentially in line with NHS guidelines. (2.58)
- 5.30 There should be triage algorithms to ensure continuity of care. (2.67)
- 5.31 Health care should liaise with the catering and residential departments to ensure prisoners on morning medication do not miss their breakfast as a result of receiving medication. (2.68)
- 5.32 The prison should investigate and address the high level of prisoners failing to attend health appointments. (2.69)
- 5.33 There should be a greater pharmacist input to provide regular support to staff and patients. (2.75)
- 5.34 Mental health awareness training should be available to all prison staff. (2.81)

Catering

- 5.35 The prison should investigate and address prisoners' negative perceptions of the food, and staff supervision of serveries should be improved. (2.86)
- 5.36 There should be better food provision for prisoners working outside the prison. (2.87)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.37 The prison should further develop the analysis of educational and vocational data to inform performance management of different groups of learners. (3.10)

- 5.38 The prison should ensure that prisoners have a better understanding of the available learning and skills provision and the timescales for joining their preferred activity. (3.15)
- 5.39 All individual learning plans should effectively recognise the prisoner's wider achievements and promote progress. (3.19)
- 5.40 The library should have a better range and variety of material to support learning and skills provision. (3.23)
- 5.41 The prison should provide more computer-based learning resources. (3.24)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.42 Prisoners should receive gym-based learning support when participating in courses. (3.31)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.43 The reducing reoffending delivery plan should include information about and objectives for offender management, and there should be a comprehensive analysis of OASys (offender assessment system) data to complement the annual self-reporting needs analysis. (4.7)
- 5.44 There should be a prison-wide approach to resettlement and offender management, and managers should ensure that all staff are appropriately knowledgeable and supportive of its function. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.45 All staff and departments having contact with prisoners, especially those who are high risk, should be actively involved in sentence planning focused on issues of risk. Sentence planning targets should focus on need rather than available provision. (4.18)
- 5.46 Offender supervisor work with prisoners should be consistent. Staff should receive sufficient training, guidance, supervision and support to meet the needs of prisoners in reducing their risk of reoffending. (4.19)
- 5.47 There should be no delays in the internal completion of home detention curfew applications. (4.20)

Reintegration planning

- 5.48 The prison should monitor whether the accommodation that prisoners are due to be released to is settled rather than temporary, and should ensure that all prisoners are offered settled accommodation on release. (4.31)
- 5.49 All prisoners with debt problems should be able to access appropriate debt management support. (4.42)
- 5.50 The prison should provide sufficient offending behaviour work to meet the needs of the population before their release. (4.53)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escorts and transfers

Prison Escort and Custody Services

- 5.51 Escort contractors should ensure that vehicle cameras are in working order. (1.4)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.52 All areas of concern identified in the internal violence reduction survey should be included in the safer custody action plan and monitored for progress. (1.21)
- 5.53 Investigations into incidents of alleged bullying or antisocial behaviour and entries into ongoing monitoring documents should be properly recorded. (1.22)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.54 Staff observing and engaging with those at risk of self-harm should do so at frequent but irregular intervals. (1.30)
- 5.55 Peer mentors should be easily identifiable and their role more widely publicised. (1.31)

Segregation

- 5.56 Documentation authorising location to the care and separation unit (CSU) should be completed properly and thoroughly. (1.72)
- 5.57 Visits for residents in the CSU who do not pose an abscond risk should take place in the visits hall. (1.73)
- 5.58 The CSU information booklet should be updated and reflect the regime available. (1.74)

Residential units

- 5.59 All telephones should be kept in working order, and calls should not be cut off without warning. (2.14)

Catering

- 5.60 Changes to menus resulting from prisoner consultation should be more widely publicised. (2.88)
- 5.61 Food comment books should be freely available and there should be constructive responses to comments. (2.89)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.62 The prison should allow prisoners to gain library-based work experience as orderlies. (3.25)

Offender management and planning

- 5.63 There should be appropriate facilities for all sentence planning meetings, including teleconferencing and video conferencing. (4.21)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Hindpal Singh Bhui	Team leader
Kieron Taylor	Shadow team leader
Bev Alden	Inspector
Michael Calvert	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Alice Reid	Researcher
Amy Summerfield	Researcher
Nalini Sharma	Research trainee
Specialist inspectors	
Bridget McEvilly	Health services inspector
Paul Roberts	Substance use inspector
Stan Brandwood	Pharmacist
Kathleen Byrne	Care Quality Commission inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector
Eileen O'Sullivan	Offender management inspector
Ian Simpkins	Offender management inspector
Steven Woodgate	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	125	168	99.3
Recall	2	0	0.7
Total	127	168	100

