

Report on an unannounced inspection of

**HMP Usk**

**and**

**HMP/YOI Prescoed**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**22 April – 3 May 2013**

## **Glossary of terms**

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

Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or:  
[hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk)

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prisons>

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 – Usk	7
Fact page – Prescoed	8
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	47
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	55
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix IIIa: Prison population profile – Usk	75
Appendix IIIb: Prison population profile – Prescoed	78
Appendix IVa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – Usk	81
Appendix IVa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – Prescoed	97



# Introduction

Usk and Prescoed, although managed as a single entity, are in fact two quite distinct facilities serving very different purposes. Located in Monmouthshire, Usk is a small 19th century radial institution designated as a category C training prison for about 270 mostly convicted sex offenders. Prescoed, located about two miles away in a rural setting, is an open prison holding about 230 category D prisoners, including a small number of young adults.

At previous inspections we have reported very positively on outcomes for prisoners at both these prisons. At this inspection we again found two very successful institutions, with Prescoed awarded our highest assessment against all four tests of a healthy prison. Outcomes at Usk were similarly impressive, although we noted some need for further improvements in the overall quality of the environment and relationships and in the delivery of resettlement.

Both prisons were commendably safe. Prisoners felt safe and all indicators, such as levels of violence, bullying and self-harm, were very low. Security at Prescoed was proportionate but some aspects were unnecessarily restrictive at Usk. Disciplinary procedures were used sparingly, and it was a sign of the quality of life we found that both institutions could operate without the need for segregation units.

Environmental standards at both prisons were reasonable. Despite its age, cleanliness at Usk was satisfactory, although cell sharing brought some limitations. Standards at Prescoed were more mixed and some units were grubby. We observed very good staff-prisoner relationships at both prisons, but our survey indicated a concerning decline in prisoners' perceptions of the quality of their relationships with staff.

Structures to promote equality, such as the deployment of peer supporters, were well established, although there was evidence that the perceptions of minority groups were more negative than those of the population as a whole. More rigorous enquiry into complaints and more systematic consultation with minorities would be beneficial. Prisoners, with some good reasons, had limited confidence in the way general complaints were dealt with, and there were issues with the quality of food. Health care provision at both prisons was good overall.

Both prisons had active regimes and were achieving good activity outcomes. Learning and skills were well managed and provision predicated on an analysis of need. There was enough activity, most of it of reasonable quality, to ensure all prisoners had something meaningful to do. Well over half the population were engaged in active learning, and success rates across learning and skills were good. At Usk the range of provision was satisfactory, although more limited in vocational training. At Prescoed there was a very clear and effective focus on moving prisoners toward work through temporary release in the community.

The use of temporary release generally to support resettlement at Prescoed was creditably high and was key to its function in managing sentences and preparing prisoners for release. The nature of the Usk population was different and, although risk of harm assessments were reasonable and sentence planning targets relevant, offender supervision was reactive and limited. It was also troubling, in view of the risk and complexity of the cases managed, that quality assurance and the supervision of case managers were very limited. However, public protection arrangements had improved considerably since. Overall, support across the key resettlement pathways in both prisons met need.

Usk and Prescoed are two very successful prisons. The institutions are well led and, in general, continue to deliver useful outcomes. An important message from this inspection, however, would be to ensure that there is no drift toward complacency, particularly at Usk. A priority would be to sharpen up offender management at Usk but also to ensure no further drift in the quality of

relationships and the provision of some basic services, such as food and the management of complaints.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2013

# Fact page – Usk

**Task of the establishment**

Category C training prison for adult male prisoners, most of whom are convicted sex offenders. HMP Usk is a dedicated sex offender treatment provider.

**Prison status**

Public sector

**Region**

Wales

**Number held**

26 April 2013: 272

**Certified normal accommodation**

159

**Operational capacity**

273

**Date of last full inspection**

April 2010

**Brief history**

Usk opened in 1844 as a house of correction. In 1870, it became the county goal for Monmouthshire and remained in that role until 1922, when it closed. It reopened in 1939 as a closed borstal until 1964, when it became a detention centre. In 1983, it became a youth custody centre, and from 1988 to 1990 a young offender institution. Since May 1990, it has been an adult category C establishment for vulnerable prisoners.

**Short description of residential units**

The accommodation is made up of four wings, of which three are two-storey landings and one a single-storey unit, commissioned in 2003.

**Name of governor**

Steve Cross

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service commissioner and providers**

Aneurin Bevan Local Health Board

**Learning and skills providers**

In-house provision

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Beverley Moore

# Fact page – Prescoed

## **Task of the establishment**

Open resettlement prison for category D adult and young adult male prisoners.

## **Prison status**

Public sector

## **Region**

Wales

## **Number held**

26 April 2013: 228

## **Certified normal accommodation**

219

## **Operational capacity**

230

## **Date of last full inspection**

April 2010

## **Brief history**

Prescoed opened in 1939 as an open borstal. It became a detention centre in 1964 and changed to an open youth custody centre in 1983. It became an open young offender institution in 1988, also taking category D adult males some years later. Since 2004, it has been exclusively an open prison for adult males.

## **Short description of residential units**

Ten residential units, all single storey with the exception of one unit. All single room accommodation with the exception of the dedicated induction unit which has 10 double occupancy rooms. The hostel, which assists longer term prisoners to prepare for release, consists of two semi-detached houses that accommodate up to eight prisoners.

## **Name of governor**

Steve Cross

## **Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

## **Health service commissioner and providers**

Aneurin Bevan Local Health Board

## **Learning and skills providers**

In-house provision

## **Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Beverley Moore

# About this inspection and report

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.

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.

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 tests are:

<b>Safety</b>	prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
<b>Respect</b>	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
<b>Purposeful activity</b>	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
<b>Resettlement</b>	prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: 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.**  
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**  
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.**  
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.**  
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.

Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
- **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
- **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.

Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: 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 and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.

Since April 2013, the majority of our inspections have been full follow-ups of previous inspections, with most unannounced. Previously, inspections were either full (a new inspection of the establishment), full follow-ups (a new inspection of the establishment with an assessment of whether recommendations at the previous inspection had been achieved and investigation of any areas of serious concern previously identified) or short follow-ups (where there were comparatively fewer concerns and establishments were assessed as making either sufficient or insufficient progress against the previous recommendations).

## This report

This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.

Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.

Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

# Summary

## Safety

- S1 *Usk and Prescoed were very safe prisons. The early days arrangements were good and, most importantly, prisoners felt safe on their first night. Levels of violence and self-harm were extremely low, and support for prisoners in crisis was good. Security arrangements were proportionate at Prescoed but some required review at Usk. Disciplinary procedures were fair, consistent and used sparingly. The privileges scheme was appropriate and transparent, and the Usk enhanced unit was a good initiative. Access to illegal drugs was low at Usk. **Outcomes for prisoners were good at both Usk and Prescoed against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in April 2010, we found that outcomes for prisoners in both Usk and Prescoed were good against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 15 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, and nine had not been achieved.*
- S3 Escort staff were helpful but vehicles were dirty. The reception facility was poor at Usk but much better at Prescoed. Reception staff at both sites were supportive and the reception processes were swift.
- S4 Most prisoners felt safe on their first night. The first night centre at Prescoed was well prepared. At Usk, new arrivals were located in any available cells but they were also well prepared. Both prisons ensured that arrivals had a comprehensive first night risk interview, and first night staff handover arrangements were appropriate. Prisoners were broadly satisfied with the peer-led induction.
- S5 Prisoners at both sites said they felt safe, and the incidence of violence, bullying and antisocial behaviour was low. The violence reduction strategy had been reviewed and guidance presented in a more concise and user-friendly style for staff and prisoners. At Usk, there was evidence of some low-level bullying, victimisation and name calling. Incidents reported to the safer custody team were investigated to a reasonable level, and perpetrators challenged appropriately and victims given good support. Attendance at safer custody meetings had improved, as had the sharing of information between security and safer custody staff. Prisoners from Usk and young adults had been safely integrated into Prescoed.
- S6 Incidents of self-harm and opened self-harm monitoring (ACCT) documents were low. ACCTs were of a good standard with evidence of positive interactions between staff and prisoners. Prisoners subject to monitoring reported high levels of care, and support from staff was good. Listeners (Samaritans-trained prisoners supporting those at risk of self-harm) operated at both sites, although those at Usk reported feeling unsupported by wing staff. Despite the good levels of care, we noted that less than a quarter of staff had received up-to-date ACCT training. The safer custody improvement plan was limited and did not include recommendations from the reports into three deaths from natural causes since our last inspection.
- S7 There was no formal safeguarding policy and no contact with local social services. Staff had identified prisoners at risk who would benefit from social care, and good ad hoc arrangements had been made to support some prisoners at both sites.

- S8 Security arrangements were properly focused, but some measures at Usk were over-controlled for a category C prison. Arrangements at Prescoed were proportionate. Patterns of drug use varied considerably at each site, but drug testing results were low. Weekend testing had not been taking place at Prescoed, and the drug testing suite at Usk was not fit for purpose.
- S9 The privileges scheme was applied fairly across both sites, and the unsupervised enhanced unit at Usk, which promoted independent living, was a good initiative. Both sites were impressively managed without need for segregation units, and the use of other elements of disciplinary procedure were applied appropriately.
- S10 There had been a local substance misuse needs assessment, but the drug and alcohol strategy needed to be updated in light of service changes. Prisoners completed detoxification before they arrived, but there was inadequate coordinated care and support from health and substance misuse services for prisoners using diverted medication. The substance misuse (CARAT) service was in transition and group work had stopped, but one-to-one support was easily accessible and of good quality.

## Respect

S11 *Some residential accommodation was tired but most areas were clean, although in-cell toilets in Usk lacked privacy. We observed positive interactions between staff and prisoners at Prescoed but relationships at Usk had deteriorated significantly. Formal arrangements for equality and diversity work were sound and most prisoners felt supported, but more consultation was required. Responses to most complaints were satisfactory, but prisoner confidence in the process was generally poor. Legal service provision was appropriate, apart from legal visits at Usk. Health services were good overall. Prisoners had mixed views about the food. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good at Usk and good at Prescoed against this healthy prison test.***

S12 *At the last inspection in April 2010, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Usk and Prescoed were good against this healthy prison test. We made 63 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that 23 of the recommendations had been achieved, 11 had been partially achieved, 26 had not been achieved and three were no longer relevant.*

- S13 Set in an open campus, communal house blocks varied significantly at Prescoed; some were grubby and not well maintained while others were cleaner. In Usk, a more traditional prison dating from the 19<sup>th</sup> century, most areas were commendably clean and well maintained despite its age. Cells were clean and free from graffiti, and prisoners had good access to cell cleaning materials. In-cell toilets in Usk were inadequately screened. Access to showers was good, although some were broken and had inadequate privacy.
- S14 Staff-prisoner relationships at Prescoed were positive, but at Usk they were more mixed and there was evidence that the relationships we previously described as excellent had deteriorated. Staff entries in prisoner case history notes were comprehensive at Usk but perfunctory at Prescoed. Prisoner consultation arrangements at Prescoed were well embedded and responsive, but at Usk they were irregular and required greater focus on outcomes.

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

- S15 In our survey, some respondents from minority groups at both sites were less positive than their counterparts about victimisation and intimidation, although the prisoners we spoke to felt well supported and did not speak of unfair treatment or discrimination. Formal structures for equality and diversity work were well embedded. Action plans were outcome-focused and monitoring data indicated that processes were fair. Consultation arrangements with minority groups were underdeveloped. The few discrimination complaints at Usk were investigated rigorously. Prisoner equality representatives were effective and appreciated by their peers.
- S16 The small number of foreign national prisoners had limited support from the UK Border Agency and no independent immigration advice. Initial identification of prisoners with disabilities was weak, and there were no individual emergency evacuation plans, but some appropriate reasonable adjustments had been made and many prisoners with disabilities received good care and support. Support for older prisoners required development. The faith provision was better at Usk but required improvement and attention at Prescoed.
- S17 Although the number of complaints was low at both sites, prisoners repeatedly told us they had limited confidence in the complaints process and feared repercussions, including transfers out, if they made a complaint. We found no evidence to support this. Quality assurance was ineffective, and we found examples of terse replies that had not properly investigated or addressed the complaint.
- S18 The legal services provision was generally appropriate, although the area for legal visits in Usk was insufficiently private. The prison was addressing the improper opening of legally privileged mail.
- S19 In our survey, respondents at Usk were positive about primary health care services but those at Prescoed were more negative. We found the service was good across the two sites. Primary care services were appropriate with regular access to GP clinics. Prisoners could see nurses daily at triage and medication collection clinics, and we observed clinically thorough and polite consultations. There was some developing work on chronic disease management. All medication was now provided to prisoners 'in possession'. Access to the dentist at Usk was reasonable but waits at Prescoed for community appointments were too long. Mental health services were responsive and good quality, and patients felt well supported.
- S20 Despite survey results at Usk that were better than the comparator, most prisoners we spoke to were negative about the quality of food. The temporary closure of a kitchen on one site had had a significant effect on the meals provided. Some new arrivals had long delays before they received orders from the prison shop, which was a significant gap at Usk, where there were no reception packs.

## Purposeful activity

- S21 *Opportunities for time out of cell were good at Usk, and Prescoed operated an open regime. Management of learning and skills was good and strategic planning was well developed. There were sufficient activity places, and allocation to activities was fair and efficient. The overall quality of activity and range of provision were good, and attendance was well managed. Educational and vocational achievements were impressive. The library offered a good service. Prisoners benefited from a range of PE activities that supported skills acquisition and healthy living. **Outcomes for prisoners were good at both Usk and Prescoed against this healthy prison test.***

- S22 *At the last inspection in April 2010, we found that outcomes for prisoners in both Usk and Prescoed were good against this healthy prison test. We made four recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that no recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, two had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S23 At Usk all prisoners could have at least nine hours a day out of their cell, irrespective of their employment status, and there was no lock up at Prescoed. Exercise at Usk was rarely cancelled but was limited to 30 minutes during the day, and exercise yards were not always freely accessible during evening association.
- S24 The management of learning and skills was good. The prison had produced a very comprehensive needs analysis and used labour market information well to develop new courses. Good partnerships with local statutory and voluntary agencies, as well as local employers, had led to more relevant work placements at Prescoed and improved prisoner well-being at Usk. Systems to improve quality were well embedded and the self-assessment process took very good account of the views of prisoners. The three-year development plan had a clear and appropriate focus on employability.
- S25 Most prisoners at both sites attended a satisfactory induction programme that identified their needs. The number of activity places was appropriate for the population, and few prisoners were unemployed. Many work placements were purposeful and developed good practical skills that helped prisoners build confidence and self-esteem. There was adequate provision for retired prisoners and others with poor health.
- S26 Good initial assessment of prisoners' interests, abilities and learning needs informed the planning of their education. In Usk, vocational tutors used assessment outcome information well to plan teaching. The range of work opportunities in Usk was satisfactory, but vocational development opportunities were limited. The range of unpaid community placements available on temporary release from Prescoed was satisfactory, but opportunities for paid employment in the community were too limited. Provision on the Cilwrgi Farm at Prescoed was still underused, but there were plans for improvement. The range of education provision was good, but prisoners' progress in open learning at Usk was not evaluated well enough. The quality of teaching was good, and the use of well-qualified and skilled orderlies enhanced teaching and learning support.
- S27 Success rates across all courses were very good, and most prisoners achieved their learning goals. Nearly all prisoners on vocational courses attained a relevant qualification, and prisoners in some classes produced quality work above the standards required for their qualifications. Most prisoners improved their basic literacy and numeracy skills and many gained useful qualifications. Targets in individual learning plans were too focused on qualification outcomes rather than individual needs.
- S28 Prisoners had good access to library facilities, which offered helpful activities to encourage reading, basic skills development and creative writing. The range of library materials was adequate, but let down by the poor range of Welsh language and culture books.
- S29 Most prisoners had a good understanding of healthy living, fitness and personal well-being, and benefited from a wide range of indoor and outdoor physical education activities. Older prisoners were encouraged to take part in appropriate fitness programmes. Some prisoners developed sports theory knowledge alongside physical activities.

## Resettlement

- S30 *Strategic management of resettlement arrangements were adequate but required development, and while recent changes to align offender management more closely with the security department appeared appropriate, they were too new to evaluate. Offender management at Prescoed focused appropriately on its population but at Usk was too reactive and insufficiently integrated. Public protection arrangements were impressive. Release on temporary licence arrangements were very well managed and a commendable number of prisoners used them, although access to outside paid work was limited. Resettlement pathway support was generally good, with positive outcomes for accommodation and health needs, but further work was required on finance, benefit and debt support and children and families provision. Offending behaviour work was good but more could be done with prisoners in denial of their offence. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good at Usk and good at Prescoed against this healthy prison test.***
- S31 *At the last inspection in April 2010, we found that outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good in Usk and were good in Prescoed against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that nine recommendations had been achieved, eight partially achieved, and eight had not been achieved.*
- S32 The reducing reoffending policy and strategy continued to incorporate resettlement but there was no strategy document covering offender management, and significant planned changes needed to be clear. The recent close alignment of security and offender management under one manager at each site (to better account for the particular risks prevalent) was appropriate but it was too early to evaluate its effectiveness fully. There was no up-to-date needs assessment.
- S33 At Usk, although risk assessments were generally good and sentence plans reflected the needs of prisoners, the role of offender supervisors was almost exclusively reactive, with little prisoner contact beyond responses to applications and annual reviews. There was little integration with the programme team. At Prescoed, the role of offender management was more clearly defined, with a clear and active role in risk assessment.
- S34 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) boards were well managed and appropriately focused on risk management. At Prescoed, levels of ROTL were impressive with around 12,000 events in the previous six months, higher than other open prisons, but access to paid work was limited.
- S35 Although OASys (offender assessment system) assessments were checked by managers, quality assurance did not extend to cover the wider work of offender supervisors at either site. There was no formal supervision or case management. This was more significant at Usk due to the risks posed by its significant sex offender population.
- S36 At Usk, arrangements for managing public protection had improved significantly and were now well organised and focused. Initial assessments of new arrivals and again before release were multidisciplinary, comprehensive and addressed risk management, but outcomes from reviews needed to be shared more routinely with offender managers. At Prescoed, the small number of public protection cases were consistently reviewed through the ROTL board or security committee.
- S37 The resettlement teams at both sites saw all prisoners during their induction and before release for reintegration planning. Accommodation support at Prescoed was provided by a local service, and was more limited for those from further afield. However, it was very rare for prisoners to be released with no fixed address from either site. In Prescoed, staff liaised

well with external support agencies and employers to help prisoners access appropriate progression opportunities on their release. There was limited specialist debt advice and support but prisoners at both sites had access to Jobcentre Plus advice before release.

- S38 A nurse saw prisoners 24 hours before discharge and gave them supplies of prescribed medication, where appropriate, and those with complex needs were given a discharge letter for their GP. There were very good links with mental health services and community mental health teams to support prisoners with mental health needs on discharge.
- S39 Other than the impressive use of ROTL at Prescoed and access to visits at both sites, work across the children and families pathway was limited. The visits hall at Usk remained a poor environment and visits rarely started on time, but prisoners and their families told us they were treated well by staff and were satisfied with the arrangements. Family days were only offered to life- and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners at Usk. They were appreciated by the few who received them.
- S40 Usk offered a comprehensive range of sex offender treatment programmes, but work with those in denial of their offence or who refused treatment was limited. Although there were no offending behaviour programmes at Prescoed, some provision was available through ROTL in the community, and the probation officer offender supervisor undertook some one-to-one work.