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Less than 6 months	3	3	2
6 months to less than 12 months	8	3	3.7
12 months to less than 2 years	16	17	11.2
2 years to less than 4 years	59	46	35.6
4 years to less than 10 years	38	92	44.1
10 years and over (not life)	0	2	0.7
Life	3	5	2.7
Total	127	168	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	127	43.1
21 years to 29 years	168	56.9
Total	295	100

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	118	166	96.3
Foreign nationals	2	1	1
Not stated	7	1	2.7
Total	127	168	100

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
YOI closed	7	2	3.1
YOI open	115	35	50.8
Cat C	0	4	1.4
Cat D	5	127	44.7
Total	127	168	100

Ethnicity	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
<i>White</i>			
British	96	128	75.9
Other	2	1	1
<i>Mixed</i>			
White and black Caribbean	0	8	2.7
White and black African	1	0	0.3
White and Asian	1	1	0.7
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>			
Indian	2	1	1
Pakistani	6	7	4.4
Bangladeshi	6	1	2.4
Other Asian	3	5	2.7
<i>Black or black British</i>			
Caribbean	5	12	5.8
African	2	0	0.7
Other black	1	1	0.7
Not stated	2	3	1.7

Total	127	168	100
--------------	------------	------------	------------

Religion	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Church of England	13	26	13.2
Roman Catholic	30	42	24.4
Other Christian denominations	10	7	5.8
Muslim	19	19	12.9
Sikh	1	0	0.3
Buddhist	1	1	0.7
Other	1	1	0.7
No religion	48	72	40.7
Not stated	4	0	1.4
Total	127	168	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	27	9.2	19	6.4
1 month to 3 months	39	13.2	36	12.2
3 months to 6 months	36	12.2	56	19
6 months to 1 year	23	7.8	43	14.6
1 year to 2 years	2	0.7	14	4.7
Total	127	43.1	168	56.9

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the young adult 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 18 January 2012 the young adult population at HMYOI Thorn Cross was 302. The sample size was 161. Overall, this represented 53% of the young adult population.

Selecting the sample

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. No respondents were interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 147 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 49% of the young adult population. The response rate was 91%. In addition to the three respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, six questionnaires were not returned and five were returned blank.

Comparisons

The following documents detail the results from the survey. Data from each establishment have 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 2011 against comparator figures for all young adults surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young adult surveys carried out in 15 young offender institutions since April 2008.
- The current survey responses in 2012 against the responses of young adults surveyed at HMYOI Thorn Cross in 2005.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of Muslim young adults and non-Muslims.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of those under 21 and those 21 and over.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of those in Unit 5 and those in all other units, excluding the CSU.

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 young adults' background details.

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

Summary

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

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

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

Summary of survey results

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	57	(39%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	90	(61%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	146	(99%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	0	(0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	7	(5%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	8	(5%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	15	(10%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	45	(31%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	65	(45%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>Life</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>	7	(5%)
	<i>No</i>	138	(95%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	146	(99%)
	<i>No</i>	1	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	145	(99%)
	<i>No</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	102	(70%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	2	(1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	12	(8%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	7	(5%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0	(0%)

Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	1 (1%)	Arab.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani ..	12 (8%)	Other ethnic group.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	6 (4%)		

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

Yes.....	4 (3%)
No.....	140 (97%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None	59 (41%)	Hindu.....	0 (0%)
Church of England.....	22 (15%)	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
Catholic.....	28 (19%)	Muslim	23 (16%)
Protestant.....	6 (4%)	Sikh	0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination	3 (2%)	Other.....	2 (1%)
Buddhist	1 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/ Straight.....	146 (99%)
Homosexual/ Gay	0 (0%)
Bisexual.....	1 (1%)

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

Yes.....	4 (3%)
No.....	143 (97%)

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

Yes.....	6 (4%)
No.....	140 (96%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	116 (80%)
No.....	29 (20%)

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

Yes.....	30 (21%)
No.....	114 (79%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

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

Less than 2 hours	93 (63%)
2 hours or longer.....	47 (32%)
Don't remember	7 (5%)

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

My journey was less than two hours.....	93 (63%)
Yes.....	33 (22%)
No.....	20 (14%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

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

My journey was less than two hours.....	93 (63%)
Yes.....	5 (3%)

	No.....	47 (32%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	90 (62%)
	No.....	45 (31%)
	Don't remember	11 (8%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	122 (85%)
	No.....	19 (13%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	37 (25%)
	Well.....	60 (41%)
	Neither.....	38 (26%)
	Badly.....	5 (3%)
	Very badly	4 (3%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	121 (83%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	5 (3%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	21 (14%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	137 (94%)
	No.....	8 (6%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	121 (84%)
	2 hours or longer.....	17 (12%)
	Don't remember	6 (4%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	121 (84%)
	No	17 (12%)
	Don't remember	6 (4%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	31 (21%)
	Well.....	55 (38%)
	Neither.....	37 (26%)
	Badly.....	15 (10%)
	Very badly	6 (4%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

- Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|--|----------|--|----------|
| <i>Loss of property</i> | 12 (8%) | <i>Physical health</i> | 2 (1%) |
| <i>Housing problems</i> | 3 (2%) | <i>Mental health</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>Contacting employers</i> | 5 (3%) | <i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> | 2 (1%) |
| <i>Contacting family</i> | 19 (13%) | <i>Getting phone numbers</i> | 28 (19%) |
| <i>Childcare</i> | 1 (1%) | <i>Other</i> | 2 (1%) |
| <i>Money worries</i> | 22 (15%) | Did not have any problems | 84 (58%) |
| <i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 7 (5%) | | |
- Q3.5 Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Yes | 17 (12%) |
| No..... | 40 (28%) |
| Did not have any problems | 84 (60%) |
- Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>Tobacco</i> | 116 (80%) |
| <i>A shower</i> | 46 (32%) |
| <i>A free telephone call</i> | 48 (33%) |
| <i>Something to eat</i> | 36 (25%) |
| <i>PIN phone credit</i> | 72 (50%) |
| <i>Toiletries/ basic items</i> | 49 (34%) |
| Did not receive anything | 10 (7%) |
- 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> | 84 (59%) |
| <i>Someone from health services</i> | 107 (75%) |
| <i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> | 37 (26%) |
| <i>Prison shop/ canteen</i> | 32 (23%) |
| Did not have access to any of these | 23 (16%) |
- 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> | 76 (55%) |
| <i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 56 (41%) |
| <i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> | 57 (42%) |
| <i>Your entitlement to visits</i> | 60 (44%) |
| <i>Health services</i> | 83 (61%) |
| <i>Chaplaincy</i> | 81 (59%) |
| Not offered any information | 25 (18%) |
- Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Yes | 125 (87%) |
| No..... | 13 (9%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 6 (4%) |
- Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| Have not been on an induction course | 9 (6%) |
| <i>Within the first week</i> | 118 (82%) |
| <i>More than a week</i> | 12 (8%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 5 (3%) |

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 9 (6%)
 Yes 73 (51%)
 No..... 53 (37%)
 Don't remember 9 (6%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?
Did not receive an assessment..... 47 (34%)
 Within the first week 39 (28%)
 More than a week 37 (26%)
 Don't remember 17 (12%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	17 (12%)	37 (26%)	30 (21%)	19 (13%)	12 (9%)	26 (18%)
<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	9 (7%)	33 (24%)	31 (23%)	10 (7%)	4 (3%)	50 (36%)
<i>Get bail information?</i>	6 (4%)	18 (13%)	29 (22%)	11 (8%)	7 (5%)	63 (47%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?
Not had any letters..... 55 (38%)
 Yes 40 (28%)
 No..... 48 (34%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?
 Yes 50 (35%)
 No..... 9 (6%)
 Don't know 85 (59%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	84 (60%)	55 (39%)	2 (1%)
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	129 (91%)	11 (8%)	2 (1%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	111 (78%)	26 (18%)	6 (4%)
<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	94 (66%)	45 (32%)	3 (2%)
<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	13 (14%)	36 (40%)	42 (46%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	98 (71%)	37 (27%)	4 (3%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	60 (43%)	50 (35%)	31 (22%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?
 Very good..... 0 (0%)
 Good..... 12 (9%)

Neither.....	14 (10%)
Bad.....	31 (22%)
Very bad.....	84 (60%)

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>	3 (2%)
Yes.....	67 (47%)
No.....	73 (51%)

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

Yes.....	55 (38%)
No.....	21 (15%)
Don't know.....	67 (47%)

Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes.....	64 (44%)
No.....	16 (11%)
Don't know/ N/A.....	64 (44%)