# Section 1. Safety

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

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.1** *Journey times to the prison for new arrivals were short and most prisoners felt safe, but escort vans were dirty. Access to both prisons was normally swift but the reception at Usk was closed over lunch, which meant that prisoners were often kept on vehicles for longer than necessary.*

**I.2** In our survey, respondents were positive against the comparators about the escort arrangements. Most journey times were short, escort staff were friendly and most prisoners indicated that they felt safe during transit; however, vans were dirty.

**I.3** Escort vans entered both prisons quickly and disembarkation was swift. However, the reception at Usk was closed over lunch and prisoners who arrived then were held on escort vans until staff returned from their break. Prisoners were not handcuffed from the vans to reception, which was proportionate to the risk. Late arrivals to either prison were rare.

### Recommendation

**I.4** **Prisoners should not be left on vans during the lunch period at Usk before embarkation to reception.** (Repeated recommendation I.5)

### Housekeeping point

**I.5** Escort vans should be clean.

## 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.**

**I.6** *The reception environment at Prescoed was very good but poor at Usk, although time spent there was minimal. First night facilities were reasonable and staff handover arrangements were sound. Induction at both sites was good but took too long at Usk.*

- 1.7** The reception at Usk was cramped, cluttered and a poor environment. The reception at Prescoed was large, bright and clean. New arrivals at Usk were strip searched routinely, which was disproportionate to the risk (see recommendation 1.46) while at Prescoed this was only done on the basis of a risk assessment.
- 1.8** Throughput in both receptions was low and time spent there was minimal. Staff were courteous and conducted a confidential risk assessment interview in reception before prisoners moved on to the first night/induction process. Most prisoners said that they felt safe on their first night.
- 1.9** At Usk there were no dedicated first night cells and new arrivals were allocated a cell wherever there was space; those we saw were clean and prepared for occupancy. New arrivals had a comprehensive first night interview with staff and were offered a telephone call and shower, but were not given a reception pack and could experience significant delays before they received their first shop order (see paragraph 2.121 and recommendation 2.123). Prisoners were left unlocked and were seen by the trained induction peer supporter, who gave a comprehensive overview of the regime at Usk.
- 1.10** At Prescoed new arrivals were allocated a cell on Pugh, the dedicated induction unit. Cells were clean and well prepared. Staff completed an initial interview, offered a telephone call and an initial reception pack if required. Prisoners at Prescoed were not locked up and showers were freely available.
- 1.11** Health services staff at both sites conducted confidential interviews with all new arrivals on the day they arrived. Handover arrangements to night staff about new arrivals were adequate.
- 1.12** At Usk the induction programme covered all the elements required but had no staff oversight and took place over a two-week period, which was too long. However, all prisoners were left unlocked during the day. In our survey, most prisoners were positive about the induction programme covering everything they needed to know.
- 1.13** At Prescoed a structured five-day induction programme started the day after arrival and was managed by a trained induction peer support orderly supported by induction staff. In our survey, fewer respondents than the comparator said the induction programme covered everything they needed to know. However, the induction programme was comprehensive.

## Recommendations

- 1.14** **The reception at Usk should be of an adequate size and appropriately equipped to manage the arrival and departure of prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 1.20)
- 1.15** **The induction programme at Usk should be completed within a week, and it should be properly supervised by a staff member.**

## Housekeeping point

- 1.16** Canteen reception packs should be provided to new arrivals at Usk.

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.17** *Prisoners felt safe and incidents of violence, bullying and antisocial behaviour were low, although prisoners at Usk reported some low-level bullying that had not been sufficiently challenged. The violence reduction strategy had been reviewed. Incidents were investigated to a reasonable level and perpetrators challenged appropriately. Victims were given good support. Attendance at safer custody meetings and sharing of information had improved. Prisoners from Usk and young adults had been safely integrated at Prescoed.*

**I.18** In our survey, respondents said they felt safe. Prisoners in groups and individually reported some problems around low-level bullying and name calling at Usk, which had not been sufficiently challenged by staff or reported to the safer custody team. In our survey, more respondents at Usk reported victimisation by other prisoners, which was both higher than the comparator and compared with our last inspection.

**I.19** The violence reduction strategy had been revised and gave concise guidance to staff and prisoners but was not informed by a survey of prisoners. The continuous improvement plan had few identified actions, required development and did not include recommendations from the three natural-cause deaths since our last inspection. Information sharing between the security and safer custody teams had improved and the safer custody team routinely received details of antisocial behaviour from security information reports (SIRs), which were then investigated.

**I.20** The number of violent incidents was low with only three fights and one assault at Usk and none at Prescoed in the previous six months. Bullying incidents were also low with six prisoners at Usk and one at Prescoed identified as involved in bullying activity during the same period. Incidents were investigated to a reasonable standard and perpetrators were managed using the incentives and earned privileges (IEP), adjudication procedures and through daily monitoring. Those involved in incidents that were more serious were transferred to other prisons. Victims were offered good support.

**I.21** Monthly safer custody meetings were well attended, including prisoners once a quarter, and were focused on relevant issues. Data collection and analysis were undertaken but the low number of incidents made it difficult to identify any trends. Reports of injuries to prisoners were shared with appropriate staff and unexplained injuries were investigated.

**I.22** New arrivals received information about safer custody during induction. A free helpline had been set up at both sites, and some calls had been received and prisoners offered immediate support as a result at Prescoed. Cell sharing risk assessments were completed on reception and reviewed as required. It was positive that prisoners from Usk and young adults had been safely integrated into Prescoed.

### Recommendations

**I.23** **A violence reduction survey should be carried out and used to inform the current strategy.**

- I.24 The safer custody team should be informed of all incidents of antisocial behaviour and investigate all incidents thoroughly.**

## Self-harm and suicide

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.25** *The incidence of self-harm and numbers of opened monitoring documents (ACCTs) were low. Documents were completed to a good standard and post-closure monitoring was good. Although less than a quarter of staff had received up-to-date ACCT training, prisoners subject to ACCTs reported high levels of care and support from staff. Listeners operated at both sites.*

- I.26** Arrangements for the management of suicide and self-harm were detailed in a comprehensive local policy. The number of incidents of self-harm was very low with only one incident at Usk and none at Prescoed in the previous six months. Ten assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents had been opened at Usk and one at Prescoed during the same period.
- I.27** ACCT documents contained comprehensive entries that demonstrated meaningful engagement with prisoners. Reviews were timely and multidisciplinary. There was a good system for monitoring prisoners after their ACCT was closed. Reviews documented high levels of care and support from staff, which was echoed by prisoners we spoke to.
- I.28** Prescoed prisoners subject to ACCT procedures were only ever transferred to other establishments as a last resort. This action was to ensure that an appropriate level of care could be offered and when more direct ongoing supervision was required. Post crisis, prisoners could return to Prescoed. Prisoners and staff at Prescoed assured us that every effort was made to help prisoners in crisis, and ACCT documents were opened only when absolutely necessary. Other factors (such as security matters) meant that remaining at Prescoed was not appropriate for the prisoner concerned. Despite the high levels of care we found, less than 25% of staff across both sites had received up-to-date training in ACCT procedures.
- I.29** There had been three deaths at Usk from natural causes since our last inspection but recommendations from Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) investigations had not been incorporated into the continuous improvement plan (see paragraph 1.19 and recommendation 1.24)
- I.30** There was an effective Listener scheme (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) and Listeners we spoke to felt generally well supported, although those at Usk reported feeling unsupported by some staff. In our survey, fewer prisoners at Prescoed than the comparator said they were able to speak to a Listener at any time, although the response was better than at the last inspection. Listeners at Prescoed did not wear easily identifiable T-shirts, but their photographs were displayed. They met all new arrivals and prisoners we spoke to knew who they were.

- I.31** Listeners could speak to prisoners in private at both Usk and Prescoed, and there were Listener suites at both sites. The local Samaritans attended regularly and dedicated Samaritan telephones were available.

## Recommendations

- I.32** **All staff should receive training in assessment, care in custody and teamwork procedures.** (Repeated recommendation 3.29)
- I.33** **The safer custody team at Prescoed should investigate the reasons for the poor survey results about access to Listeners.**

## Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.34** *There was no formal safeguarding policy and no contact with local social services. Staff had identified and made arrangements to support some prisoners in need of social care.*

- I.35** There was no formal safeguarding policy and there had been no contact with local social services about developing the policy.
- I.36** Staff at both sites could identify prisoners who were vulnerable for a variety of reasons and had made some ad hoc arrangements to support those who would benefit from social care. These arrangements were more sophisticated and better developed at Prescoed, where one prisoner with Asperger's Syndrome received commendable support both in the prison and in his community work placement.

## Recommendation

- I.37** **The governor should initiate contact with the local Safeguarding Adults Strategic Management Board and Safeguarding Adults Team to develop local safeguarding processes.**

## Security

### Expected outcomes:

**Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.**

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

**I.38** *Security arrangements were properly focused on the risks facing each prison. Some measures at Usk were over-controlled for a category C prison, but at Prescoed they were proportionate. Although the mandatory drug testing suite at Usk was unfit for purpose and there was no weekend testing at Prescoed, drug testing arrangements were otherwise well managed.*

**I.39** Security was managed by separate committees at each site, and each was properly focused on the distinct risks posed by their populations. Security information reports (SIRS) were processed efficiently and required actions were timely. There was evidence of work to tackle issues raised through SIRs but these were not always set as security objectives or monitored through the security committees.

**I.40** The prison had a very good relationship with the local police and shared information appropriately with other departments. In the previous six months, there had been seven absconds from Prescoed.

**I.41** Some security arrangements for prisoners at Usk were more restrictive than expected in a category C prison, including the lack of freedom of movement, wearing of brightly coloured sashes in visits, and strip searching on reception and after visits in the absence of supporting intelligence. To comply with a national directive, Prescoed had reintroduced routine strip searching for some prisoners after visits, which was unnecessary and out of tune with otherwise measured and proportionate arrangements.

**I.42** The combined year-to-date random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate was low at 3.36%, against a target of 5%, but there had been no weekend testing at Prescoed for some time. Suspicion testing took place as required. Testing facilities were satisfactory at Prescoed but the suite at Usk was not fit for purpose.

**I.43** Patterns of drug use varied significantly across the two sites. In our survey, fewer prisoners at Usk than the comparator said it was easy to get illegal drugs, but there was some evidence of diverted prescribed medication. At Prescoed, more respondents than the comparator reported illegal drug availability, which was borne out in SIRs and drug test results. Appropriate supply reduction measures were in place, and there was good information sharing between health, security and CARAT (substance misuse) departments.

## Recommendations

**I.44** **The establishment should ensure that the mandatory drug testing programme is adequately resourced to undertake the required level of weekend testing.**  
(Repeated recommendation 3.67)

**I.45** **Security arrangements at Usk should be commensurate with the risks presented at a category C prison.**

**I.46** **Prisoners should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion.**

**I.47** **The establishment should provide an adequate testing and waiting environment for mandatory drug testing at Usk.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.48** Security objectives based on received intelligence should be set and properly monitored.

## Incentives and earned privileges<sup>4</sup>

### 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.**

- I.49** *The majority of prisoners were on the enhanced privilege level and very few had been on basic. The regime on basic was reasonable. Designated enhanced units at both sites were a good initiative.*

- I.50** The IEP policy was comprehensive and understood by both staff and prisoners. Prisoners who transferred in on enhanced status could retain that level. Prisoners could apply to be enhanced after three months, which was too long.
- I.51** At Usk, two-thirds of prisoners were enhanced status and none was on the basic level. In the previous six months, only four prisoners had been placed on basic; the documentation we sampled justified these decisions. At Prescoed, the majority of prisoners were on the enhanced level and basic was used infrequently. The few warnings we reviewed were linked to antisocial behaviour and were justified. The basic privilege level at both sites was reasonable and offered a daily shower, telephone call and exercise, along with a period of association in the first seven days.
- I.52** Both sites operated units where prisoners on enhanced could apply to live. At Usk, enhanced prisoners could apply to live on D wing after six months. This unit was unsupervised and prisoners were unlocked for 24 hours a day. This promoted independent living and was a good initiative. At Prescoed, enhanced prisoners could apply to live on Mitchell unit, which was the newest accommodation and provided a decent environment.
- I.53** Differentials between levels were reasonable at Usk and good at Prescoed, as enhanced was linked to access to outside work and earned community/resettlement visits.

## Housekeeping point

- I.54** Prisoners should be able to apply for the enhanced privilege level after a month at Usk/Prescoed.

## 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.**

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

**I.55** *Application of all disciplinary measures was impressively low. Adjudications were used sparingly and for proper reasons, but some punishments were harsh. Force was used infrequently and only for appropriate reasons. Both prisons managed extremely well without segregation units.*

## Disciplinary procedures

**I.56** Adjudications were used sparingly but for appropriate reasons at both sites. There was no quality assurance but the records we sampled were mostly of a reasonable standard, although in some there was insufficient exploration before a finding of guilt and a small minority of punishments appeared harsh. There was no formal quality assurance procedure. Although numbers were low there was still no trend or pattern analysis of adjudications.

## The use of force

**I.57** The requirement for use of force was, impressively, very infrequent across both sites and we were assured that all instances were appropriate and a last resort. At Usk there had been no use of force in 2011, only one in 2012 and three times in 2013 to date. The incident in 2012 necessitated the application of control and restraint, but the three cases in 2013 involved no restraint and only a single member of staff applying minimal levels of physical coercion. The last recorded incident at Prescoed was a planned intervention that involved full use of control and restraint; although planned, it was not filmed

**I.58** The documentation on the use of force that we sampled was mostly of a reasonable standard, although some lacked detail and showed only limited efforts to de-escalate/communicate with the prisoner. Injury to prisoner forms (F213s) were not always completed. There was no formal quality assurance.

## Recommendation

**I.59** **All planned use of force incidents should be filmed.** (Repeated recommendation 7.21)

## Housekeeping point

**I.60** Use of force documentation should be thorough and comprehensive, including records of efforts to de-escalate and communicate with the prisoner. Injury to prisoner forms (F213s) should be completed and attached, and a formal quality assurance system should be introduced.

## Segregation

**I.61** Neither site had a segregation unit and managed very well without one. Infrequently and only in extreme circumstances, prisoners were held in reception holding rooms pending transfers to other prisons. A record of this was maintained and we were assured it was very rare and for the shortest possible time

## 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.**

**I.62** *Drug and/or alcohol dependent prisoners had completed detoxification before arrival but there was insufficient clinical support for those using diverted medication. Prisoners could readily access good quality one-to-one interventions, although group work had been suspended while the service was in transition. The drug and alcohol strategy was under new management and required updating.*

**I.63** Neither site accepted prisoners requiring detoxification or opiate-substitute treatment. However at Usk, there was some evidence of diversion of medication, such as the painkillers co-codamol, dihydrocodeine, tramadol and gabapentin. Prisoners using tradable medication were reluctant to approach health care for fear of getting reported and punished, and health and CARAT (substance misuse) services did not coordinate care and support to this group.

**I.64** There had been a local needs assessment to inform the strategy but the document required updating in light of service changes. CARAT services, currently provided by a small team of officers and one external drug worker, were due to be re-commissioned and there was a risk management action plan to prioritise work during the transition. Prisoners, including those with alcohol problems, could still access CARAT services easily. In our survey, more respondents at Usk than the comparator said they had received help with their alcohol problem. At Prescoed, where evening sessions were available, an impressive 100% of respondents who said they had a drug or alcohol problem said they had received support against the 65% comparator.

**I.65** In April 2013, 75 prisoners (27 at Usk and 48 at Prescoed) were actively engaged with the substance misuse service with 183 files suspended; these were reviewed every six months. Care plans and one-to-one work were of good quality, and CARAT clients could also access a counselling service, but all group work courses had stopped and acupuncture treatment was also due to cease. Both sites hosted weekly Alcoholics Anonymous self-help groups. At Usk, the CARAT worker still lacked appropriate interviewing facilities.

### Recommendations

**I.66** **Health and CARAT (substance misuse) services should work together to provide joint care and support to prisoners using diverted medication.**

**I.67** **The drug and alcohol strategy document should be updated in light of service changes and following re-commissioning, and a new development plan and performance measures should be established.**

**I.68** **The prison should provide the CARAT team at Usk with adequate group work facilities and interview rooms. (Repeated recommendation 9.70)**



## Section 2. Respect

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

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *Communal areas varied significantly at Prescoed, from refurbished units to those that were dirty and poorly maintained. Communal areas at Usk were clean and well maintained. Cells across both sites were clean. Too many cells at Usk designed for one person held two with inadequate in-cell toilet screening. Access to showers at both sites was good but some lacked privacy. Access to telephones, clean clothes and sheets at both sites was good, and their application systems worked well.*
- 2.2** Usk was of Victorian radial design and although it was old it was well maintained and standards of cleanliness in communal areas were very good. The accommodation at Prescoed was prefabricated and set in an open campus; standards of accommodation there varied significantly - Mitchell unit was clean and well maintained but other units, including Morgan, were grubby and untidy. External areas were clean and well presented at both sites.
- 2.3** Cells at Usk were generally clean, free from graffiti and the offensive displays policy was mostly adhered to. However, considering the population we were surprised to find some images of nudity on display, which were allowed in the policy. Access to cell cleaning materials was good. Most rooms at Prescoed were clean, free from graffiti and the offensive displays policy was adhered to.
- 2.4** At Usk prisoners had privacy keys to their cells. Most single cells were used inappropriately to hold two prisoners, and in-cell toilet privacy screening was inadequate, particularly when prisoners had to dine in their cell. All cells had adequate furniture, including lockable cabinets. Staff response times to cell bells were quick and most prisoners we spoke to said this was the norm. At Prescoed some communal toilets were smelly and heavily scaled. Shared rooms did not have enough furniture.
- 2.5** Shower privacy curtains had been installed at Usk but some were missing on one wing. Access to showers was good due to the amount of time prisoners spent out of their cells. At Prescoed, some showers were broken and some had insufficient privacy. Many prisoners complained about generally poor maintenance, and this had been repeatedly documented at the prisoner consultative meeting. Survey respondents at Prescoed were also less positive than the comparator about access to showers, although we found prisoners had unlimited access.
- 2.6** At both sites prisoners were allowed to wear their own clothes, and laundry facilities worked well. Most prisoners were positive about access to clean sheets and clothing.
- 2.7** Rules and routines were discussed on arrival and were prominently displayed at both sites. In our survey, respondents at Usk were more positive than the comparator about access to

and fairness of the application system. Application forms were freely accessible and the system generally worked well. However, at Prescoed fewer respondents than the comparator said it was easy to make an application or that they were dealt with quickly. Applications were freely available from the control building (central staff office) on the site, and prisoners we spoke to said the application system was reasonable.

- 2.8** Access to telephones and mail at both sites was good. There were enough telephones for the population and prisoners had easy access as they were unlocked for most of the day. Mail was delivered to prisoners at both sites within 24 hours of arrival.
- 2.9** In our survey, prisoners at Prescoed, unlike those at Usk, were negative about access to their stored property. However, we found no backlog of stored property applications there and prisoners we spoke to said access was good.

## Recommendations

- 2.10** Communal areas in Prescoed should be kept clean and well maintained.
- 2.11** Cells designed for one prisoner should not hold two, and toilets in cells should be effectively screened. (Repeated recommendations 2.28 and 2.29)
- 2.12** Rooms in Prescoed should have lockable cabinets.