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

Yes.....	95 (66%)
No.....	6 (4%)
Don't know/ N/A.....	43 (30%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i>	22 (15%)
Very easy.....	48 (34%)
Easy.....	38 (27%)
Neither.....	6 (4%)
Difficult.....	4 (3%)
Very difficult.....	3 (2%)
Don't know.....	22 (15%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes.....	117 (82%)
No.....	12 (8%)
Don't know.....	13 (9%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications:
(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are applications dealt with fairly?	31 (22%)	65 (47%)	43 (31%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	31 (23%)	64 (47%)	41 (30%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

Yes.....	99 (71%)
No.....	14 (10%)
Don't know.....	27 (19%)

Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)	Not made one	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	58 (41%)	35 (25%)	48 (34%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	58 (43%)	40 (29%)	38 (28%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes		18 (14%)	
	No		111 (86%)	
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>		24 (17%)	
	Very easy		22 (16%)	
	Easy		38 (28%)	
	Neither		28 (20%)	
	Difficult		20 (14%)	
	Very difficult		6 (4%)	

Section 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>		2 (1%)	
	Yes		80 (57%)	
	No		50 (35%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		9 (6%)	
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>		2 (1%)	
	Yes		82 (59%)	
	No		40 (29%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		16 (11%)	
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes		2 (1%)	
	No		139 (99%)	
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?			
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>		110 (80%)	
	Very well		10 (7%)	
	Well		5 (4%)	
	Neither		3 (2%)	
	Badly		5 (4%)	
	Very badly		4 (3%)	

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?		
	Yes		87 (61%)
	No		55 (39%)

Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	105 (74%)
	No.....	36 (26%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	48 (34%)
	No.....	95 (66%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	6 (4%)
	Never.....	26 (18%)
	Rarely.....	44 (31%)
	Some of the time.....	48 (34%)
	Most of the time.....	8 (6%)
	All of the time.....	9 (6%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/ her	10 (7%)
	In the first week.....	91 (64%)
	More than a week.....	31 (22%)
	Don't remember	11 (8%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her	10 (7%)
	Very helpful.....	57 (40%)
	Helpful.....	36 (25%)
	Neither.....	19 (13%)
	Not very helpful.....	8 (6%)
	Not at all helpful.....	12 (8%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	21 (15%)
	No.....	122 (85%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	7 (5%)
	No.....	134 (95%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	122 (85%)
	Everywhere.....	3 (2%)
	Segregation unit.....	4 (3%)
	Association areas	6 (4%)
	Reception area.....	1 (1%)
	At the gym.....	3 (2%)
	In an exercise yard.....	0 (0%)
	At work.....	4 (3%)
	During movement	4 (3%)
	At education.....	2 (1%)
	At meal times.....	5 (3%)
	At health services	1 (1%)
	Visits area	1 (1%)
	In wing showers	12 (8%)
	In gym showers.....	5 (3%)
	In corridors/stairwells	5 (3%)
	On your landing/wing	4 (3%)
	In your cell.....	6 (4%)
	At religious services	1 (1%)

Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	17 (12%)
	No.....	126 (88%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated.....</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Having your canteen/ property taken.....</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Medication.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Debt.....</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Your religion/ religious beliefs.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age.....</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You were new here.....</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	3 (2%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	45 (32%)
	No.....	96 (68%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....</i>	24 (17%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated.....</i>	21 (15%)
	<i>Medication.....</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Debt.....</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/ religious beliefs.....</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age.....</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here.....</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	3 (2%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	94 (70%)
	Yes.....	11 (8%)

No..... 29 (22%)

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	9 (6%)	29 (21%)	55 (39%)	25 (18%)	17 (12%)	5 (4%)
The nurse	6 (4%)	45 (32%)	63 (45%)	16 (12%)	7 (5%)	2 (1%)
The dentist	21 (15%)	14 (10%)	21 (15%)	16 (11%)	46 (33%)	22 (16%)

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	13 (9%)	31 (22%)	57 (41%)	24 (17%)	12 (9%)	3 (2%)
The nurse	11 (8%)	34 (24%)	58 (41%)	15 (11%)	18 (13%)	5 (4%)
The dentist	44 (31%)	22 (16%)	33 (23%)	20 (14%)	14 (10%)	8 (6%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	7 (5%)
<i>Very good</i>	24 (17%)
<i>Good</i>	60 (43%)
<i>Neither</i>	28 (20%)
<i>Bad</i>	17 (12%)
<i>Very bad</i>	5 (4%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	34 (24%)
No.....	107 (76%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	107 (75%)
Yes, all my meds.....	27 (19%)
Yes, some of my meds	3 (2%)
No.....	5 (4%)

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

Yes	7 (5%)
No.....	133 (95%)

Q9.7 Are your being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison?
(E.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)

<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	133 (94%)
Yes	3 (2%)
No.....	5 (4%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?