## Staff-prisoner relationships

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.13** *There was evidence that staff-prisoner relationships at Usk, which we had previously described as excellent, had deteriorated. While we observed some good interaction, some staff appeared disinterested. Personal officer work was better. In our survey, prisoners at Prescoed were positive about the quality of relationships with staff, which was supported by our own observations.*

- 2.14** Staff-prisoner relationships at Usk, described as excellent at our last inspection, had deteriorated significantly, and in our survey the proportion of respondents who said that staff treated them with respect had fallen from 90% to 75%, although this was comparable with similar prisons. Most respondents at Prescoed were positive across a range of indicators about relationships with staff.
- 2.15** At both sites we observed some good interactions, with staff focused on caring for prisoners. However, at Usk some staff were indifferent and prisoners described a few as disinterested. In our survey, fewer respondents at Usk than the comparator said staff spoke to them during association and we observed some staff who stayed in wing offices when prisoners were out of their cells. Staff use of prisoners' preferred names was not embedded at either site.
- 2.16** In our survey, respondents at Usk were more positive than the comparator about having a personal officer who was helpful. Fewer prisoners at Prescoed said they had a personal officer. At Usk we found balanced, regular case history notes which reflected staff knowledge of prisoners' personal circumstances and focused on offender management. At Prescoed,

staff entries were mechanistic, focusing on eligibility dates for release on temporary licence (ROTL) rather than meaningful engagement. Regular management checks of entries at Usk were effective but there were no checks at Prescoed.

- 2.17** Prisoner consultation meetings at Usk were irregular and many actions recorded in the minutes had not been dealt with. Effective monthly consultation meetings at Prescoed, chaired by the head of residence, were held during the evening period so prisoners working out could attend.

## Recommendations

- 2.18** Usk prison should address prisoners' negative perceptions about staff, and staff identified as indifferent should be encouraged to take a more active and positive approach.
- 2.19** Staff should use prisoners' preferred names or titles when addressing them, (Repeated recommendation 2.42)
- 2.20** Personal officer entries in wing files at Prescoed should evidence frequent meaningful engagement with prisoners and knowledge of their personal circumstances. (Repeated recommendation 2.52)

## Housekeeping point

- 2.21** Prisoner consultation at Usk should be regular and address the issues raised.

## Equality and diversity

### Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic<sup>5</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.22** *The promotion of diversity was guided by a useful policy document and led by an identified senior manager supported by effective prisoner peer supporters. Consultation arrangements with prisoners were underdeveloped. Despite some negative survey results, prisoners from minority groups were generally content with their treatment. External support for foreign national prisoners was inadequate. There were no formal structures for identifying prisoners with disabilities, and emergency evacuation plans were rudimentary. The support group for gay and bisexual prisoners had gone into decline.*

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

## Strategic management

- 2.23** An overarching equality and diversity policy document covered both sites and included legal obligations and provision for the different protected characteristic groups. The policy was underpinned by a meaningful action plan focused on outcomes for prisoners. Impact assessments across several key areas had been completed.
- 2.24** A senior manager led on equality and diversity work and was supported by full-time prisoner equality representatives at each site. The representatives were appreciated by other prisoners and were a conduit between them and the prison on equality issues.
- 2.25** The quarterly equality and diversity meeting was held at Usk and was well attended by staff and prisoner representatives from each site. The minutes reflected a useful meeting and, although not all protected characteristics were identified in the standing agenda, all were covered in the equality report to the meeting.
- 2.26** Systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment (SMART) data were collated monthly and disaggregated for each site. Data for black and minority ethnic prisoners were normally in range but scrutinised effectively on those occasions when they were not to address potential discrimination.
- 2.27** The number of discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) from prisoners was low, with only 13 submitted at Usk during 2012/13 and none at Prescoed. All DIRFs were investigated rigorously and conclusions were balanced. However, the forms were only available in English.
- 2.28** Cultural events were celebrated across both sites, and there was an impressive display covering sexual orientation on the wings at Usk. Only 74% of staff had been trained in diversity awareness.

## Recommendations

- 2.29** **The prison should work with prisoners from minority groups through formal consultation arrangements, which should be used to address the negative perceptions evidenced in our survey.**
- 2.30** **Managers should monitor incentives and earned privileges levels by nationality, and investigate the reasons behind the poorer experience of foreign national prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 4.32)
- 2.31** **Discrimination incident report forms in good condition and in a range of languages relevant to the population should be freely available on both sites.** (Repeated recommendation 4.17)
- 2.32** **Training in all strands of diversity should be delivered to all staff.** (Repeated recommendation 4.7)

## Protected characteristics

- 2.33** Prisoners from a black or minority ethnic background made up 6% of the population at Usk and 12% at Prescoed. In our survey at Prescoed, black and minority ethnic prisoners were more negative than white respondents across a range of indicators. Across both sites consultation arrangements with minority groups were underdeveloped. There had been a few informal focus groups with black and minority ethnic and foreign national prisoners, but

these meetings lacked structure with no minutes or action plans formulated. Prisoners we spoke to said that they would appreciate better communication, although they did appreciate the work of the prisoner representatives (see paragraph 2.24). Our survey suggested that 4% of the population at both sites were Gypsy, Romany or Travellers but there was no specific support for these prisoners.

- 2.34** There were eight foreign national prisoners at Usk and none at Prescoed. The United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA) visited the establishment infrequently, and no formal independent immigration advice was available. The equality manager and legal services officers saw all foreign national prisoners. Despite the lack of external support, all the foreign national prisoners we spoke to were content with their treatment at the prison. Translation services were available and the prison could translate local documents into different languages as and when needed.
- 2.35** Muslim prisoners accounted for around 5% of the population at Usk and 8% at Prescoed. We spoke to a number at both sites and they spoke favourably about their treatment by staff, indicated that they were not discriminated against and that they were able to practise their religion.
- 2.36** In our survey at both Prescoed and Usk, prisoners who considered themselves to have a disability were more negative than their counterparts across a range of indicators. There were no formal procedures for identifying prisoners who considered themselves to have a disability. In our survey, 22% of respondents at Usk and 13% at Prescoed considered themselves to have a disability. The names of prisoners who would need help in an evacuation were clearly displayed and most staff had a good knowledge of prisoners and their disabilities, but personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) were not readily available and there was no specific information for staff on the type and level of help needed. There was no formal prisoner peer support scheme. There was a suitable adapted cell at Usk and a stair lift to get prisoners to the second floor for the library. Some adjustments had been made for individual prisoners with a disability.
- 2.37** In our survey, prisoners over the age of 50 at Usk were more positive about their treatment than those under 50, but responses by age at Prescoed were similar. There were over 100 prisoners over 50 at Usk and 29 at Prescoed. An older prisoners' group was held daily at Usk for prisoners to meet and this was appreciated by prisoners. Support for older prisoners required further consideration.
- 2.38** Usk had a specific support group – 'XPressions' – for gay and bisexual prisoners, but this good initiative had started to go into decline. Meetings were no longer regular and the monthly newsletter was no longer published. Prisoners from the group felt unsupported and that the prison no longer cared. There was no specific policy or strategy for transsexual or transgender prisoners.

## Recommendations

- 2.39** **The prison should ensure that there are adequate and well-publicised arrangements for external support and advice for foreign national prisoners from both the United Kingdom Border Agency and independent immigration advisory services.**
- 2.40** **There should be formal procedures for identifying prisoners with disabilities and an accurate record maintained.**

- 2.41 Personal emergency evacuation plans for those prisoners requiring assistance should be readily available to staff on the units where they are located.** (Repeated recommendation 4.47)
- 2.42 An organised scheme of peer support for prisoners with disabilities should be introduced.** (Repeated recommendation 4.49)

### Housekeeping points

- 2.43** The prison should reactivate the XPressions group to provide regular support for gay and bisexual prisoners.
- 2.44** There should be a policy for the care and treatment of transgender and transsexual prisoners.

### 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.**

**2.45** *The faith provision was good at Usk, the team was well integrated into the life of the prison and all religions were supported, but the service had a lower profile at Prescoed and required some development. The multi-faith areas and chapels at both sites were suitable.*

- 2.46** In our survey at Usk, more respondents than the comparator said that they saw a religious leader on arrival, their religious beliefs were respected and they could speak to a religious leader in private. However, the responses at Prescoed were worse than the comparators for most aspects of faith and religious activity, including being seen by a religious leader within 24 hours of arrival.
- 2.47** There was a newly appointed head of faith who was a Free Church minister. His time was split between the two sites, but he told us that he spent disproportionately more time at Usk than at Prescoed. Two sessional Muslim chaplains worked across both sites and the prison deployed other sessional chaplains as needed.
- 2.48** The chapel and the multi-faith rooms at both sites were small but adequate for the limited numbers attending services. There were weekly faith-based classes at Usk but the provision at Prescoed was limited, although prisoners could go to the chapel unsupervised. Major faith festivals were celebrated and given a high priority.

### Recommendation

- 2.49 The chaplaincy should ensure that each newly arrived prisoner sees a chaplain within 24 hours, and monitor performance.** (Repeated recommendation 3.53)

## 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.**

**2.50** *Although the number of complaints was low prisoners had limited confidence in the complaints process, and we found some evidence to support their negative perceptions. The quality of responses varied and quality assurance was ineffective.*

**2.51** In our survey, prisoners at Usk were more negative than the comparator about the ease of making a complaint but those who had made a complaint were more positive about it being dealt with fairly and on time. Prisoners at both sites repeatedly told us they had limited confidence in the complaints process and feared the repercussions, including transfers out if they made a complaint. We found no evidence to support these perceptions.

**2.52** The number of complaints was very low. Complaints about health care were submitted through the general complaints system, which gave insufficient confidentiality (see paragraph 2.61 and housekeeping point 2.69). The responses we sampled were mostly polite and addressed the concern raised, but a few were terse, biased towards staff and not properly investigated or dealt with. The quality assurance procedure checked 100% of responses but was ineffective as it did not highlight any of the issues we found. There was no trend or pattern analysis of complaints.

### Recommendation

**2.53** **The quality of complaint responses should be improved through regular monitoring by managers.** (Repeated recommendation 3.37)

## 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.**

**2.54** *The general provision of legal services was appropriate, although legal visits arrangements at Usk were unsatisfactory. Legal correspondence had been opened inappropriately but this was being dealt with.*

**2.55** One of four trained legal services officers at Usk saw all new arrivals and offered an appropriate service, including the facilitation of free telephone calls and assistance with appeal documentation where necessary. Due to the stage that prisoners were at in their sentence, the requirement for legal services provision was much less at Prescoed.

**2.56** Legal visits at Usk took place in the main visits hall and continued to offer insufficient privacy. Arrangements at Prescoed were adequate.

## Recommendation

- 2.57** Legal visits facilities at Usk should be improved so that legal advisers can interview their clients in private. (Repeated recommendation 3.43)

## 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.**

- 2.58** *Health services were good overall with an appropriate range of primary care services. Partnership working between the prison and health care was mature and effective. Dental care was good at Usk but waits for treatment at Prescoed were too long. Medicines management needed to be improved and focus on effective and appropriate prescribing and safe use of in-possession medicines. Prisoners with mental health needs received good quality care but there was too little focus on primary mental health needs.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.59** Health services were commissioned by NHS Wales and provided by Aneurin Bevan Health Board. There was very good oversight and partnership working between the prison and health care, and the prison partnership board had supported some necessary changes to the model of health care.
- 2.60** There was clear leadership for all services from the health care manager, and the small nursing team included appropriate skill mix and experience. There was no formal clinical supervision for primary care nursing staff.
- 2.61** Clinical incidents and complaints were dealt with through the health board governance mechanism but there was no local prison forum. Early resolution of complaints was encouraged through direct discussion with the health care manager, and the few formal written complaints were responded to appropriately and promptly, but were submitted through the general complaint system, which provided insufficient confidentiality. Reporting of incidents was good and staff understood its importance.
- 2.62** All clinicians used electronic patient records, and recording was appropriate and clear. There was no effective chronic disease management register or use of the 'task' system for effective clinical-to-clinician communication
- 2.63** The health care environment at Usk was clean and suitable, but Prescoed had some soft flooring and lacked consultation space in clinical areas. Most sinks and taps did not meet infection control standards and there had been no infection control audit at either site. Emergency equipment, including semi-automated defibrillators, was kept in the health care departments. Prison staff had no access or appropriate training to use it.
- 2.64** There were appropriate policies for information sharing, infection control, and outbreak and blood-borne viruses. The palliative care policy was inadequate and a new one was being developed. Health promotion literature was varied and accessible but there was little

available in foreign languages. Health promotion was limited to individual advice and immunisation campaigns for blood-borne viruses and measles, mumps and rubella.

**2.65** There was no health care representation at the prisoner consultative forums.

## Recommendations

**2.66** **Clinical supervision should be established for all clinical staff.**

**2.67** **All health care information should be available in a range of languages relevant to the population.** (Repeated recommendation 5.6)

**2.68** **Automated emergency defibrillators should be available at Usk and Prescoed and prison and health care staff should be trained in their use.**

## Housekeeping points

**2.69** There should be a confidential process for health care complaints.

**2.70** Health promotion should be developed.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

**2.71** In our survey, more prisoners at Usk than the comparators were positive about access to health services and said that health care was good. Respondents at Prescoed were more negative about access to and quality of services than the comparators and fewer said that the service from the doctor and dentist was good. However, prisoners we spoke to at Prescoed were not negative, and most whom we spoke to at both sites said that health care had responded appropriately to their needs.

**2.72** New arrivals were given an initial health screening and those at Usk had a secondary health assessment within three days, but at Prescoed they were only offered a secondary assessment if they had come from a prison other than Usk.

**2.73** Prisoners had access to a suitable range of primary care services, including a podiatrist and optician. They could visit a nurse triage clinic every day at set times and between 8am and 4pm for advice and urgent problems. Most were seen first by a nurse and diverted to GP clinics where appropriate. We observed clinically thorough and respectful consultations by nurses. A recent trial of evening triage clinics at Prescoed had not attracted much use by outworkers. There was no formal triage protocol and nurses had not received triage training.

**2.74** Locum GPs provided medical clinics pending a permanent contract to a local practice. Clinical records showed appropriate consultations and follow-through, and we observed evidence of good professional working between the GPs and nurses.

**2.75** Chronic disease management was starting to develop but lacked a systematic structured approach. Care planning for prisoners with complex conditions was underdeveloped.

## Recommendations

- 2.76 Nursing staff should use triage algorithms and be trained to at least a basic level in triage skills.** (Repeated recommendation 5.26 and 5.27)
- 2.77 Chronic disease management should be systematic and enable appropriate follow-up, with active care planning for prisoners with multiple conditions.**

## Pharmacy

- 2.78** A local community pharmacy supplied medicines. There was good regular professional advice and strategic oversight from the health board. The pharmacist from the supplying pharmacy visited on request, but there were no pharmacy clinics or medicines use reviews.
- 2.79** All prisoners were allowed medication in possession based solely on the risk assessment by the sending prison. We also observed a man allowed his medicines in possession where this had not happened at the sending prison. The in-possession medicines policy was not based on appropriate risk-based screening of the prisoner and his medication. Random in-possession checks were conducted with support from prison staff, as well as checks where there were concerns about use and compliance with medication.
- 2.80** Prisoners could obtain small supplies of simple pain relief from the nurses, and at Prescoed, officers could also provide simple pain relief out of hours. Patient group directions (authorising appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) were confined to vaccines and oxygen.
- 2.81** We noted some inconsistent prescribing of stronger pain-relieving medication, including opioid-based and tradable drugs, and a lack of medicines use reviews. There were plans to introduce community-type prescriptions to support prescribing audits and enable prisoners to take responsibility for re-ordering their medicines.
- 2.82** Prisoners were not always asked for identification cards before they were given their medication, information leaflets were not always provided and reference booklets were out of date.
- 2.83** If prisoners required prescriptions outside GP clinic hours, there were clear and appropriate arrangements for remote prescribing and provision of medicines.
- 2.84** Medicines were re-labelled and reused as stock and nurses were re-labelling stock medicines as in-possession medicines for individual patients. There were no standard operating procedures.
- 2.85** The medicines and therapeutics committee had not met for more than a year.

## Recommendations

- 2.86 The pharmacist should visit the prison at least once a month to check the systems in operation and provide counselling sessions, pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication review.** (Repeated recommendation 5.16)
- 2.87 Patient group directions should be introduced to enable supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed patient group directions should be**

**held in the pharmacy and read and signed by all relevant staff.** (Repeated recommendation 5.35)

- 2.88 Primary dispensing (nurses dispensing stock medicines as named-patient medicines and vice versa) should stop.** (Repeated recommendation 5.38)
- 2.89 Medicines management should include robust in-possession risk assessments, medicines use reviews, audit of prescriptions and faxed prescriptions, patient advice, robust stock control and dispensing, and appropriate standard operating procedures through regular operational oversight by a pharmacy professional.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.90** Patients should be identified by their prison ID card when collecting medication.
- 2.91** Patient leaflets should always be given with medication, and pharmaceutical reference books should be up to date.
- 2.92** The World Health Organization (WHO) 'pain ladder' should be used to inform appropriate prescribing of opiates.
- 2.93** The medicines and therapeutics committee should meet regularly with appropriate representation.

## Dentistry

- 2.94** Dental services at Usk were good. A local community dentist provided services with regular professional oversight from the National Public Health service. Prisoners waited up to eight weeks for a first appointment, which was better than in most comparable prisons. They could access a full range of NHS treatment and only more complex procedures were referred out to the local dental surgery service. Paper and electronic records provided accurate and complete descriptions of assessment and treatments.
- 2.95** The surgery at Usk was clean and fit for purpose with appropriate adherence to national infection control requirements. Arrangements for maintenance and calibration of equipment were shared between the prison and the health board. All regular checks were up to date, including for X-ray equipment and decontamination equipment.
- 2.96** Prisoners at Prescoed attended an external dental practice for a monthly dedicated session. There were 63 men on the waiting list and the longest wait was over 14 weeks. Some sessions had been cancelled due to lack of escort staff. The dental waiting list at Prescoed was not triaged appropriately, although emergency problems were dealt with promptly. There were no arrangements to cover the dentist's leave.

## Recommendation

- 2.97 Dental care at Prescoed should ensure appropriate triage of need and prompt appointments, Appointments should not be routinely cancelled.**

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.98** Mental health services were provided by Aneurin Bevan Health Board. A full-time and registered mental health nurse supported by a part-time mental health nurse provided an integrated service. The service operated on weekdays between 8am and 4pm, and at other times, urgent referrals were made through the GP out-of-hours service
- 2.99** New arrivals with known mental health conditions were referred by the sending prison or identified and referred during reception screening. Prisoners could also self-refer or be referred by any member of staff. An initial routine assessment was made within two days. Prisoners who needed an urgent assessment could be seen the same day during the working week.
- 2.100** Assessment was robust, including use of a depression inventory scale and good use of relapse indicator tools to identify early signs of deterioration. There was good use of care planning and review. The lead nurse contributed to multi-agency meetings in the prison and parole reports, and there was effective collaboration with other prison services.
- 2.101** The service was disproportionately weighted towards men with severe and enduring conditions, with not enough use of primary interventions, including counselling. Prisoners we spoke to described good support for their mental health needs and felt confident in asking for help. There had been no assessments or transfers under the Mental Health Act in the last year
- 2.102** The mental health team had provided some mental health awareness training for staff, and approximately 14 prisoner Listeners had also received training.