Yes	21 (15%)
No.....	120 (85%)

Q10.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?

Yes	11 (8%)
No.....	131 (92%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	34 (25%)
	<i>Easy</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	73 (53%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>Easy</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Neither</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	86 (61%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	135 (95%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>No</i>	139 (98%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/ do not have a drug problem</i>	115 (84%)
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (4%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/ do not have an alcohol problem</i>	131 (94%)
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	121 (86%)
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	
						<i>Very difficult</i>	
	Prison job	11 (8%)	35 (25%)	39 (28%)	21 (15%)	21 (15%)	14 (10%)
	Vocational or skills training	10 (7%)	36 (26%)	40 (29%)	23 (17%)	17 (12%)	11 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)	10 (7%)	45 (33%)	44 (32%)	24 (18%)	8 (6%)	6 (4%)

Offending behaviour programmes	20 (15%)	23 (17%)	42 (31%)	32 (23%)	15 (11%)	5 (4%)
--------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	--------

- Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
Not involved in any of these..... 24 (17%)
 Prison job 66 (47%)
 Vocational or skills training..... 39 (28%)
 Education (including basic skills)..... 43 (31%)
 Offending behaviour programmes..... 30 (22%)
- Q11.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?**
- | | <i>Not been involved</i> | Yes | No | <i>Don't know</i> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Prison job | 15 (13%) | 46 (39%) | 51 (44%) | 5 (4%) |
| Vocational or skills training | 15 (13%) | 65 (57%) | 30 (26%) | 4 (4%) |
| Education (including basic skills) | 10 (9%) | 64 (57%) | 31 (28%) | 7 (6%) |
| Offending behaviour programmes | 15 (13%) | 54 (48%) | 35 (31%) | 8 (7%) |
- Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?**
Don't want to go..... 23 (16%)
Never..... 21 (15%)
Less than once a week..... 39 (28%)
About once a week..... 40 (28%)
More than once a week..... 18 (13%)
- Q11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?**
Don't use it..... 34 (24%)
 Yes..... 70 (50%)
 No..... 36 (26%)
- Q11.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?**
Don't want to go..... 10 (7%)
 0..... 8 (6%)
 1 to 2..... 36 (26%)
 3 to 5..... 67 (48%)
 More than 5..... 18 (13%)
- Q11.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?**
Don't want to go..... 10 (7%)
 0..... 48 (34%)
 1 to 2..... 63 (45%)
 3 to 5..... 12 (9%)
 More than 5..... 7 (5%)
- Q11.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?**
Don't want to go..... 2 (1%)
 0..... 2 (1%)
 1 to 2..... 8 (6%)
 3 to 5..... 8 (6%)
 More than 5..... 120 (86%)
- Q11.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)**
Less than 2 hours..... 6 (4%)

2 to less than 4 hours.....	6 (4%)
4 to less than 6 hours.....	11 (8%)
6 to less than 8 hours.....	22 (16%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	30 (22%)
10 hours or more.....	43 (31%)
Don't know	21 (15%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	76 (55%)
	No.....	62 (45%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	68 (48%)
	No.....	74 (52%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	28 (20%)
	No.....	112 (80%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	7 (5%)
	Very easy	25 (18%)
	Easy.....	39 (28%)
	Neither.....	14 (10%)
	Difficult.....	20 (15%)
	Very difficult.....	30 (22%)
	Don't know	2 (1%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	Not sentenced	0 (0%)
	Yes	123 (87%)
	No.....	18 (13%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Not sentenced/ N/A	18 (13%)
	No contact.....	37 (27%)
	Letter.....	39 (28%)
	Phone	30 (22%)
	Visit	45 (32%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	119 (85%)
	No.....	21 (15%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	0 (0%)
	Yes	123 (87%)

No..... 19 (13%)

Q13.5 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?
Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced..... 19 (14%)
 Very involved..... 34 (24%)
 Involved..... 44 (31%)
 Neither..... 20 (14%)
 Not very involved..... 16 (11%)
 Not at all involved..... 7 (5%)

Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)
Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced..... 19 (14%)
 Nobody..... 40 (29%)
 Offender supervisor..... 59 (43%)
 Offender manager..... 39 (28%)
 Named/ personal officer..... 30 (22%)
 Staff from other departments..... 18 (13%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?
Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced..... 19 (14%)
 Yes..... 95 (69%)
 No..... 16 (12%)
 Don't know..... 8 (6%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?
Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced..... 19 (14%)
 Yes..... 19 (14%)
 No..... 84 (60%)
 Don't know..... 17 (12%)

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..... 19 (14%)
 Yes..... 30 (22%)
 No..... 62 (45%)
 Don't know..... 28 (20%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?
 Yes..... 6 (4%)
 No..... 76 (55%)
 Don't know..... 55 (40%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?
 Yes..... 40 (30%)
 No..... 95 (70%)

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	22 (16%)	66 (49%)	46 (34%)
Accommodation	33 (25%)	36 (28%)	61 (47%)
Benefits	33 (25%)	46 (35%)	54 (41%)
Finances	35 (27%)	35 (27%)	58 (45%)
Education	34 (26%)	52 (40%)	45 (34%)

Drugs and alcohol	47 (36%)	45 (34%)	40 (30%)
-------------------	----------	----------	----------

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?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
Yes	85 (63%)
No	51 (38%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 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/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		147	2151	147	83
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	39%	86%	39%	88%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	87%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	7%	1%	0%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	10%	36%	10%	50%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	7%	2%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	12%	5%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%		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)?	28%	37%	28%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	4%	3%	
1.1	Are you Muslim?	16%	17%	16%	
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	2%	1%	
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	3%	11%	3%	
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%		4%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	80%	41%	80%	69%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	21%	23%	21%	17%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	32%	37%	32%	18%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	61%		61%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%		9%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	62%		62%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	85%		85%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	62%	67%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	83%		83%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	3%		3%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	95%	86%	95%	93%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	84%		84%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	78%	84%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	60%	59%	82%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	42%	61%	42%	33%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	16%	8%	3%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	2%	20%	2%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	6%	3%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	13%	24%	13%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	3%	1%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	15%	19%	15%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	5%	13%	5%	3%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	1%		1%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	3%		3%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	9%	1%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	19%	20%	19%	
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	30%		30%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	80%	90%	80%	93%
3.6	A shower?	32%	40%	32%	65%
3.6	A free telephone call?	33%	67%	33%	71%
3.6	Something to eat?	25%	78%	25%	89%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	50%		50%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	34%		34%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	59%		59%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	75%		75%	
3.7	A Listener/ Samaritans?	26%		26%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	23%	9%	23%	38%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	56%	51%	56%	79%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	41%	50%	41%	76%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	42%	42%	42%	67%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	44%	53%	44%	77%
3.8	Health services?	61%	61%	61%	
3.8	The chaplaincy?	59%	52%	59%	
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	87%	77%	87%	90%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	90%	94%	95%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	54%	58%	54%	85%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	67%		67%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	38%	38%	
4.1	Attend legal visits?	31%	51%	31%	
4.1	Get bail information?	18%	20%	18%	
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	28%	39%	28%	25%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	35%		35%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	60%	52%	60%	85%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91%	72%	91%	100%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	78%	78%	78%	92%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	66%	58%	66%	85%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	14%	42%	14%	29%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	71%	57%	71%	82%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	43%	36%	43%	54%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/ very good?	9%	24%	9%	45%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	41%	47%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	39%	42%	39%	59%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	44%	52%	44%	58%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	57%	66%	74%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	60%		60%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%		83%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	60%	60%	60%	75%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	61%	46%	61%	75%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	71%		71%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	42%	33%	42%	51%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	51%	40%	51%	60%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	14%		14%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	44%	23%	44%	35%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	57%	47%	57%	70%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	59%	54%	59%	
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	1%	17%	1%	3%
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?	55%		55%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	61%	66%	61%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	74%	71%	74%	86%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	33%		33%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/ all of the time during association?	12%	22%	12%	54%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	93%	72%	93%	89%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/ very helpful?	71%	58%	71%	83%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	15%	38%	15%	10%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	16%	5%	
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	12%	21%	12%	8%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	11%	9%	7%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	8%	5%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%		8%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/ property?	3%	6%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%		3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%		3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/ religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%		2%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	6%	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%		1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	1%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	7%	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/ crime?	3%	4%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	5%	2%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	32%	25%	32%	15%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	12%	17%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	5%	4%	1%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%		15%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%		4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%		1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	6%	5%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/ religious beliefs?	4%	4%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%		3%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	5%	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%		1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	6%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/ crime?	4%	4%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	4%	2%	
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:					
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	28%	34%	28%	29%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	60%	42%	60%	
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	78%	61%	78%	
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	25%	18%	25%	
	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?	69%	61%	69%	83%
9.2	The nurse?	71%	65%	71%	74%
9.2	The dentist?	57%	44%	57%	85%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	63%	54%	63%	72%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	24%	23%	24%	
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	86%		86%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	5%	21%	5%	
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	38%		38%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	15%	30%	15%	9%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	8%	25%	8%	7%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	33%	18%	33%	34%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%		14%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	5%	5%	5%	
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%		2%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	78%		78%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%		100%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	90%	82%	90%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	53%		53%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	56%		56%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	65%		65%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	47%		47%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	47%	40%	47%	
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	28%	18%	28%	
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	31%	37%	31%	
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	22%	10%	22%	
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	87%	74%	87%	
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	45%	50%	45%	
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	87%	69%	87%	
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?	66%	66%	66%	
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	91%	83%	91%	
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	63%	69%	63%	
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	87%	64%	87%	
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?	56%	55%	56%	
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	41%	35%	41%	38%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	50%		50%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	61%	5%	61%	72%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	14%	24%	14%	45%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	86%	54%	86%	97%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	31%	22%	31%	52%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/ friends while in this prison?	55%	42%	55%	
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	48%	52%	48%	12%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	35%	20%	13%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	47%		47%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	Young adult prisons comparator	HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012	HMP Thorn Cross 2005
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	87%		87%	
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	31%		31%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	32%		32%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	25%		25%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	37%		37%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	85%		85%	
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	87%	59%	87%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/ very involved in the development of your plan?	65%	62%	65%	100%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	nobody?	34%		34%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	50%		50%	
13.6	Offender manager?	33%		33%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	25%		25%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	15%		15%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	80%	80%	80%	
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	16%		16%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	25%		25%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%		4%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	30%	20%	30%	
	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?	59%		59%	
13.12	Accommodation?	37%		37%	
13.12	Benefits?	46%		46%	
13.12	Finances?	38%		38%	
13.12	Education?	54%		54%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	53%		53%	
	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?	62%	56%	62%	80%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 2012