## Recommendations

- 2.103 Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services.** (Repeated recommendation 5.59)
- 2.104 The mental health needs of prisoners should be reviewed to ensure that those with primary care needs are dealt with appropriately.**
- 2.105 A rolling programme of mental health awareness training should be delivered to all discipline and health care staff.** (Repeated recommendation 5.60)

## Good practice

- 2.106** *Prisoner Listeners had been trained in mental health awareness, which enabled early identification of prisoner needs.*

## 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.**

**2.107** *Many prisoners were negative about the food. The menu was limited, and breakfast packs were issued too early. The kitchen at Usk was not fit for purpose. Consultation arrangements were poor.*

- 2.108** In our survey at Usk, more prisoners than the comparator said that the food was good but the responses was much worse than at our last inspection. At Prescoed, fewer respondents than the comparator said the food was good. Prisoners said that the food quality had been poor since the menu had been reduced (see below).
- 2.109** A four-week menu cycle consisted of only three options at each meal. The repetitive menu covered halal, vegan and vegetarian diets but did not include healthy options. Breakfast packs were issued the day before they were to be consumed. New arrivals could choose their pre-select menu options for the following day.
- 2.110** The prison had reduced the menu in November 2012 in anticipation of the closure of the kitchen at Usk, which was not fit for purpose, and the expansion of the kitchen at Prescoed. However, the closure was only confirmed during the week of the inspection. The kitchen at Usk was small, poorly maintained and unsuitable, with no separate preparation or cooking facilities for halal food. At Prescoed, the kitchen was clean and well maintained. At both sites, food serveries were attached to the kitchen and supervised by catering staff. Meals were served at appropriate times.
- 2.111** Prisoners working in the kitchen at Usk could gain a national vocational qualification (NVQ) in catering but this was not available to those working in the kitchen at Prescoed (which would eventually replace the one at Usk).
- 2.112** There was no provision at Usk for prisoners to dine in association, but in Prescoed they could dine in association in a central dining hall, and eight prisoners who lived in a resettlement house on site could self-cater.
- 2.113** Food consultation arrangements were poor. There had been no food survey for over 18 months and the catering manager did not attend either prisoner consultative meeting. Food comments books were available on serveries, but at Prescoed responses to comments were limited.

## Recommendations

- 2.114** **Prisoners working in the kitchen at Prescoed should be able to achieve qualifications.**
- 2.115** **Prisoners at Usk should have the facility to dine out.** (Repeated recommendation 8.9)

## Housekeeping points

- 2.116** The interim menu should cater for all diets.
- 2.117** Breakfast packs should be given out on the day they are to be eaten. (Repeated recommendation 8.8)
- 2.118** Food consultation arrangements should be improved.

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.119** *Prisoners were generally satisfied with the prison shop arrangements, but new arrivals waited too long to use it. Consultation was regular and responsive. There was a good range of catalogues but prisoners were charged an administration fee on orders.*

**2.120** The prison shop was provided under a national contract. Around 375 items were available on the separate shop lists for each site and prisoners were broadly satisfied with the range available, but still felt that some items were expensive. There was regular consultation, which resulted in changes to the shop lists.

**2.121** New arrivals could wait 11 or 12 days to make their first shop order, depending on the day they arrived. At Usk, this was compounded by a lack of reception packs (see paragraph 1.9 and recommendation 1.16).

**2.122** A good range of catalogues was available but prisoners were charged a 50p administration fee on orders, which was inappropriate.

### Recommendation

**2.123** **Prisoners should have access to the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival.**

### Housekeeping point

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

## Section 3. Purposeful activity

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

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.1** *Time out of cell at both sites was good but access to exercise at Usk was limited.*

**3.2** At Usk, all prisoners were unlocked for nine hours a day during the week and 7.5 hours at the weekend. Prescoed operated an open regime and prisoners had freedom to associate all day.

**3.3** Daily exercise periods at Usk were rarely cancelled but were only for 30 minutes before lunch. Association took place in the evening but the exercise yard was not open to allow prisoners to get further time in the open air.

### Housekeeping point

**3.4** There should be open access through the day to the exercise yard at Usk. (Repeated recommendation 6.41)

## Learning and skills and work activities

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.5** *The management of learning and skills was good overall. Quality improvement arrangements were well established and effective. Labour market information was used well to develop relevant courses. The standard of teaching was good and success rates on all courses were high. The number of activity places met the needs of the population, and they offered a broad range of provision that developed good practical skills and helped build confidence and self-esteem. Library facilities were good and used well.*

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

**3.6** *Estyn made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<i>Current performance</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Prospects for improvement</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>How good are outcomes?</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>How good is provision?</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>How good are leadership and management?</i>	<i>Good</i>

**Management of learning and skills and work**

- 3.7** Management of learning and skills was good. There were effective systems to collect and analyse data on learning outcomes. The learning and skills department had usefully compared its performance with other providers, such as colleges, in Wales. Arrangements for reporting fully on the data were still at an early stage, and the prison was not yet using this information to evaluate provision or set challenging improvement targets.
- 3.8** A very comprehensive needs analysis had been produced and used well to develop new courses. Staff had taken good account of local labour market information – for example, there was a well-developed plan to introduce agricultural-related training at Prescoed.
- 3.9** There were good partnerships with local statutory and voluntary agencies, as well as local employers, leading to more relevant work placements at Prescoed and improved prisoner well-being at Usk.
- 3.10** Many teaching staff were very experienced and well qualified. The prison provided very good support for continuing professional development and a few staff had completed higher level qualifications. Vocational tutors had completed useful additional assessor and verifier awards.
- 3.11** Arrangements to improve quality were well embedded. Staff met regularly to review the learning provision. Most contributed well to a comprehensive, largely evaluative self-assessment report. The three-year development plan had a clear and appropriate focus on employability. Senior staff regularly monitored individual learning plans, which ensured consistency of the plans and quality of the learning. The monitoring system was used well to identify staff training needs.
- 3.12** The self-assessment process took very good account of the views of prisoners, with quarterly surveys, and participation in a learner quality improvement group and curriculum reviews.

**Provision of activities**

- 3.13** Most prisoners at Usk and Prescoed attended a satisfactory induction programme that identified their needs well, and they had a good awareness of the work and learning on offer.
- 3.14** The number of activity places to meet the needs of the population was appropriate and few prisoners were unemployed. There was a mix of part-time and full-time places, with 155 full-time places in learning and skills, which meant that around 58% of the population could take part.

- 3.15** There was a good range of learning with enough provision to meet basic skills needs. Many work placements were purposeful and developed good practical work skills that helped build prisoner confidence and self-esteem.
- 3.16** A weekly meeting allocated prisoners to activities and was reasonably successful in matching their needs to the available opportunities. Prisoners on the waiting list to attend popular activities, such as vocational training, used their time productively by attending other relevant courses. An effective electronic system recorded the participation of prisoners in learning and work.
- 3.17** Prisoners were not disadvantaged by attending learning, and pay rates were equitable. There was reasonable provision for retired prisoners and others with poor health.

### Quality of provision

- 3.18** There was good initial assessment of prisoners' interests, abilities and learning needs. This helped tutors to plan activities that improved prisoners' employability. Independent careers advice helped many to make realistic plans.
- 3.19** The quality of teaching was good. In Usk, vocational tutors used assessment outcome information well to plan teaching. They took good account of learners' ability levels and preferred learning styles. This approach improved prisoner progress in sessions. Most tutors used a good range of methods to engage prisoners in learning, and good quality materials, pitched at appropriate levels, that challenged them well. The use of well-qualified and skilled orderlies enhanced the quality of teaching and learning support. A few classes were led by prisoners, who planned the activities well and enriched the provision available.
- 3.20** In Usk, the range of work opportunities was satisfactory, and although vocational training was limited, bricklaying, plastering and woodwork were offered. The range of unpaid community work opportunities in Prescoed was satisfactory. Provision for agricultural work and training on the Cilwrgi Farm was still underused, but there were recent improvement plans for it based on a useful labour market analysis.
- 3.21** At Prescoed, around 90 prisoners a day worked outside the prison through release on temporary licence (ROTL), but while every effort was made to find work of particular interest to prisoners, this was not always possible. Although the amount of work available through ROTL was positive, most of it was unpaid – only seven prisoners were in paid employment in the community at the time of the inspection.
- 3.22** The range of education provision was good, but prisoners' progress in open learning was not evaluated well enough to show whether they were developing their skills.
- 3.23** Many tutors made good references to the Welsh context to improve prisoners' awareness of the culture, history and economy of Wales. However, this was inconsistent and there was still not a clear strategy to promote use of the Welsh language.

### Recommendation

- 3.24** **The prison should develop a clear strategy to increase the use of the Welsh language and promotion of the Welsh dimension across its learning and skills provision.**

## Housekeeping point

- 3.25** The prison should evaluate the progress and outcomes of prisoners who take part in open learning.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.26** Success rates on all courses were very good. Nearly all prisoners on vocational courses successfully completed their learning and attained a relevant qualification, and attainment on essential skills courses was high at 97%. Success rates on courses to improve employability were adequate at 70%. All prisoners who stayed in learning attained a qualification, nearly all achieved their learning goals, and most made considerable progress.
- 3.27** Prisoners in bricklaying, woodworking and plastering workshops at Usk developed their knowledge and skills very well. They produced work of an excellent quality in excess of the standards required for their qualifications, and developed specialist additional skills, such as Welsh love spoon carving and marble plastering techniques. Prisoners in art classes produced work of an exceptional quality, much of which was entered into the prestigious Koestler competition.
- 3.28** A minority of prisoners improved their skills in communication, job search and interview techniques. This helped many to have a clear plan for their future careers or employment.
- 3.29** Most prisoners in literacy and numeracy classes developed their skills appropriately and nearly all attained a useful qualification. Nearly all prisoners had a good understanding of the skills they needed to improve, although these were not recorded clearly enough on individual learning plans. Most prisoners developed their communication skills very well, spoke clearly and were confident to give and support their opinions. Prisoners in GCSE English and art classes engaged in high level discussions and reflected on the challenges and successes of their work.
- 3.30** Attendance in education classes was very good at around 96% in Usk and 94% in Prescoed. All prisoners attended promptly, but a few with appointments in other areas of the prison had to wait too long to be escorted back to classes, which affected their learning.

## Housekeeping point

- 3.31** The prison should improve the recording of learners' progress in literacy and numeracy in individual learning plans.

## Library

- 3.32** Prisoners on both sites were aware of the library facilities and knew when they could use them, and access was good. In Usk, the library held helpful activities to encourage reading, basic skills development and creative writing. The rate of prisoner borrowing was good, nearly all looked after the materials they borrowed, and book losses were low. Orderlies enhanced the library service and supported prisoners well in their choice of materials and the day-to-day management of the facilities.
- 3.33** The range of library materials was adequate, and prisoners could also order books from the local authority library service. A good range of books and other media catered for most interest groups and enabled prisoners to research their learning or work activities. There

was a good selection of materials in formats that catered for learners with poor literacy or vision, but the availability of Welsh language books was poor (see also recommendation 3.24).

## 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.**

**3.34** *Most prisoners had a good understanding of healthy living, fitness and personal well-being, and all had access to physical education at least twice a week. The indoor sports facilities at both Prescoed and Usk provided opportunities for a range of activities, and there was a good balance between gym-based exercise and other sports. Older prisoners were offered specific activities.*

**3.35** Most prisoners had a good understanding of healthy living, fitness and personal well-being, and had opportunities to explore these as part of personal and social development courses.

**3.36** All prisoners gained a good understanding of the physical education and fitness programmes available during their initial induction. They all had access to PE twice a week, and a few gained additional sessions as part of the incentives scheme. Those attending the gym had an appropriate induction enhanced by manual handling awareness and an individually designed fitness programme. Health care staff passed essential health and medical information to gym staff promptly to ensure they had all relevant information before a prisoner's induction. However, the links between health care and gym staff were not coordinated well enough for a few prisoners to ensure effective joint monitoring of weight loss programmes. Prisoners knew how to stay safe when using gym equipment, and could shower in safety.

**3.37** The prison promoted a good balance between gym-based exercise and other sporting activities. The indoor sports facilities at both Prescoed and Usk provided opportunities for a range of activities, such as volleyball, softball and badminton. An outdoor field at Usk was used for football and touch rugby, and was used effectively every morning for older prisoners to 'walk for health'. Prisoners at Prescoed made very good use of the outdoor games pitches and multi-purpose courts. Older prisoners were offered specific activities, including football for the over-45s.

**3.38** A minority of prisoners developed their sports theory knowledge alongside physical activities and could discuss technical aspects of the sports they played. PE staff had appropriate qualifications to support prisoners and provide suitable and effective exercise programmes, and had also developed an innovative programme for prisoners with poor coordination skills.

### Housekeeping point

**3.39** The prison should improve the links between health care and gym staff to ensure effective joint monitoring of weight loss programmes for prisoners.



## Section 4. Resettlement

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

### Strategic management of resettlement

#### Expected outcomes:

**Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival at the prison.**

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

**Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.**

**4.1** *The recent alignment of offender management with the security department at each site was appropriate, especially at Usk, but had not been in place long enough to evaluate fully. The needs of the population beyond offending behaviour work and substance misuse services had not been fully evaluated. With significant planned changes in staffing, the function of offender management and its strategic direction needed clarifying.*

**4.2** Since April 2013, the offender management and security departments had been linked together under one overarching manager at each site. This closer alignment was appropriate, especially at Usk where public protection issues were paramount, but it was too soon to evaluate the impact of the change. Although the wider resettlement function of each site now operated separately from offender management, there continued to be close links.

**4.3** The reducing reoffending strategy (2013-16) included a detailed outline of each resettlement pathway, along with development objectives, and indicated how each related to the wider functioning of the establishment. However, the nature and extent of need across the two sites remained unclear. Although there had been a substance misuse needs analysis as well as a detailed analysis of offending behaviour treatment need at Usk, other areas of resettlement had not been evaluated (including finance, benefit and debt need and the children and families pathway). Despite this, in our survey at both sites more respondents than the comparators said that they had done something at the prison to make it more likely that they would not reoffend in the future.

**4.4** The prison was part of the Wales offender management delivery and implementation group (OMDIG), which met bimonthly and incorporated both probation and prison services across the country. This group set the strategic direction of offender management and was a forum for problem solving. However, while the broad strategic direction was set through this group, and the 2010-13 NOMS Cymru strategic commissioning and business plan, the specific development of offender management at the prison was less clearly defined and there was no policy or strategy. Although the broad needs of the population were met, especially at Prescoed, it remained unclear how some significant changes within the two departments were to be implemented. The most significant of these was the planned increase in the number of officer offender supervisors from two at each site to 14 across the whole establishment, with each undertaking the offender supervisor role part time. Managers were reasonably clear about how this would be managed, but staff less so. It was also not clear how cases would be managed, the level of support and training required or how the new staff would be line managed or supervised.

## Recommendations

- 4.5 Up to date needs analysis should be undertaken to assess the resettlement requirements of all prisoners. Such needs should be reflected in the available provision.** (Repeated recommendation 9.7)
- 4.6 The prison should develop a clear policy and strategy to address offender management, and ensure that development objectives identify and meet the needs of the population.**

## 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.**

**4.7** *The quality of risk of harm assessments and sentence planning arrangements at Usk were reasonable, but the wider role of offender supervisors was unclear. There was little integration with the programme team or reinforcement of learning. The role at Prescoed was more clearly defined and the level of ROTL was commendable. Public protection arrangements were now appropriate and prisoners were suitably reviewed, although such information was not routinely shared with offender managers.*

- 4.8** The offender management departments at both sites were made up of both officer and probation offender supervisors. There was no distinction between the roles of the two staff groups, and each offender supervisor carried a caseload of around 70. At both sites there was a small backlog of OASys (offender assessment system) assessments for which the prison was responsible. There was no monitoring of cases that were the responsibility of community offender managers and, as a consequence, the number of such cases that were out of date was not known. In our file review, we came across several such cases at Usk, where 85% of all cases were the offender manager's responsibility; in one case, no sentence plan had been developed for over 12 months. This was less of a concern at Prescoed, where only 15 cases were assessed as high or very high risk of harm.
- 4.9** There were no quality assurance mechanisms or casework supervision at either site. None of the offender supervisors received any supervision, and cases were not regularly reviewed or audited by managers. At Usk, reports prepared for parole reviews were also not quality assured before submission.
- 4.10** Given the different roles of the two sites, the overarching role of offender management in each also differed in emphasis and focus.

### Usk

- 4.11** Of the 271 prisoners held at Usk, 228 were assessed as high or very high risk of harm, with around 95% convicted of a sexual offence. As a specialist sex offender prison with a national remit, its key function was to address sexual offending, which it did primarily through the provision of the sex offender treatment programme (see paragraph 4.56).

- 4.12** Most risk of serious harm assessments were completed to a reasonable standard, and the sentence plan targets we saw were also appropriately focused. It was encouraging that sentence planning meetings were usually attended by staff from across the establishment. In our survey, more respondents than the comparator indicated that they had contact with their offender manager, and 38%, against the comparator of 27%, said their offender manager worked with them to achieve sentence plan targets.
- 4.13** Despite this, the role of the offender management unit (OMU), and thus offender supervisors, in addressing offending behaviour was limited. In the cases we reviewed, prisoner contact with offender supervisors beyond annual sentence plans was relatively rare. In most cases, contact was limited to responding to prisoner applications, usually to address practical issues or give information. We saw few examples of focused or planned work oriented to offending behaviour or linked to supporting the work of the programmes team. Both OMU and programmes team staff indicated that the two departments worked largely in parallel, and while information was often shared it was rare for there to be discussions about how work could be developed to meet the shared focus of reducing risk.
- 4.14** Approximately 30% of the prison's population either denied their offence and/or declined to engage in group work to address sexual offending. The prison had reintroduced the A2Z motivational course following the last inspection but, due to staffing shortfalls, had not delivered the programme since January 2013. The OMU did not provide any alternative.

### Prescoed

- 4.15** The role of offender supervisors and the wider OMU at Prescoed was more clearly defined. As an open prison, it was assumed that all prisoners there would be subject to release on temporary licence (ROTL), and the key function of the department was to undertake risk assessments and liaise with offender managers to ensure that arrangements, including accommodation, were appropriate. The department did this extremely well.
- 4.16** ROTL boards met weekly and undertook comprehensive risk assessments. All cases were discussed in detail and, where necessary, decisions were suspended until clarification was sought.
- 4.17** It was to the prison's credit that the level of ROTL at Prescoed was very high, and higher than comparable open prisons. In the previous six months, there had been around 12,000 separate ROTL events, including home leave, weekend day release and working out.

### Recommendations

- 4.18** **There should be a central log of completed and up-to-date OASys assessments to ensure that all prisoners are assessed and reviewed regularly, and shortfalls that are the responsibility of the offender manager should be addressed.**
- 4.19** **Quality assurance systems should be introduced into the offender management unit to ensure effective and consistent practice.** (Repeated recommendation 9.35)
- 4.20** **The role of offender supervisors at Usk should be clarified to ensure they are appropriately integrated with other departments working to reduce the risk of reoffending. Offender supervisors should be appropriately trained and supported for this role.**

- 4.21 Usk should offer motivational work with those prisoners either refusing to complete programmes or denying their offence(s).** (Repeated main recommendation HP44)

## Public protection

- 4.22** At the time of the inspection, 240 prisoners at Usk were subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs), including 34 at level two and five assessed as level three. There were 203 prisoners subject to child protection arrangements.
- 4.23** Public protection arrangements had improved since the last inspection and were now suitably robust and comprehensive. There was a detailed public protection policy at both sites, with all new arrivals at Usk screened through the OMU and other departments, including the programme/psychology team. The interdepartmental risk management team (IDRMT) met monthly and reviewed all new arrivals and determined the frequency of subsequent reviews, along with the level of mail and telephone monitoring for each prisoner. Prisoners due for release were also reviewed six months and one month beforehand.
- 4.24** Although reports prepared for the IDRMT were detailed and comprehensive, their content was not routinely shared with community offender managers. Reports for community MAPPA meetings were also prepared when requested but, as with other reports, there was no quality assurance to ensure that they were sufficiently comprehensive and analytical.
- 4.25** The few public protection cases held at Prescoed were also reviewed through the ROTL board, and monitoring arrangements managed through the security committee meeting.

## Recommendation

- 4.26 Reports prepared for interdepartmental risk management boards should be forwarded to offender managers to inform risk management decisions in the community.** (Repeated recommendation 9.40)

## Categorisation

- 4.27** Prisoners at Usk had their categorisation reviewed annually or six monthly, depending on their length of sentence. Reviews were undertaken automatically and documentation indicated appropriate consideration of cases. At the time of the inspection, there were seven category D prisoners but, while there was evidence that there could be delays in facilitating transfers to open establishments, given the specialist nature of Usk this was not surprising.
- 4.28** There had been considerable efforts to accommodate the transfer of prisoners from Usk to Prescoed, where appropriate, and the prison held 15 sex offenders (compared with six at our last inspection). Support was available to prisoners to manage this transition including, commendably, from the area psychology team.
- 4.29** The prison did not keep a record of the number of prisoners transferred back to closed conditions from Prescoed. Despite this, our review of several such recent cases showed that there had been proper consideration of the circumstances and decisions had been appropriate.

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.30** Over a third of Usk's population, 35%, were indeterminate sentence prisoners, with 24 lifers and 71 on an indeterminate sentence for public protection. There had been three lifer family days in 2012 and a further three were planned for 2013. Lifer forums had been introduced since the last inspection but had stopped in April 2012, mainly due to staff shortages. Although prisoners told us that the forums had been useful, some acknowledged that their needs were not significantly different from other long-term prisoners. The prisoner consultative committee now had a specific representative for indeterminate sentence prisoners.
- 4.31** Prescoed held 67 indeterminate sentence prisoners. There were no specific provisions for this group and the policy was to treat them as other prisoners. Prisoners we spoke to were not unhappy about this approach.

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

**4.32** *Reintegration planning at both sites was generally appropriate, although arrangements at Usk were being reorganised. Provision for accommodation support met the needs of most prisoners, despite limited specialist input. Education, training and employment provision was broadly good but was not evaluated well enough. Drug and alcohol support was well integrated into the prison, and pre-release health care assessments were good. Prisoners were generally satisfied with the support offered under the children and families pathway but further work was required. There was a good range of accredited offending behaviour programmes at Usk, and appropriate support at Prescoed.*

- 4.33** Usk released around eight to 10 prisoners a month and Prescoed approximately 25-30. The resettlement department at Usk was being reorganised and two officers had recently been allocated to support the two prisoner resettlement orderlies. All new arrivals were seen during induction and, where appropriate, referrals made to service providers, but in practice were almost exclusively to offender supervisors for accommodation support. The same staff also saw prisoners approximately six weeks before release to give pre-release packs – with information about community support agencies – and to respond to any questions.
- 4.34** At Prescoed, a dedicated team of two officers and a manager, along with administrative support, undertook the resettlement function, which was largely focused on finding and facilitating work placements.

## Accommodation

- 4.35** Neither site had a dedicated accommodation service. At Usk, given the nature of the population, most accommodation needs were managed through the OMU and primarily community offender managers. Nevertheless, in our survey fewer respondents than the comparator said that they knew who to speak to at the prison about accommodation on release.

**4.36** At Prescoed, one of the resettlement officers provided accommodation support and liaised with a variety of community services. For those released locally, there was support through a community housing officer who attended the prison weekly, but for those from further afield there was relatively little support, except with their local housing office. In most cases, however, as prisoners were receiving home leave the issue of longer term accommodation was rarely a problem.

**4.37** At both sites release of prisoners with no fixed accommodation was rare.

## Education, training and employment

**4.38** Both prisons exceeded their targets for the number of prisoners who reported they were entering employment or training on release. In Prescoed, staff liaised well with external support agencies and employers to help prisoners access appropriate progression opportunities on their release. Prescoed had improved the range of occupational areas available for prisoners on unpaid community placements. However, opportunities to progress to paid employment were too limited. In Usk, resettlement programmes were not structured or planned well enough.

**4.39** At Prescoed, the workshops and many classes and the farm offered a realistic work environment, which enabled prisoners to gain up-to-date skills and an understanding of how to apply these in a work context, as well as develop behaviour and attitudes required by employers.

**4.40** Neither prison evaluated well enough the impact of resettlement programmes on prisoners' ability to sustain their progress into work or training.

## Recommendation

**4.41** **Prescoed should evaluate the impact of resettlement programmes on prisoners' ability to sustain work and training on release.**

## Health care

**4.42** Prisoners were seen by a nurse 24 hours before release, which was inadequate to support longer-term prisoners who lacked confidence in contacting community health services. Prisoners on most prescribed medicines were given two weeks supply. Those with complex health conditions were given a summary of their treatment and medication to give to their GP. Prisoners with severe and enduring mental health conditions were linked with their local community mental health teams, and pre-release meetings were arranged with good use of telephone and video conferencing where necessary.

## Housekeeping point

**4.43** Health care staff should see prisoners due for release further in advance of their release date and support them with advice and information on how to register and use community health services.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.44** The CARAT (substance misuse) service was well integrated into each prison and had close links with the OMU. Prisoners testing positive under mandatory or compliance drug testing were referred to the service and the team contributed to sentence planning and risk assessment boards. Prisoners at Prescoed could be prescribed the opiate blocker naltrexone before release. Case files demonstrated good quality relapse prevention work with drug as well as alcohol users, and prisoners were given appropriate harm reduction advice and information during their sentence and before release. CARAT staff on both sites had developed good links with local drug intervention programmes and community drug services, including residential rehabilitation providers.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.45** Although some basic budget management work was available at both sites through the education department, neither offered any specialist debt management advice. At Prescoed, one of the resettlement officers had had some training in such work and offered guidance to prisoners in writing to creditors, but this was limited. Although both prisons had previously received some debt management support from a local solicitor, this had ended as demand was low. With the lack of a needs analysis it was not possible to establish whether this was still the case. All prisoners could access advice and support from Jobcentre Plus before release.

## Recommendation

- 4.46** **Appropriate follow-up support should be available for prisoners identified as having finance and debt problems.** (Repeated recommendation 9.58)

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.47** In our survey, respondents at both sites were more positive than the comparators about the support they were offered to maintain family ties and the ease of family visits.
- 4.48** Visitors' waiting areas at both sites were adequate. At Usk, visits were still held in a Portakabin that was cramped and too small to accommodate the number of visits that prisoners were entitled to. Visits often started later than the published time. Refreshments were only available from vending machines, which we were told often broke down, and prisoners were still unnecessarily required to wear bright green sashes (see paragraph 1.41). It was also sometimes difficult to get through to the visits booking line. Despite these criticisms, prisoners and visitors told us that they were broadly satisfied with the visits arrangements at Usk.
- 4.49** Staff at Usk were focused on the risks posed to children by a significant part of their population, and child protection measures were enforced robustly. Family days for life- and other indeterminate-sentenced prisoners had been introduced and were appreciated by participants. There were positive efforts to increase the frequency of these family days, but there were no other initiatives to encourage meaningful contact with family members or children, where appropriate.
- 4.50** Arrangements for visits at Prescoed were generally good. There was an appropriate focus on prisoners maintaining family ties through ROTL (see paragraph 4.17), although the few prisoners who had their own cars for work were still not permitted to use them at

weekends to maintain contact with their family. Visits were held at weekends in the dining hall, which was an appropriate environment. Visits did not need to be booked, and refreshments were available from a small charity-run facility.

- 4.51** Apart from the impressive amount of ROTL and weekend visits, other initiatives to encourage meaningful engagement with family and children were limited. Some previous facilities, including 'Language and Play' and Storybook Dads, no longer took place at Prescoed.

## Recommendations

- 4.52** **Visits at Usk should take place in a venue that is fit for purpose and the capacity increased.** (Repeated recommendation 9.77)
- 4.53** **Prisoners who have access to their own vehicles for weekday release on temporary licence should be allowed to use them to attend weekend town visits.** (Repeated recommendation 9.79)
- 4.54** **There should be a range of initiatives to encourage appropriate and meaningful engagement with families and children (where appropriate) at both Usk and Prescoed.**

## Housekeeping point

- 4.55** Prisoners at Usk should not be required to wear identification sashes. (Repeated recommendation 9.78)

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.56** The programme team at Usk provided six separate courses under the generic banner of sex offender treatment programmes. Between April 2012 and March 2013, there had been 55 course completions. A similar number of prisoners were expected to complete programmes in the year to the end of March 2014. Waiting lists for attendance on programmes were generally well managed, and most prisoners willing to engage and suitable for them could access treatment reasonably quickly.
- 4.57** There was also some individual one-to-one work by the psychology staff when specific requests were received from the Parole Board.
- 4.58** There were no offending behaviour programmes at Prescoed. However, prisoners identified through the ROTL boards or their offender managers as needing such work could do so either in the community with the local probation trust while on ROTL or through one-to-one contact with the prison's probation offender supervisor. At the time of the inspection, two prisoners were attending the integrated domestic violence programme in the community.

# Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report, or in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

## Recommendations

To the governor

### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.1** Prisoners should not be left on vans during the lunch period at Usk before embarkation to reception. (1.4, repeated recommendation 1.5)

### Early days in custody

- 5.2** The reception at Usk should be of an adequate size and appropriately equipped to manage the arrival and departure of prisoners. (1.14, repeated recommendation 1.20)
- 5.3** The induction programme at Usk should be completed within a week and it should be properly supervised by a staff member. (1.15)

### Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.4** A violence reduction survey should be carried out and used to inform the current strategy. (1.23)
- 5.5** The safer custody team should be informed of all incidents of antisocial behaviour and investigate all incidents thoroughly. (1.24)

### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.6** All staff should receive training in assessment, care in custody and teamwork procedures. (1.32, repeated recommendation 3.29)
- 5.7** The safer custody team at Prescoed should investigate the reasons for the poor survey results about access to Listeners. (1.33)

### Safeguarding

- 5.8** The governor should initiate contact with the local Safeguarding Adults Strategic Management Board and Safeguarding Adults Team to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.37)

## Security

- 5.9** The establishment should ensure that the mandatory drug testing programme is adequately resourced to undertake the required level of weekend testing. (1.44, repeated recommendation 3.67)
- 5.10** Security arrangements at Usk should be commensurate with the risks presented at a category C prison. (1.45)
- 5.11** Prisoners should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.46)
- 5.12** The establishment should provide an adequate testing and waiting environment for mandatory drug testing at Usk. (1.47)

## Discipline

- 5.13** All planned use of force incidents should be filmed. (1.59, repeated recommendation 7.21)

## Substance misuse

- 5.14** Health and CARAT (substance misuse) services should work together to provide joint care and support to prisoners using diverted medication. (1.66)
- 5.15** The drug and alcohol strategy document should be updated in light of service changes and following re-commissioning, and a new development plan and performance measures should be established. (1.67)
- 5.16** The prison should provide the CARAT team at Usk with adequate group work facilities and interview rooms. (1.68, repeated recommendation 9.70)

## Residential units

- 5.17** Communal areas in Prescoed should be kept clean and well maintained. (2.10)
- 5.18** Cells designed for one prisoner should not hold two, and toilets in cells should be effectively screened. (2.11, repeated recommendations 2.28 and 2.29)
- 5.19** Rooms in Prescoed should have lockable cabinets. (2.12)

## Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.20** Usk prison should address prisoners' negative perceptions about staff, and staff identified as indifferent should be encouraged to take a more active and positive approach. (2.18)
- 5.21** Staff should use prisoners' preferred names or titles when addressing them, (2.19, repeated recommendation 2.42)
- 5.22** Personal officer entries in wing files at Prescoed should evidence frequent meaningful engagement with prisoners and knowledge of their personal circumstances. (2.20, repeated recommendation 2.52)

## Equality and diversity

- 5.23** The prison should work with prisoners from minority groups through formal consultation arrangements, which should be used to address the negative perceptions evidenced in our survey. (2.29)
- 5.24** Managers should monitor incentives and earned privileges levels by nationality, and investigate the reasons behind the poorer experience of foreign national prisoners. (2.30, repeated recommendation 4.32)
- 5.25** Discrimination incident report forms in good condition and in a range of languages relevant to the population should be freely available on both sites. (2.31, repeated recommendation 4.17)
- 5.26** Training in all strands of diversity should be delivered to all staff. (2.32, repeated recommendation 4.7)
- 5.27** The prison should ensure that there are adequate and well-publicised arrangements for external support and advice for foreign national prisoners from both the United Kingdom Border Agency and independent immigration advisory services. (2.39)
- 5.28** There should be formal procedures for identifying prisoners with disabilities and an accurate record maintained. (2.40)
- 5.29** Personal emergency evacuation plans for those prisoners requiring assistance should be readily available to staff on the units where they are located. (2.41, repeated recommendation 4.47)
- 5.30** An organised scheme of peer support for prisoners with disabilities should be introduced. (2.42, repeated recommendation 4.49)

## Faith and religious activity

- 5.31** The chaplaincy should ensure that each newly arrived prisoner sees a chaplain within 24 hours, and monitor performance. (2.49, repeated recommendation 3.53)

## Complaints

- 5.32** The quality of complaint responses should be improved through regular monitoring by managers. (2.53, repeated recommendation 3.37)

## Legal rights

- 5.33** Legal visits facilities at Usk should be improved so that legal advisers can interview their clients in private. (2.57, repeated recommendation 3.43)

## Health services

- 5.34** Clinical supervision should be established for all clinical staff. (2.66)
- 5.35** All health care information should be available in a range of languages relevant to the population. (2.67, repeated recommendation 5.6)

- 5.36** Automated emergency defibrillators should be available at Usk and Prescoed and prison and health care staff should be trained in their use. (2.68)
- 5.37** Nursing staff should use triage algorithms and be trained to at least a basic level in triage skills. (2.76, repeated recommendation 5.26 and 5.27)
- 5.38** Chronic disease management should be systematic and enable appropriate follow-up, with active care planning for prisoners with multiple conditions. (2.77)
- 5.39** The pharmacist should visit the prison at least once a month to check the systems in operation and provide counselling sessions, pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication review. (2.86, repeated recommendation 5.16)
- 5.40** Patient group directions should be introduced to enable supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed patient group directions should be held in the pharmacy and read and signed by all relevant staff. (2.87, repeated recommendation 5.35)
- 5.41** Primary dispensing (nurses dispensing stock medicines as named-patient medicines and vice versa) should stop. (2.88, repeated recommendation 5.38)
- 5.42** Medicines management should include robust in-possession risk assessments, medicines use reviews, audit of prescriptions and faxed prescriptions, patient advice, robust stock control and dispensing, and appropriate standard operating procedures through regular operational oversight by a pharmacy professional. (2.89)
- 5.43** Dental care at Prescoed should ensure appropriate triage of need and prompt appointments. Appointments should not be routinely cancelled. (2.97)
- 5.44** Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (2.103, repeated recommendation 5.59)
- 5.45** The mental health needs of prisoners should be reviewed to ensure that those with primary care needs are dealt with appropriately. (2.104)
- 5.46** A rolling programme of mental health awareness training should be delivered to all discipline and health care staff. (2.105, Repeated recommendation 5.60)

#### Catering

- 5.47** Prisoners working in the kitchen at Prescoed should be able to achieve qualifications. (2.114)
- 5.48** Prisoners at Usk should have the facility to dine out. (2.115, repeated recommendation 8.9)

#### Purchases

- 5.49** Prisoners should have access to the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.123)

#### Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.50** The prison should develop a clear strategy to increase the use of the Welsh language and promotion of the Welsh dimension across its learning and skills provision. (3.24)

### Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.51** Up to date needs analysis should be undertaken to assess the resettlement requirements of all prisoners. Such needs should be reflected in the available provision. (4.5, repeated recommendation 9.7)
- 5.52** The prison should develop a clear policy and strategy to address offender management, and ensure that development objectives identify and meet the needs of the population. (4.6)

### Offender management and planning

- 5.53** There should be a central log of completed and up-to-date OASys assessments to ensure that all prisoners are assessed and reviewed regularly, and shortfalls that are the responsibility of the offender manager should be addressed. (4.18)
- 5.54** Quality assurance systems should be introduced into the offender management unit to ensure effective and consistent practice. (4.19, repeated recommendation 9.35)
- 5.55** The role of offender supervisors at Usk should be clarified to ensure they are appropriately integrated with other departments working to reduce the risk of reoffending. Offender supervisors should be appropriately trained and supported for this role. (4.20)
- 5.56** Usk should offer motivational work with those prisoners either refusing to complete programmes or denying their offence(s). (4.21, repeated main recommendation HP44)
- 5.57** Reports prepared for interdepartmental risk management boards should be forwarded to offender managers to inform risk management decisions in the community. (4.26, repeated recommendation 9.40)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.58** Prescoed should evaluate the impact of resettlement programmes on prisoners' ability to sustain work and training on release. (4.41)
- 5.59** Appropriate follow-up support should be available for prisoners identified as having finance and debt problems. (4.46, repeated recommendation 9.58)
- 5.60** Visits at Usk should take place in a venue that is fit for purpose and the capacity increased. (4.52, repeated recommendation 9.77)
- 5.61** Prisoners who have access to their own vehicles for weekday release on temporary licence should be allowed to use them to attend weekend town visits. (4.53, repeated recommendation 9.79)
- 5.62** There should be a range of initiatives to encourage appropriate and meaningful engagement with families and children (where appropriate) at both Usk and Prescoed. (4.54)

## Housekeeping points

### Courts, escort and transfers

### To Prison Escort and Custody Services

**5.63** Escort vans should be clean. (1.5)

### Early days in custody

**5.64** Canteen reception packs should be provided to new arrivals at Usk. (1.16)

### Security

**5.65** Security objectives based on received intelligence should be set and properly monitored. (1.48)

### Incentives and earned privileges

**5.66** Prisoners should be able to apply for the enhanced privilege level after a month at Usk/Prescoed. (1.54)

### Discipline

**5.67** Use of force documentation should be thorough and comprehensive, including records of efforts to de-escalate and communicate with the prisoner. Injury to prisoner forms (F213s) should be completed and attached, and a formal quality assurance system should be introduced. (1.60)

### Staff-prisoner relationships

**5.68** Prisoner consultation at Usk should be regular and address the issues raised. (2.21)

### Equality and diversity

**5.69** The prison should reactivate the XPressions group to provide regular support for gay and bisexual prisoners. (2.43)

**5.70** There should be a policy for the care and treatment of transgender and transsexual prisoners. (2.44)

### Health services

**5.71** There should be a confidential process for health care complaints. (2.69)

**5.72** Health promotion should be developed. (2.70)

**5.73** Patients should be identified by their prison ID card when collecting medication. (2.90)

**5.74** Patient leaflets should always be given with medication, and pharmaceutical reference books should be up to date. (2.91)