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		41	105	23	121
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	5%	9%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	68%	100%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	99%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			100%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	4%	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	57%	0%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	2%	3%	4%	2%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	4%	0%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	81%	80%	82%	80%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	67%	56%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	79%	85%	83%	83%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	86%	75%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	42%	67%	44%	63%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	39%	42%	44%	40%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	79%	74%	87%	73%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	88%	83%	88%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	93%	96%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/ very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	38%	48%	36%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	62%	59%	64%	61%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	85%	93%	87%	91%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	15%	14%	25%	13%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/ very good?	5%	10%	4%	10%
4.6	Does the shop/ canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35%	52%	34%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	35%	39%	38%	38%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	43%	56%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	68%	70%	65%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	83%	79%	84%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	71%	70%	75%	70%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	48%	61%	34%	62%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	57%	60%	62%	60%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	43%	69%	34%	67%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	62%	79%	48%	80%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	2%	16%	4%	14%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	85%	96%	84%	95%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	22%	12%	17%	15%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	4%	9%	4%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	12%	12%	9%	13%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	5%	9%	0%	10%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	2%	4%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	2%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	2%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	4%	4%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	34%	31%	38%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	16%	13%	15%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	10%	3%	17%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	8%	2%	9%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	2%	9%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	2%	4%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	57%	62%	62%	62%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	74%	79%	92%	76%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	28%	22%	30%	23%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	0%	7%	0%	6%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	32%	52%	30%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	38%	52%	38%	49%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	33%	26%	38%	27%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	40%	26%	44%	28%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	10%	26%	13%	24%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	37%	52%	38%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	54%	65%	48%	64%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	18%	12%	21%	12%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	93%	83%	96%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	33%	31%	21%	34%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	57%	44%	56%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	19%	21%	19%

Diversity - age analysis



Key question responses (age - under 21) HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 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

		Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		57	90
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	30%	27%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	18%	15%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	3%	2%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	81%	79%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	86%	81%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	54%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	29%	50%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	69%	79%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86%	87%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	95%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	39%