- 5.75** The World Health Organization (WHO) 'pain ladder' should be used to inform appropriate prescribing of opiates. (2.92)
- 5.76** The medicines and therapeutics committee should meet regularly with appropriate representation. (2.93)

### Catering

- 5.77** The interim menu should cater for all diets. (2.116)
- 5.78** Breakfast packs should be given out on the day they are to be eaten. (2.117, Repeated recommendation 8.8)
- 5.79** Food consultation arrangements should be improved. (2.118)

### Purchases

- 5.80** Prisoners should have access to the prison shop within 24 hours of their arrival. (2.128)
- 5.81** Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.129)

### Time out of cell

- 5.82** There should be open access through the day to the exercise yard at Usk. (3.4, repeated recommendation 6.41)

### Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.83** The prison should evaluate the progress and outcomes of prisoners who take part in open learning. (3.25)
- 5.84** The prison should improve the recording of learners' progress in literacy and numeracy in individual learning plans. (3.31)

### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.85** The prison should improve the links between health care and gym staff to ensure effective joint monitoring of weight loss programmes for prisoners. (3.39)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.86** Health care staff should see prisoners due for release further in advance of their release date and support them with advice and information on how to register and use community health services. (4.43)
- 5.87** Prisoners at Usk should not be required to wear identification sashes. (4.55, repeated recommendation 9.78)

## Example of good practice

- 5.88** Prisoner Listeners had been trained in mental health awareness, which enabled early identification of prisoner needs. (2.106)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief inspector
Kieron Taylor	Team leader
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Hayley Cripps	Researcher
Amy Radford	Researcher
Annie Crowley	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Senior researcher

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Jane Mackenzie	Health Inspectorate Wales
Helen Boniface	Pharmacist
Rachael Bubalo	Lead Estyn inspector
Alun Connick	Estyn inspector
Gill Sims	Estyn inspector



## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

### Safety

#### **Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection, in 2010, reception, first night and induction procedures at both establishments were generally good, although induction at Usk could have been better supervised. Both prisons were very safe, with little evidence of bullying or intimidation and only a limited call on safer custody procedures. Coordination between security and violence reduction strands, however, could have been developed further. Security and rules were applied proportionately and there was little use of disciplinary procedures and no use of segregation. Use of force was very low and the number of prisoners needing to be returned to closed or higher security conditions was not excessive. The number of absconds from Prescoed was very low. Illicit drug usage was marginally higher than expected. Prisoners felt safe. Outcomes for prisoners were good at both Usk and Prescoed against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

Prisoners should not be left on vans during the lunch period at Usk before embarkation to reception. (1.5)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.4)

The reception at Usk should be of an adequate size and appropriately equipped to manage the arrival and departure of prisoners. (1.20)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.14)

Non-smokers should not be located in cells with smokers. (1.21)

**Achieved**

The induction programme at Usk should take no longer than a week, and all elements should be completed within this time. (1.22)

**Not achieved**

The induction programme at Usk should include a session with resettlement staff that focuses on individual needs, including housing and employment. (1.23)

**Achieved**

A member of staff should effectively oversee the induction programme at Usk, including the work of peer orderlies. (1.24)

**Not achieved**

Induction at Prescoed should commence on the first working day after arrival at the prison. (1.25)

**Achieved**

The violence reduction policy should be revised to more concise and user friendly and violence reduction information made available for staff and prisoners at both sites. (3.11)

**Achieved**

Prisoners and their family and friends should have access to a free dedicated telephone line to report incidents of bullying. (3.12)

**Achieved**

The monthly safer prisons meeting should monitor trends and patterns of anti-social behaviour, and attendance at this meeting should be improved. (3.13)

**Achieved**

Security information identifying incidents of anti-social behaviour should routinely be referred to the safer prison team for investigation. (3.14)

**Achieved**

The self-harm and suicide prevention strategy document should be reviewed to include a near miss policy and current staff information. The policy should be available to staff and prisoners. (3.25)

**Achieved**

All sections of the assessment, care in custody and teamwork document should be fully completed. (3.26)

**Achieved**

Listeners at Prescoed should be more identifiable and accessible. (3.27)

**Not achieved**

There should be an informal Listener suite or office on both sites for confidential meetings between prisoners in crisis and Listeners. (3.28)

**Achieved**

All staff should receive training in assessment, care in custody and teamwork procedures. (3.29)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.33)

Night staff at Prescoed should carry anti-ligature knives. (3.30)

**Achieved**

The establishment should ensure that the mandatory drug testing programme is adequately resourced to undertake the required level of weekend testing. (3.67)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.45)

Decision logs to record consideration of a prisoner's continued suitability for open conditions should be consistently and comprehensively completed. (7.9)

**Achieved**

The level of analysis of adjudications by type, award and location should be developed to ensure any trends can be readily identified and addressed. (7.19)

**Not achieved**

Release on temporary licence (ROTL) risk assessment boards should clearly demonstrate how a prisoner's behaviour has led to an increased risk of a ROTL breach to ensure decisions are appropriate and proportionate. (7.20)

**Achieved**

All planned use of force incidents should be filmed. (7.21)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.59)

Formal records should be kept of the use of the reception holding cell at Usk. (7.22)

**Achieved**

The differentials between standard and enhanced levels should be reviewed to ensure they are sufficient to encourage engagement with the scheme. (7.34)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should have their incentives and earned privileges status routinely reviewed in accordance with the timescales stipulated in the published policies. (7.35)

**Partially achieved**

## Respect

**Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection, in 2010, the environment at both Usk and Prescoed was clean and well ordered. Double cells in Usk were too small and afforded little privacy. Relationships between staff and prisoners were excellent. There was a reasonable personal officer scheme. The management of diversity was good across most strands, with useful services provided to minority groups. The apparent low number of prisoners from a black and minority ethnic background in Prescoed required investigation. The quality of food was good, and applications and complaints arrangements were generally adequate. The prison had a well-integrated chaplaincy, although there was a need to improve access to services in Prescoed. Health care provision was very good at both sites. Outcomes for prisoners were good at both Usk and Prescoed against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

The Director of Offender Management for Wales should investigate the reasons for the low number of black and minority ethnic prisoners applying for and accepted for transfer to Prescoed, and take action on the basis of their findings. (HP43)

**Achieved**

### Recommendations

Young adults should be able to progress to Lester unit. (2.26)

**Achieved**

All rooms on Prescoed should be equipped with curtains and a full complement of cell furniture, and there should be regular checks to ensure that missing items are replaced. (2.27)

**Partially achieved**

Cells designed for one prisoner should not hold two. (2.28)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Toilets in cells should be effectively screened. (2.29)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Lockable lockers should be provided in shared cells. (2.30)

**Partially achieved**

Managers should continue to monitor the timeliness of receipt of incoming mail and take action to address any concerns. (2.31)

**Achieved**

All showers on Usk should be equipped with privacy screens. (2.32)

**Partially achieved**

Staff should use prisoners' preferred names or titles when addressing them. (2.42)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.19)

There should be a published personal officer policy with comprehensive information about the role. (2.50)

**Achieved**

The frequency of personal officer wing file entries should be clarified, communicated to all staff and consistently adhered to. (2.51)

**Partially achieved**

Personal officer entries in wing file on Prescoed should evidence frequent meaningful engagement with prisoners and knowledge of their personal circumstances. (2.52)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.20)

Management checks of personal officer entries in wing files should include comments to provide feedback to staff, and should be sufficiently robust to drive improvements in practice. (2.53)

**Partially achieved**

The quality of complaint responses should be improved through regularly monitoring by managers. (3.37)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.53)

Legal visits facilities at Usk should be improved so that legal advisers can interview their clients in private. (3.43)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.57)

The chaplaincy should ensure that each newly arrived prisoner sees a chaplain within 24 hours, and monitor performance. (3.53)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.49)

Chaplains should give the same priority to Prescoed prisoners as to those at Usk, and should be able to evidence this. (3.54)

**Not achieved**

Major religious festivals should be given a higher profile throughout the establishment. (3.55)

**Achieved**

All strands of diversity should be monitored separately for Usk and Prescoed to identify any trends and patterns in relation to diversity issues. (4.6)

**Achieved**

Training in all strands of diversity should be delivered to all staff. (4.7)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.32)

Managers should further investigate the sustained low proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners granted release on temporary licence, and take action to correct the imbalance. (4.16)

**Achieved**

Racist incident report forms in good condition and in a range of languages relevant to the population should be freely available on both sites. (4.17)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.31)

There should be an action plan that sets out how the prison will implement the religious diversity policy. (4.22)

**Achieved**

Managers should ask the escort contractor to investigate the less positive perceptions by foreign nationals of treatment by their staff. (4.31)

**Achieved**

Managers should monitor incentives and earned privileges levels by nationality, and investigate the reasons behind the poorer experience of foreign national prisoners. (4.32)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.30)

Managers should investigate why a lower than expected proportion of foreign national prisoners are in employment, and take action as justified by the findings. (4.33)

**Achieved**

The material on the touch screen information points should be translated into languages appropriate to the population. (4.34)

**No longer relevant**

A basic local information leaflet for prisoners should be produced in the main languages spoken by them. (4.35)

**Achieved**

Telephone interpreters should be used regularly to check the well-being of prisoners with limited English and no access to interpretation by peers. (4.36)

**Achieved**

Information about independent immigration advice and support agencies, with up-to-date contact details, should be readily available to foreign national prisoners. (4.37)

**Not achieved**

Personal emergency evacuation plans for those prisoners requiring assistance should be readily available to staff on the units where they are located. (4.47)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.41)

Managers should improve access to education and the library and ensure equality of access to offending behaviour programmes for prisoners with disabilities. (4.48)

**Achieved**

An organised scheme of peer support for prisoners with disabilities should be introduced. (4.49)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.42)

A policy on the management of older prisoners should be drawn up and published. (4.58)

**Achieved**

Impact assessments should include impacts on older prisoners. (4.59)

**Achieved**

Managers should investigate the perceptions among some older prisoners at Prescoed of victimisation or intimidation by some other prisoners, and take action to improve those perceptions. (4.60)

## **Achieved**

Managers should consult gay and bisexual prisoners through the XPressions group to identify how experiences of intimidation can be addressed and prevented in future. (4.67)

## **Not achieved**

An impact assessment should be carried out on access to the gym, to identify and remove any obstacles to attendance by gay or bisexual prisoners. (4.68)

## **Achieved**

All health care information should be available in a range of languages relevant to the population. (5.6)

## **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.67)

The pharmacist should visit the prison at least once a month to check the systems in operation and provide counselling sessions, pharmacist-led clinics, clinical audit and medication review. (5.16)

## **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.86)

Automated emergency defibrillators should be available at Usk and Prescoed and all health care staff should be trained in their use. (5.17)

## **Not achieved**

An electronic clinical information system should be implemented as soon as possible. (5.18)

## **Achieved**

Barrier protection should be easily available to prisoners. (5.25)

## **Achieved**

All nursing staff should be trained to at least a basic level in triage skills. (5.26)

## **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.76)

Triage algorithms should be available to ensure consistency of treatment. (5.27)

## **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.76)

The introduction of patient group directions should be introduced to enable supply of more potent medication by the pharmacist and/or nurse to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. A copy of the original signed patient group directions should be held in the pharmacy and read and signed by all relevant staff. (5.35)

## **Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.87)

The way of recording supplied items should be reviewed to ensure a robust process so that medication is not given to patients where there is no valid authority to do so. (5.36)

## **Achieved**

The use of general stock should be audited so that stock supplied can be reconciled against prescriptions issued. Medication issues to patients should be labelled in accordance with regulations. (5.37)

## **Not achieved**

Primary dispensing should stop. (5.38)

## **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.88)

The security of the controlled drugs cabinet should be reviewed. (5.39)

## **Achieved**

All controlled drugs should be recorded in a controlled drugs register compliant with current regulations. Each site should have its own register. (5.40)

**Achieved**

The digital x-ray equipment should be installed in the new dental surgery. (5.49)

**Achieved**

A full surgery inspection should be carried out by/on behalf of the local health board before the new dental surgery is commissioned. (5.50)

**Achieved**

A protocol should be developed to assist the triaging of dental applications. (5.51)

**Not achieved**

The administration of the dental waiting list should be improved to provide accurate and up-to-date information and the reasons for failures to attend assessed. (5.52)

**Partially achieved**

A protocol should be developed for dental out of hours and annual leave cover. (5.53)

**Not achieved**

Patients struggling to cope on the wings should have access to day care services. (5.58)

**No longer relevant**

Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (5.59)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.103)

A rolling programme of mental health awareness training should be delivered to all discipline and health care staff. (5.60)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.105)

Both kitchens should be upgraded to ensure they are fit for purpose. (8.7)

**No longer relevant**

Breakfast packs should be given out on the day they are to be used. (8.8)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point 2.117)

Prisoners at Usk should have the facility to dine out. (8.9)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.115)

A cheaper range of non-food goods should be made available through the shop. (8.16).

**Not achieved.**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection, in 2010, learning and skills provision at both sites was well managed and the quality generally good. Initial screening and assessment were rigorous and take-up of education and work by prisoners excellent. All prisoners had access to meaningful activity. The education curriculum addressed need and the quality of teaching was generally good. Useful accreditation was available in almost all activity areas,*

*including work, although the farm provision was underdeveloped. Opportunities for learning progression were good. PE provision was good within the constraints of some limit on the extent of facilities and access was satisfactory. Access to time out of cell was good on both sites. Outcomes for prisoners at both sites were good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

Opportunities to gain accreditation should be extended to those working in the stores. (6.30)

**No longer relevant**

The prison should further develop the training opportunities at the farm to meet labour market needs. (6.31)

**Partially achieved**

There should be a strategy to promote the use of Welsh language. (6.32)

**Not achieved**

There should be open access through the day to the exercise yard at Usk. (6.41)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point, 3.4)

## Resettlement

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

*At the last inspection, in 2010, the resettlement and reducing reoffending strategies addressed appropriate issues and were based on some limited needs analysis. At Prescoed, procedures to assess resettlement need included effective follow-up referral arrangements. Pre-release assessments were less well developed. A high proportion of prisoners could access the working out scheme and other ROTL facilities. At Usk, arrangements were less comprehensive and there was a lack of clarity about the role of offender supervisors. Public protection arrangements at Usk were inadequate. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners was also lacking. Arrangements for resettlement work across the pathways were reasonable, although better at Prescoed. Visits facilities at Usk were poor. Outcomes for prisoners were good at Prescoed but not sufficiently good at Usk against this healthy prison test.*

## Main recommendations

The prison should offer motivational work with those prisoners either refusing to complete programmes or denying their offence(s). (HP 44)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.21)

All prisoners identified as a risk to children and/or MAPPA level 2 or 3 should be reviewed by the inter-departmental risk management board six months before release and, when necessary, before release. (HP45)

**Achieved**

## Recommendations

Up to date needs analysis should be undertaken to assess the resettlement requirements of all prisoners. Such needs should be reflected in the available provision. (9.7)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.5)

At Prescoed, referrals to resettlement pathways following induction should be tracked to ensure that they are completed. (9.32)

**Achieved**

All prisoners should be subject to pre-release planning, with meetings reviewing both custody/sentence plan objectives and arrangements for post-release progress to meet resettlement and offending behaviour needs. (9.33)

**Achieved**

A central log of completed and up-to-date OASys should be maintained to ensure that all prisoners are assessed and reviewed regularly. (9.34)

**Not achieved**

Quality assurance systems should be introduced into the offender management unit to ensure effective and consistent practice. (9.35)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.19)

Both sites should implement staff awareness training of the work undertaken by the offender management unit to enhance integrated provision and support. (9.36)

**Achieved**

Both sites should identify a public protection coordinator who should become the central focus for all public protection issues. (9.37)

**Achieved**

All security information regarding public protection should be included in information held by the offender management unit. Quality assurance systems should be in place to ensure this happens. (9.38)

**Achieved**

Decisions to include, or remove, prisoners from telephone or mail monitoring should be undertaken through an interdepartmental risk management board. (9.39)

**Achieved**

Reports prepared for interdepartmental risk management boards should be forwarded to offender managers to inform risk management decisions in the community. (9.40)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.26)

Both sites should undertake an analysis of the needs of lifers and those serving indeterminate sentences for public protection at both sites and, where practical, develop services to meet these needs. (9.41)

**Achieved**

Regular forums should be available at both Usk and Prescoed for both life sentenced prisoners and prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection as a medium through which their specific needs can be addressed. (9.42)

**Partially achieved**

The housing officer should receive appropriate training and support to facilitate their role. (9.56)  
**Partially achieved**

Placement of prisoners on Stage 1 and Stage 2 resettlement programmes should take better account of their interests, skills and achievements. (9.57)  
**Partially achieved**

Appropriate follow-up support should be available for prisoners identified as having finance and debt problems. (9.58)  
**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.46)

The drug strategy document should be revised, informed by a comprehensive and up to date needs analysis and include alcohol services. It should have detailed action plans and performance measures. (9.69)  
**Partially achieved**

The prison should provide the CARAT team at Usk with adequate group work facilities and interview rooms. (9.70)  
**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.68)

Visits at Usk should take place in a venue that is fit for purpose and the capacity increased. (9.77).  
**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.52)

Prisoners at Usk should not be required to wear identification sashes. (9.78)  
**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point, 4.54)

Prisoners who have access to their own vehicles for weekday release on temporary licence should be allowed to use them to attend weekend town visits. (9.79)  
**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.53)

Storybook Dads at Prescoed should be fully re-launched and the number of courses facilitated each year increased. (9.80)  
**Not achieved**

Family days and family-orientated initiatives should be introduced at Usk. (9.81)  
**Partially achieved**

The prison should ensure that sufficient interventions are available to enable prisoners to access the range of services identified in their sentence plans. (9.87)  
**Achieved**

## Appendix IIIa: Prison population profile – Usk

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

Status	21 and over	%
Sentenced	256	94.1
Recall	14	5.1
Other	2	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

Sentence	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	1	0.4
Less than 6 months	1	0.4
6 months to less than 12 months	1	0.4
12 months to less than 2 years	7	2.6
2 years to less than 4 years	47	17.2
4 years to less than 10 years	104	38.2
10 years and over (not life)	19	7
Life	92	33.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 21		
Under 21 years	0	0.5
21 years to 29 years	39	14.3
30 years to 39 years	62	22.8
40 years to 49 years	70	25.7
50 years to 59 years	62	22.8
60 years to 69 years	31	11.5
70 plus years	8	2.9
Please state maximum age here: 82		
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	21 and over	%
British	263	96.7
Foreign nationals	8	2.9
Not stated	1	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

Security category	21 and over	%
Category C	264	97.1
Category D	7	2.5
Unclassified	1	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	21 and over	%
White		
British	240	88.2
Irish	3	1.1
Other white	12	4.4

Mixed		
White and black Caribbean	1	0.4
Asian or Asian British	3	1.1
Indian	2	0.8
Pakistani	3	1.1
Bangladeshi	1	0.4
Black or black British		
Caribbean	3	1.1
African	1	0.4
Other black	3	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Religion</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist	2	0.7
Church of England	69	25.4
Roman Catholic	37	13.6
Other Christian denominations	52	19.1
Muslim	13	4.8
Buddhist	8	2.9
Jewish	1	0.4
Other	14	5.1
No religion	72	26.5
Not stated	4	1.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Other demographics</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Veteran (ex-armed services)	9	
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	

### Sentenced prisoners only

<b>Length of stay</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 month	23	8.5
1 month to 3 months	41	15.1
3 months to 6 months	36	13.2
6 months to 1 year	60	22.1
1 year to 2 years	55	20.2
2 years to 4 years	39	14.3
4 years or more	18	6.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

### Sentenced prisoners only

	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	1	0.4
Public protection cases (this does <b>not</b> refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	6	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2.6</b>

<b>Main offence</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Violence against the person	15	5.5
Sexual offences	244	89.7
Robbery	2	0.7
Other offences	11	4.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>100</b>

## Appendix IIIb: Prison population profile – Prescoed

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	1	221	98.2
Recall	0	2	0.9
Other	0	2	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	1	0.5
Less than 6 months	0	1	0.5
6 months to less than 12 months	0	5	2.2
12 months to less than 2 years	0	14	6.2
2 years to less than 4 years	0	36	15.9
4 years to less than 10 years	1	94	42
10 years and over (not life)	0	10	4.4
Life	0	64	28.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 20		
Under 21 years	1	0.5
21 years to 29 years	58	25.7
30 years to 39 years	83	36.7
40 years to 49 years	55	24.3
50 years to 59 years	21	9.3
60 years to 69 years	8	3.5
Please state maximum age here: 64		
<b>Total</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	1	225	100
Foreign nationals	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category C	0	3	1.3
Category D	0	221	97.8
YOI Open	1	1	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	1	192	85.4
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	3	1.3
Other white	0	3	1.3
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	8	3.5%

White and black African	0	1	0.5
White and Asian	0	1	0.5
Other mixed	0	1	0.5
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	1	0.4
Pakistani	0	1	0.4
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	5	2.2
African	0	2	0.9
Other black	0	2	0.9
Other ethnic group	0	1	0.5
Not stated	0	2	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Religion</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist	0	2	0.9
Church of England	0	40	17.7
Roman Catholic	0	16	7.1
Other Christian denominations	1	37	16.8
Muslim	0	18	8
Buddhist	0	3	1.3
Other	0	4	1.8
No religion	0	100	44.2
Not stated	0	5	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Other demographics</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Veteran (ex-armed services)	0	3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	

### Sentenced prisoners only

<b>Length of stay</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>		<b>21 and over</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 month	0	0	28	12.4
1 month to 3 months	0	0	57	25.2
3 months to 6 months	0	0	49	21.7
6 months to 1 year	1	0.4	53	23.5
1 year to 2 years	0	0	36	15.9
2 years to 4 years	0	0	2	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>99.6</b>

<b>Main offence</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Violence against the person	1	72	32.4
Sexual offences	0	10	4.4
Burglary	0	14	6.2
Robbery	0	17	7.6
Theft and handling	0	8	3.6
Fraud and forgery	0	13	5.8
Drugs offences	0	65	28.8
Other offences	0	23	10.2
Offence not recorded / holding warrant	0	3	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100</b>



## Appendix IVa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – Usk

### Prisoner survey methodology

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

### Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment<sup>7</sup>. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-NOMIS prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who do not read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 22 April 2013 the prisoner population at HMP Usk was 268. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 148 prisoners.

We received a total of 140 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 95%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Six respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, one questionnaire was not returned and one was returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	46
B	36
C	48

<sup>7</sup> 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes an 80% response rate (70% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

D	10
---	----

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Usk.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>8</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data has been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Usk in 2013 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 38 prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Usk in 2013 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Usk in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2011 survey between responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other and those who consider themselves to be heterosexual.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be veterans and those who consider themselves not to be veterans.

---

<sup>8</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

## Survey summary

### Section I: About you

<b>Q1.1</b>	<b>What wing or house block are you currently living on?</b> See shortened methodology		
<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	<i>Under 21</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		16 (11%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		31 (22%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		37 (26%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		33 (24%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		18 (13%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		4 (3%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		133 (95%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		7 (5%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		0 (0%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	<b>Not sentenced</b>		0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		13 (9%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		29 (21%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		44 (32%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		9 (7%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		30 (22%)
	<i>Life</i>		13 (9%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national?</b> (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>		9 (7%)
	<i>No</i>		129 (93%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		137 (99%)
	<i>No</i>		2 (1%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		135 (96%)
	<i>No</i>		5 (4%)
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	121 (88%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)		

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

Yes	5 (4%)
No	128 (96%)

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

<i>None</i>	35 (26%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	45 (33%)	<i>Jewish</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Catholic</i>	17 (13%)	<i>Muslim</i>	8 (6%)
<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	11 (8%)	<i>Other</i>	11 (8%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	6 (4%)		

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

<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>	115 (85%)
<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>	12 (9%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	9 (7%)

**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	31 (22%)
No	107 (78%)

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

Yes	14 (10%)
No	124 (90%)

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

Yes	94 (68%)
No	44 (32%)

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

Yes	50 (36%)
No	88 (64%)

**Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts****Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?**

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	68 (50%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	61 (45%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (6%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	68 (50%)
Yes	58 (43%)
No	9 (7%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	68 (50%)
Yes	9 (7%)
No	57 (42%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)

<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>		
	Yes		107 (79%)
	No		22 (16%)
	Don't remember		7 (5%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>		
	Yes		120 (88%)
	No		13 (10%)
	Don't remember		3 (2%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>		
	Very well		58 (43%)
	Well		57 (42%)
	Neither		13 (10%)
	Badly		6 (4%)
	Very badly		1 (1%)
	Don't remember		1 (1%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply)</b>		
	Yes, someone told me		109 (81%)
	Yes, I received written information		10 (7%)
	No, I was not told anything		17 (13%)
	Don't remember		2 (1%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>		
	Yes		126 (93%)
	No		10 (7%)
	Don't remember		0 (0%)

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

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>			
	Less than 2 hours		109 (78%)	
	2 hours or longer		23 (16%)	
	Don't remember		8 (6%)	
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>			
	Yes		130 (94%)	
	No		7 (5%)	
	Don't remember		2 (1%)	
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>			
	Very well		66 (47%)	
	Well		61 (44%)	
	Neither		7 (5%)	
	Badly		3 (2%)	
	Very badly		0 (0%)	
	Don't remember		2 (1%)	
<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply)</b>			
	Loss of property	10 (8%)	Physical health	15 (11%)
	Housing problems	7 (5%)	Mental health	14 (11%)
	Contacting employers	0 (0%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	2 (2%)
	Contacting family	30 (23%)	Getting phone numbers	28 (21%)

	<i>Childcare</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	22 (17%)	<b>Did not have any problems</b>	51 (38%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	27 (20%)		
<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			48 (36%)
	<i>No</i>			36 (27%)
	<b>Did not have any problems</b>			51 (38%)
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply)</b>			
	<i>Tobacco</i>			39 (29%)
	<i>A shower</i>			42 (31%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>			78 (57%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>			63 (46%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>			35 (26%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>			77 (57%)
	<b>Did not receive anything</b>			20 (15%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply)</b>			
	<i>Chaplain</i>			75 (56%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>			102 (76%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>			80 (59%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>			44 (33%)
	<b>Did not have access to any of these</b>			21 (16%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply)</b>			
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>			86 (63%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>			92 (67%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>			90 (66%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>			85 (62%)
	<i>Health services</i>			99 (72%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>			86 (63%)
	<b>Not offered any information</b>			18 (13%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			125 (89%)
	<i>No</i>			14 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>			1 (1%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>			
	<b>Have not been on an induction course</b>			7 (5%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>			115 (82%)
	<i>More than a week</i>			14 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>			4 (3%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>			
	<b>Have not been on an induction course</b>			7 (5%)
	<i>Yes</i>			96 (70%)
	<i>No</i>			25 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>			9 (7%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>			
	<b>Did not receive an assessment</b>			6 (4%)

Within the first week	46 (34%)
More than a week	73 (53%)
Don't remember	12 (9%)

#### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to.....</b>					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	22 (17%)	46 (35%)	14 (11%)	16 (12%)	6 (5%) 27 (21%)
	Attend legal visits?	24 (19%)	47 (38%)	11 (9%)	5 (4%)	3 (2%) 34 (27%)
	Get bail information?	4 (4%)	12 (11%)	12 (11%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%) 79 (71%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>					
	<b>Not had any letters</b>					23 (17%)
	Yes					63 (46%)
	No					50 (37%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>					
	Yes					101 (73%)
	No					6 (4%)
	Don't know					32 (23%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	101 (72%)	37 (26%)	2 (1%)		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	131 (94%)	9 (6%)	0 (0%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	120 (86%)	18 (13%)	1 (1%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	95 (69%)	41 (30%)	1 (1%)		
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	54 (40%)	25 (19%)	56 (41%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	101 (74%)	36 (26%)	0 (0%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	65 (47%)	25 (18%)	49 (35%)		
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>					
	Very good					7 (5%)
	Good					42 (30%)
	Neither					25 (18%)
	Bad					36 (26%)
	Very bad					28 (20%)
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>					
	<b>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</b>					2 (1%)
	Yes					74 (53%)
	No					63 (45%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>					
	Yes					119 (86%)
	No					4 (3%)
	Don't know					16 (12%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>					
	Yes					90 (65%)
	No					13 (9%)
	Don't know/ N/A					35 (25%)

<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	97 (69%)
	No	7 (5%)
	Don't know/ N/A	36 (26%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<b>I don't want to attend</b>	42 (31%)
	Very easy	46 (34%)
	Easy	26 (19%)
	Neither	4 (3%)
	Difficult	6 (4%)
	Very difficult	1 (1%)
	Don't know	12 (9%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>			
	Yes	124 (90%)		
	No	12 (9%)		
	Don't know	2 (1%)		
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications</b> (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option)			
		<b>Not made one</b>		
		Yes		
		No		
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	9 (7%)	90 (69%)	31 (24%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	9 (7%)	62 (50%)	54 (43%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes		65 (48%)	
	No		24 (18%)	
	Don't know		46 (34%)	
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints</b> (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option)			
		<b>Not made one</b>	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	62 (47%)	35 (27%)	35 (27%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	62 (48%)	39 (30%)	29 (22%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>			
	Yes		26 (20%)	
	No		104 (80%)	
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>			
	<b>Don't know who they are</b>		46 (34%)	
	Very easy		11 (8%)	
	Easy		31 (23%)	
	Neither		23 (17%)	
	Difficult		12 (9%)	
	Very difficult		11 (8%)	

### Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)</b>	
	<b>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</b>	9 (6%)

Yes	87 (62%)
No	26 (19%)
Don't know	18 (13%)

**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>	9 (7%)
Yes	62 (45%)
No	50 (36%)
Don't know	17 (12%)

**Q6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?**

Yes	2 (1%)
No	135 (99%)

### Section 7: Relationships with staff

**Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?**

Yes	105 (75%)
No	35 (25%)

**Q7.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?**

Yes	111 (80%)
No	27 (20%)

**Q7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?**

Yes	40 (29%)
No	98 (71%)

**Q7.4 How often do staff normally speak to you during association?**

<i>Do not go on association</i>	4 (3%)
Never	50 (36%)
Rarely	39 (28%)
Some of the time	25 (18%)
Most of the time	16 (12%)
All of the time	5 (4%)

**Q7.5 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?**

<i>I have not met him/her</i>	14 (10%)
<i>In the first week</i>	41 (29%)
<i>More than a week</i>	71 (51%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (9%)

**Q7.6 How helpful is your personal (named) officer?**

<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	14 (10%)
Very helpful	52 (38%)
Helpful	40 (29%)
Neither	18 (13%)
Not very helpful	11 (8%)
Not at all helpful	3 (2%)

### Section 8: Safety

**Q8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?**

Yes	35 (25%)
No	104 (75%)

<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>		
	Yes		11 (8%)
	No		125 (92%)
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	<b>Never felt unsafe</b>	104 (78%)	<i>At meal times</i> 5 (4%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	8 (6%)	<i>At health services</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Visits area</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	11 (8%)	<i>In wing showers</i> 9 (7%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	0 (0%)	<i>In gym showers</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	2 (1%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	5 (4%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> 13 (10%)
	<i>At work</i>	5 (4%)	<i>In your cell</i> 6 (4%)
	<i>During movement</i>	1 (1%)	<i>At religious services</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>At education</i>	1 (1%)	
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>		
	Yes		36 (26%)
	No		103 (74%)
<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>		19 (14%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>		9 (7%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>		18 (13%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>Medication</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>Debt</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>		1 (1%)
	<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>		6 (4%)
	<i>Your age</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>		4 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>		0 (0%)
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>		
	Yes		38 (27%)
	No		101 (73%)
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>		14 (10%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>		22 (16%)
	<i>Medication</i>		4 (3%)
	<i>Debt</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>		0 (0%)

<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (4%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)

<b>Q8.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	<b>Not been victimised</b>	89 (67%)
	Yes	19 (14%)
	No	24 (18%)

### Section 9: Health services

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:</b>						
		<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Very easy</b>	<b>Easy</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Difficult</b>	<b>Very difficult</b>
	The doctor	9 (7%)	16 (12%)	54 (39%)	22 (16%)	32 (23%)	5 (4%)
	The nurse	6 (4%)	38 (28%)	64 (48%)	17 (13%)	6 (4%)	3 (2%)
	The dentist	30 (23%)	4 (3%)	17 (13%)	10 (8%)	37 (28%)	35 (26%)

<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:</b>						
		<b>Not been</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Bad</b>	<b>Very bad</b>
	The doctor	12 (9%)	35 (26%)	50 (36%)	15 (11%)	14 (10%)	11 (8%)
	The nurse	5 (4%)	48 (36%)	53 (40%)	16 (12%)	7 (5%)	4 (3%)
	The dentist	38 (29%)	11 (8%)	31 (24%)	15 (12%)	17 (13%)	18 (14%)

<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>	
	<b>Not been</b>	5 (4%)
	<i>Very good</i>	24 (17%)
	<i>Good</i>	50 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i>	24 (17%)
	<i>Bad</i>	24 (17%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	12 (9%)

<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>	
	Yes	89 (64%)
	No	50 (36%)

<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?</b>	
	<b>Not taking medication</b>	50 (36%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	85 (61%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	4 (3%)
	No	0 (0%)

<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	Yes	29 (21%)
	No	110 (79%)

<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)</b>	
	<b>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</b>	110 (79%)
	Yes	20 (14%)
	No	9 (6%)

## Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	14 (10%)
	No	126 (90%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	17 (12%)
	No	122 (88%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	4 (3%)
	Easy	8 (6%)
	Neither	7 (5%)
	Difficult	5 (4%)
	Very difficult	9 (7%)
	Don't know	104 (76%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	1 (1%)
	Easy	3 (2%)
	Neither	4 (3%)
	Difficult	3 (2%)
	Very difficult	10 (7%)
	Don't know	115 (85%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	3 (2%)
	No	135 (98%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	7 (5%)
	No	131 (95%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	119 (89%)
	Yes	11 (8%)
	No	4 (3%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	122 (90%)
	Yes	12 (9%)
	No	2 (1%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	115 (86%)
	Yes	15 (11%)
	No	3 (2%)

## Section II: Activities

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<b>Don't know</b>	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	
						Very difficult	
	Prison job	13 (10%)	23 (17%)	49 (37%)	28 (21%)	15 (11%)	6 (4%)
	Vocational or skills training	22 (17%)	17 (13%)	40 (31%)	20 (16%)	19 (15%)	9 (7%)
	Education (including basic skills)	16 (13%)	29 (23%)	50 (39%)	17 (13%)	13 (10%)	3 (2%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	40 (31%)	16 (12%)	26 (20%)	13 (10%)	18 (14%)	16 (12%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply)</b>						
	<b>Not involved in any of these</b>						18 (13%)
	Prison job						85 (62%)
	Vocational or skills training						21 (15%)
	Education (including basic skills)						44 (32%)
	Offending behaviour programmes						20 (14%)
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>						
		<b>Not been involved</b>	Yes	No			Don't know
	Prison job	23 (19%)	55 (46%)	33 (28%)			9 (8%)
	Vocational or skills training	36 (40%)	31 (34%)	15 (16%)			9 (10%)
	Education (including basic skills)	20 (20%)	47 (47%)	23 (23%)			9 (9%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	36 (37%)	47 (48%)	9 (9%)			6 (6%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>						
	<b>Don't want to go</b>						0 (0%)
	Never						3 (2%)
	Less than once a week						18 (13%)
	About once a week						31 (23%)
	More than once a week						85 (62%)
<b>Q11.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>						
	<b>Don't use it</b>						5 (4%)
	Yes						97 (70%)
	No						37 (27%)
<b>Q11.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>						
	<b>Don't want to go</b>						34 (25%)
	0						29 (21%)
	1 to 2						38 (28%)
	3 to 5						36 (26%)
	More than 5						1 (1%)
<b>Q11.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>						
	<b>Don't want to go</b>						26 (19%)
	0						22 (16%)
	1 to 2						37 (27%)
	3 to 5						21 (15%)
	More than 5						31 (23%)

<b>Q11.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	6 (4%)
	0	2 (1%)
	1 to 2	3 (2%)
	3 to 5	31 (23%)
	More than 5	94 (69%)
<b>Q11.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	8 (6%)
	2 to less than 4 hours	5 (4%)
	4 to less than 6 hours	16 (12%)
	6 to less than 8 hours	28 (20%)
	8 to less than 10 hours	37 (27%)
	10 hours or more	34 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (7%)

### Section 12: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	75 (54%)
	No	63 (46%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes	46 (33%)
	No	92 (67%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes	27 (20%)
	No	109 (80%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	26 (19%)
	Very easy	18 (13%)
	Easy	35 (25%)
	Neither	13 (9%)
	Difficult	18 (13%)
	Very difficult	27 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (1%)

### Section 13: Preparation for release

<b>Q13.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	121 (90%)
	No	14 (10%)
<b>Q13.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	14 (11%)
	No contact	23 (18%)
	Letter	54 (41%)
	Phone	36 (27%)
	Visit	54 (41%)

<b>Q13.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>			
	Yes		108 (81%)	
	No		26 (19%)	
<b>Q13.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>			
	<b>Not sentenced</b>		0 (0%)	
	Yes		96 (71%)	
	No		40 (29%)	
<b>Q13.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>			
	<b>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</b>		40 (31%)	
	Very involved		23 (18%)	
	Involved		34 (26%)	
	Neither		10 (8%)	
	Not very involved		16 (12%)	
	Not at all involved		8 (6%)	
<b>Q13.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply)</b>			
	<b>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</b>		40 (31%)	
	Nobody		24 (19%)	
	Offender supervisor		36 (28%)	
	Offender manager		33 (26%)	
	Named/ personal officer		29 (23%)	
	Staff from other departments		28 (22%)	
<b>Q13.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>			
	<b>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</b>		40 (31%)	
	Yes		62 (48%)	
	No		14 (11%)	
	Don't know		12 (9%)	
<b>Q13.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>			
	<b>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</b>		40 (30%)	
	Yes		18 (14%)	
	No		51 (39%)	
	Don't know		23 (17%)	
<b>Q13.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>			
	<b>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</b>		40 (31%)	
	Yes		27 (21%)	
	No		29 (22%)	
	Don't know		35 (27%)	
<b>Q13.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>			
	Yes		8 (6%)	
	No		47 (36%)	
	Don't know		76 (58%)	
<b>Q13.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>			
	Yes		31 (23%)	
	No		104 (77%)	
<b>Q13.12</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release?: (please tick all that apply)</b>			
		<b>Do not need help</b>	Yes	No
	Employment	29 (23%)	36 (28%)	63 (49%)
	Accommodation	28 (22%)	32 (25%)	66 (52%)

Benefits	25 (20%)	38 (31%)	61 (49%)
Finances	30 (26%)	19 (16%)	68 (58%)
Education	31 (26%)	30 (26%)	56 (48%)
Drugs and alcohol	50 (44%)	29 (26%)	34 (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?**

<b>Not sentenced</b>	0 (0%)
Yes	87 (66%)
No	44 (34%)

## Appendix IVa: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews – Prescoed

### Prisoner survey methodology

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

### Sampling

Surveys were offered to all prisoners.