Key to tables

Diversity - age analysis

		Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	65%	56%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87%	93%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19%	11%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/ very good?	11%	7%
4.6	Does the shop/ canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	33%	42%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	51%	40%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57%	72%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	75%	68%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	61%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	62%	56%
6.4	In the last six months if you spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated well/ very well by staff?	4%	0%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	63%	60%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	74%	75%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	11%	13%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	93%	93%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	23%	10%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	4%	6%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	15%	10%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	11%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	2%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	3%

Diversity - age analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	37%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	15%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	2%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	2%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the doctor?	72%	53%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	91%	70%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	26%	23%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	7%	3%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	36%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	54%	44%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	25%	30%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	29%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	23%	21%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	47%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	59%	63%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	19%	10%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	95%	80%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	25%	35%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	48%	48%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	15%	23%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses (wing analysis) HMP/YOI Thorn Cross 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	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		25	118
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	80%	29%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	12%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	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)?	33%	28%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	16%	16%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	2%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	83%	80%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	13%	23%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	40%	31%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	36%	69%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	9%
2.4	Was the van clean?	73%	59%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	84%	85%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	60%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	96%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	0%	4%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	100%	93%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	84%	84%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	56%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	29%	45%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	9%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	0%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	8%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	4%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	0%	5%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%	1%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	0%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	8%	22%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	57%	25%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	80%	79%
3.6	A shower?	35%	30%
3.6	A free telephone call?	44%	31%
3.6	Something to eat?	44%	20%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	56%	48%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	28%	35%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	54%	61%
3.7	Someone from health services?	71%	76%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	20%	27%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	46%	18%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	64%	52%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	40%	41%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	46%	41%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	50%	42%
3.8	Health services?	60%	61%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	50%	60%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	89%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	96%	94%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	70%	51%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	73%	65%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/ very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	33%	40%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	31%	31%
4.1	Get bail information?	18%	18%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	16%	31%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	31%	36%
	For the wing/ unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	84%	54%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	88%	92%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	76%	78%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76%	65%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	7%	15%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	75%	71%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	58%	38%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	7%
4.6	Does the shop/ canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	28%	40%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	35%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	44%	70%
4.10	Is it easy/ very easy to attend religious services?	60%	61%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	84%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	56%	60%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	56%	61%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	76%	70%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	53%	39%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	40%	54%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	13%	14%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	54%	41%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	59%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	56%	60%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	0%
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?	50%	50%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	58%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	84%	73%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	33%	35%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	20%	11%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	96%	93%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/ very helpful?	66%	73%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	20%	13%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	4%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	16%	11%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	4%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	6%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/ religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/ crime?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	34%	32%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	18%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	3%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	15%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	17%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/ religious beliefs?	9%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/ crime?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	38%	25%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	70%	58%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	96%	74%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	34%	23%
	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?	66%	70%
9.2	The nurse?	73%	71%
9.2	The dentist?	74%	53%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	64%	62%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	12%	25%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	86%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	0%	4%
	For those who have problems:		
9.5	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?		50%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	12%	14%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	4%
10.3	Is it easy/ very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	26%	33%
10.4	Is it easy/ very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	12%	13%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	3%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	2%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	100%	73%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	100%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	100%	93%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	29%	58%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	34%	60%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	44%	70%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	30%	51%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	56%	47%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	17%	31%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	34%	31%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	21%	22%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	90%	87%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	50%	43%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	82%	90%
	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?	57%	69%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	95%	92%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	47%	67%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	91%	87%
	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?	64%	54%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	43%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	54%	50%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	63%	61%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	36%	10%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	96%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	25%	31%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	54%	56%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	42%	48%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	21%	19%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	48%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Unit 5	All other units exc. CSU
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
For those who are sentenced:			
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	84%	88%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:			
13.2	No contact?	31%	32%
13.2	Contact by letter?	36%	31%
13.2	Contact by phone?	10%	27%
13.2	Contact by visit?	41%	37%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	80%	87%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	88%	88%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	48%	68%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
13.6	Nobody?	37%	33%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	48%	51%
13.6	Offender manager?	33%	34%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	33%	24%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	14%	15%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	77%	80%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	9%	18%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	28%	25%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	5%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	36%	29%
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?	53%	61%
13.12	Accommodation?	36%	39%
13.12	Benefits?	40%	49%
13.12	Finances?	40%	39%
13.12	Education?	47%	57%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	50%	56%
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?	54%	65%