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who don't read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 22 April 2013 the prisoner population at HMP Prescoed was 212; an additional 15 prisoners were on home leave. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to all 212 prisoners.

We received a total of 136 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 64%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Two respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 63 questionnaires were not returned and 11 were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
Bingham	11
Cape	11
Casey	10
Ford	14
Gates	13
Halfway House	3
Llewellyn	5
Lester	28
Mitchell	15
Morgan	13
Pugh	13

## Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Prescoed.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant<sup>9</sup> differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data has been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Prescoed in 2013 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Prescoed in 2013 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Prescoed in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

---

<sup>9</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

## Survey summary

### Section I: About you

<b>QI.1</b>	<b>What wing or house block are you currently living on?</b> See shortened methodology		
<b>QI.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	Under 21		1 (1%)
	21 - 29		34 (25%)
	30 - 39		43 (32%)
	40 - 49		37 (27%)
	50 - 59		16 (12%)
	60 - 69		5 (4%)
	70 and over		0 (0%)
<b>QI.3</b>	<b>Are you on recall?</b>		
	Yes		2 (2%)
	No		127 (98%)
<b>QI.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	Less than 6 months		1 (1%)
	6 months to less than 1 year		6 (4%)
	1 year to less than 2 years		10 (7%)
	2 years to less than 4 years		28 (21%)
	4 years to less than 10 years		54 (40%)
	10 years or more		7 (5%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)		10 (7%)
	Life		20 (15%)
<b>QI.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)</b>		
	Yes		2 (1%)
	No		134 (99%)
<b>QI.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	Yes		136 (100%)
	No		0 (0%)
<b>QI.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	Yes		134 (99%)
	No		2 (1%)
<b>QI.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)	114 (84%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese 0 (0%)
	White - Irish	1 (1%)	Asian or Asian British - other 1 (1%)
	White - other	4 (3%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean 9 (7%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean	2 (1%)	Mixed race - white and black African 0 (0%)
	Black or black British - African	1 (1%)	Mixed race - white and Asian 1 (1%)
	Black or black British - other	0 (0%)	Mixed race - other 1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)	Arab 1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	0 (0%)	Other ethnic group 1 (1%)

Asian or Asian British - 0 (0%)  
Bangladeshi

<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?</b>		
	Yes		5 (4%)
	No		128 (96%)
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>		
	None	8 (44%)	Hindu 0 (0%)
	Church of England	5 (26%)	Jewish 3 (2%)
	Catholic	7 (13%)	Muslim 4 (3%)
	Protestant	0 (0%)	Sikh 0 (0%)
	Other Christian denomination	8 (6%)	Other 6 (5%)
	Buddhist	2 (2%)	
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		129 (97%)
	Homosexual/Gay		2 (2%)
	Bisexual		2 (2%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability?</b>		(i.e do
	you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)		
	Yes		18 (13%)
	No		117 (87%)
<b>Q1.13</b>	<b>Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?</b>		
	Yes		10 (7%)
	No		124 (93%)
<b>Q1.14</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>		
	Yes		79 (58%)
	No		57 (42%)
<b>Q1.15</b>	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>		
	Yes		70 (51%)
	No		66 (49%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>		
	Less than 2 hours		77 (57%)
	2 hours or longer		54 (40%)
	Don't remember		3 (2%)
<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>		
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b>		77 (58%)
	Yes		48 (36%)
	No		8 (6%)
	Don't remember		0 (0%)
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>		
	<b>My journey was less than two hours</b>		77 (58%)
	Yes		5 (4%)
	No		50 (38%)
	Don't remember		1 (1%)

<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>		
	Yes		98 (74%)
	No		26 (20%)
	Don't remember		8 (6%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>		
	Yes		116 (87%)
	No		15 (11%)
	Don't remember		2 (2%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>		
	Very well		64 (48%)
	Well		51 (38%)
	Neither		16 (12%)
	Badly		0 (0%)
	Very badly		1 (1%)
	Don't remember		1 (1%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply)</b>		
	Yes, someone told me		116 (87%)
	Yes, I received written information		22 (16%)
	No, I was not told anything		4 (3%)
	Don't remember		0 (0%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>		
	Yes		133 (99%)
	No		2 (1%)
	Don't remember		0 (0%)

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

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>			
	Less than 2 hours		123 (92%)	
	2 hours or longer		7 (5%)	
	Don't remember		4 (3%)	
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>			
	Yes		118 (90%)	
	No		5 (4%)	
	Don't remember		8 (6%)	
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>			
	Very well		73 (54%)	
	Well		51 (38%)	
	Neither		6 (4%)	
	Badly		4 (3%)	
	Very badly		0 (0%)	
	Don't remember		0 (0%)	
<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply)</b>			
	Loss of property	3 (2%)	Physical health	7 (5%)
	Housing problems	8 (6%)	Mental health	5 (4%)
	Contacting employers	4 (3%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	2 (2%)

Contacting family	9 (7%)	Getting phone numbers	2 (2%)
Childcare	1 (1%)	Other	5 (4%)
Money worries	10 (8%)	<b>Did not have any problems</b>	93 (70%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal	3 (2%)		

<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>		
	Yes		18 (14%)
	No		21 (16%)
	<b>Did not have any problems</b>		93 (70%)
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	Tobacco		64 (48%)
	A shower		63 (47%)
	A free telephone call		70 (52%)
	Something to eat		62 (46%)
	PIN phone credit		75 (56%)
	Toiletries/ basic items		58 (43%)
	<b>Did not receive anything</b>		25 (19%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	Chaplain		46 (36%)
	Someone from health services		100 (78%)
	A Listener/Samaritans		41 (32%)
	Prison shop/ canteen		49 (38%)
	<b>Did not have access to any of these</b>		25 (19%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply)</b>		
	What was going to happen to you		76 (59%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal		54 (42%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)		69 (54%)
	Your entitlement to visits		74 (58%)
	Health services		83 (65%)
	Chaplaincy		51 (40%)
	<b>Not offered any information</b>		27 (21%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>		
	Yes		124 (95%)
	No		6 (5%)
	Don't remember		1 (1%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>		
	<b>Have not been on an induction course</b>		14 (11%)
	Within the first week		111 (86%)
	More than a week		4 (3%)
	Don't remember		0 (0%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>		
	<b>Have not been on an induction course</b>		14 (11%)
	Yes		77 (59%)
	No		37 (28%)
	Don't remember		2 (2%)

<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	82 (65%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	19 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (7%)

#### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to.....</b>					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	48 (39%)	37 (30%)	12 (10%)	5 (4%)	2 (2%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	38 (33%)	28 (25%)	13 (11%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
						20 (16%)
						31 (27%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>					
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					44 (34%)
	<i>Yes</i>					27 (21%)
	<i>No</i>					58 (45%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>					
	<i>Yes</i>					62 (48%)
	<i>No</i>					4 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					63 (49%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	121 (93%)	9 (7%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	114 (89%)	10 (8%)	4 (3%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	92 (71%)	32 (25%)	5 (4%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	101 (78%)	29 (22%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	52 (42%)	17 (14%)	55 (44%)		
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>					
	<i>Very good</i>					5 (4%)
	<i>Good</i>					25 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i>					19 (14%)
	<i>Bad</i>					35 (26%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					49 (37%)
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>					
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>					3 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i>					61 (48%)
	<i>No</i>					64 (50%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>					
	<i>Yes</i>					62 (48%)
	<i>No</i>					12 (9%)

	<i>Don't know</i>	55 (43%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes	54 (42%)
	No	6 (5%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	70 (54%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	51 (39%)
	No	7 (5%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	72 (55%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<b><i>I don't want to attend</i></b>	42 (32%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	24 (18%)
	<i>Easy</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>Neither</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	38 (29%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>			
	Yes		107 (82%)	
	No		13 (10%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		11 (8%)	
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications</b> <i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option)</i>			
		<b>Not made one</b>	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	18 (14%)	85 (66%)	26 (20%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	18 (15%)	60 (50%)	41 (34%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes		64 (50%)	
	No		14 (11%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		51 (40%)	
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints</b> <i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option)</i>			
		<b>Not made one</b>	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	97 (78%)	15 (12%)	13 (10%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	97 (80%)	10 (8%)	15 (12%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>			
	Yes		14 (12%)	
	No		101 (88%)	
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>			
	<b><i>Don't know who they are</i></b>		45 (37%)	
	<i>Very easy</i>		20 (16%)	
	<i>Easy</i>		19 (15%)	
	<i>Neither</i>		30 (24%)	

Difficult	6 (5%)
Very difficult	3 (2%)

### Section 6: Relationships with staff

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes	114 (89%)
	No	14 (11%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	Yes	107 (84%)
	No	21 (16%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes	37 (29%)
	No	91 (71%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<b>Do not go on association</b>	30 (24%)
	Never	27 (22%)
	Rarely	23 (19%)
	Some of the time	18 (15%)
	Most of the time	15 (12%)
	All of the time	11 (9%)
<b>Q6.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<b>I have not met him/her</b>	64 (50%)
	In the first week	33 (26%)
	More than a week	24 (19%)
	Don't remember	6 (5%)
<b>Q6.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<b>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</b>	64 (50%)
	Very helpful	31 (24%)
	Helpful	16 (13%)
	Neither	11 (9%)
	Not very helpful	1 (1%)
	Not at all helpful	4 (3%)

### Section 7: Safety

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes	17 (13%)
	No	112 (87%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes	6 (5%)
	No	123 (95%)
<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply)</b>	
	<b>Never felt unsafe</b>	112 (90%)
	Everywhere	3 (2%)
	Association areas	2 (2%)
	Reception area	1 (1%)
	At the gym	4 (3%)
	At meal times	4 (3%)
	At health services	2 (2%)
	Visits area	1 (1%)
	In wing showers	3 (2%)
	In gym showers	2 (2%)

<i>In an exercise yard</i>	3 (2%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	6 (5%)
<i>At work</i>	3 (2%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	6 (5%)
<i>During movement</i>	2 (2%)	<i>In your cell</i>	9 (7%)
<i>At education</i>	2 (2%)	<i>At religious services</i>	1 (1%)

**Q7.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?**

Yes	20 (16%)
No	105 (84%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	11 (9%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	12 (10%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You were new here</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	5 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)

**Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?**

Yes	16 (13%)
No	108 (87%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	7 (6%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	8 (6%)
<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	0 (0%)
<i>You were new here</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)

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

<b>Not been victimised</b>	96 (81%)
----------------------------	----------

Yes	7 (6%)
No	15 (13%)

### Section 8: Health services

#### Q8.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:

	<b>Don't know</b>	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
The doctor	27 (21%)	24 (19%)	28 (22%)	18 (14%)	23 (18%)	6 (5%)
The nurse	18 (14%)	44 (35%)	48 (38%)	7 (6%)	8 (6%)	2 (2%)
The dentist	38 (30%)	6 (5%)	7 (6%)	2 (2%)	24 (19%)	50 (39%)

#### Q8.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:

	<b>Not been</b>	Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
The doctor	31 (25%)	29 (23%)	30 (24%)	23 (18%)	9 (7%)	3 (2%)
The nurse	16 (13%)	41 (33%)	38 (31%)	17 (14%)	9 (7%)	3 (2%)
The dentist	62 (51%)	14 (11%)	12 (10%)	12 (10%)	8 (7%)	14 (11%)

#### Q8.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

<b>Not been</b>	15 (12%)
Very good	28 (23%)
Good	36 (29%)
Neither	26 (21%)
Bad	14 (11%)
Very bad	4 (3%)

#### Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	48 (38%)
No	78 (62%)

#### Q8.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?

<b>Not taking medication</b>	78 (62%)
Yes, all my meds	44 (35%)
Yes, some of my meds	4 (3%)
No	0 (0%)

#### Q8.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes	19 (15%)
No	107 (85%)

#### Q8.7 Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)

<b>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</b>	107 (86%)
Yes	11 (9%)
No	7 (6%)

### Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

#### Q9.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?

Yes	11 (9%)
No	115 (91%)

#### Q9.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?

Yes	15 (12%)
No	111 (88%)

<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	36 (28%)
	Easy	23 (18%)
	Neither	4 (3%)
	Difficult	1 (1%)
	Very difficult	0 (0%)
	Don't know	63 (50%)
<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	17 (13%)
	Easy	11 (9%)
	Neither	9 (7%)
	Difficult	9 (7%)
	Very difficult	4 (3%)
	Don't know	77 (61%)
<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	1 (1%)
	No	126 (99%)
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	2 (2%)
	No	125 (98%)
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	115 (93%)
	Yes	8 (7%)
	No	0 (0%)
<b>Q9.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	111 (90%)
	Yes	12 (10%)
	No	1 (1%)
<b>Q9.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	109 (87%)
	Yes	15 (12%)
	No	2 (2%)

### Section 10: Activities

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Very easy</b>	<b>Easy</b>	<b>Neither</b>	<b>Difficult</b>	<b>Very difficult</b>
	Prison job	9 (7%)	50 (40%)	54 (43%)	7 (6%)	5 (4%)	1 (1%)
	Vocational or skills training	31 (25%)	27 (21%)	31 (25%)	10 (8%)	15 (12%)	12 (10%)
	Education (including basic skills)	23 (19%)	38 (31%)	41 (33%)	9 (7%)	8 (6%)	5 (4%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	56 (46%)	12 (10%)	16 (13%)	21 (17%)	12 (10%)	6 (5%)

<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply)</b>				
	<b>Not involved in any of these</b>				26 (21%)
	Prison job				89 (72%)
	Vocational or skills training				13 (11%)
	Education (including basic skills)				18 (15%)
	Offending behaviour programmes				6 (5%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>				
		<b>Not been involved</b>	Yes	No	Don't know
	Prison job	9 (8%)	47 (40%)	51 (43%)	11 (9%)
	Vocational or skills training	31 (33%)	33 (35%)	23 (24%)	8 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)	25 (26%)	36 (37%)	29 (30%)	7 (7%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	39 (44%)	13 (15%)	24 (27%)	12 (14%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>				
	<b>Don't want to go</b>				5 (4%)
	Never				8 (6%)
	Less than once a week				19 (15%)
	About once a week				33 (26%)
	More than once a week				61 (48%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>				
	<b>Don't use it</b>				12 (10%)
	Yes				83 (66%)
	No				30 (24%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>				
	<b>Don't want to go</b>				27 (21%)
	0				12 (10%)
	1 to 2				12 (10%)
	3 to 5				52 (41%)
	More than 5				23 (18%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>				
	<b>Don't want to go</b>				4 (3%)
	0				4 (3%)
	1 to 2				11 (9%)
	3 to 5				33 (26%)
	More than 5				73 (58%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>				
	<b>Don't want to go</b>				20 (16%)
	0				12 (10%)
	1 to 2				4 (3%)
	3 to 5				7 (6%)
	More than 5				79 (65%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>				
	Less than 2 hours				2 (2%)
	2 to less than 4 hours				1 (1%)
	4 to less than 6 hours				10 (8%)
	6 to less than 8 hours				15 (12%)

8 to less than 10 hours	16 (13%)
10 hours or more	72 (58%)
Don't know	9 (7%)

### Section 11: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	85 (67%)
	No	41 (33%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes	29 (23%)
	No	97 (77%)
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes	22 (18%)
	No	102 (82%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	8 (7%)
	Very easy	28 (23%)
	Easy	36 (29%)
	Neither	9 (7%)
	Difficult	23 (19%)
	Very difficult	18 (15%)
	Don't know	1 (1%)

### Section 12: Preparation for release

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	Yes	115 (94%)
	No	7 (6%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply)</b>	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/ NA</i>	7 (6%)
	No contact	12 (10%)
	Letter	50 (42%)
	Phone	71 (60%)
	Visit	51 (43%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	69 (58%)
	No	50 (42%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	Yes	91 (76%)
	No	29 (24%)
<b>Q12.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	29 (24%)
	Very involved	34 (28%)
	Involved	32 (27%)
	Neither	9 (8%)

<i>Not very involved</i>	12 (10%)
<i>Not at all involved</i>	4 (3%)

<b>Q12.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply)</b>		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	29 (25%)	
	<i>Nobody</i>	33 (28%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	39 (34%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i>	34 (29%)	
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	16 (14%)	
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	23 (20%)	
<b>Q12.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	29 (25%)	
	<i>Yes</i>	68 (60%)	
	<i>No</i>	8 (7%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (8%)	
<b>Q12.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	29 (25%)	
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (9%)	
	<i>No</i>	73 (62%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)	
<b>Q12.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>		
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	29 (25%)	
	<i>Yes</i>	45 (39%)	
	<i>No</i>	26 (23%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (12%)	
<b>Q12.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (7%)	
	<i>No</i>	69 (57%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	43 (36%)	
<b>Q12.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>	42 (35%)	
	<i>No</i>	79 (65%)	
<b>Q12.12</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release?: (please tick all that apply)</b>		
		<b><i>Do not need help</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>
			<b>No</b>
	Employment	33 (28%)	42 (36%)
	Accommodation	41 (35%)	30 (26%)
	Benefits	36 (32%)	30 (26%)
	Finances	35 (31%)	24 (21%)
	Education	44 (40%)	25 (23%)
	Drugs and alcohol	52 (46%)	36 (32%)
			42 (36%)
			45 (39%)
			48 (42%)
			54 (48%)
			42 (38%)
			25 (22%)
<b>Q12.13</b>	<b>Have you been provided with information on the following?: (please tick all that apply)</b>		
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	Resettlement day release	98 (82%)	22 (18%)
	Resettlement overnight release	95 (80%)	24 (20%)

**Q12.14 Have you had access to the following?: (please tick all that apply)**

	Yes	No
Resettlement day release	87 (74%)	31 (26%)
Resettlement overnight release	70 (60%)	47 (40%)
Special purpose leave	32 (31%)	71 (69%)

**Q12.15 Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release?:**

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here	42 (35%)	78 (65%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc	42 (35%)	79 (65%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	101 (84%)	19 (16%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	10 (8%)	108 (92%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	68 (57%)	51 (43%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	77 (66%)	39 (34%)

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Usk 2013

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 Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>140</b>	<b>6114</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	2%	1%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	5%	9%	5%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	6%	0%	4%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	22%	10%	22%	21%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	11%	7%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	98%	96%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	9%	26%	9%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	4%	4%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	12%	6%	4%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	15%	3%	15%	9%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	17%	22%	32%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	6%	10%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	68%	36%	68%	60%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	36%	52%	36%	38%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	45%	44%	45%	34%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	85%	71%	85%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	13%	9%	13%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	79%	67%	79%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	88%	81%	88%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	85%	69%	85%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	81%	61%	81%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	7%	19%	7%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	93%	89%	93%	91%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>				
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	78%	54%	78%	
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	94%	83%	94%	93%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	91%	72%	91%	87%
When you first arrived:				
3.4 Did you have any problems?	62%	61%	62%	56%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	17%	8%	10%
3.4 Did you have any housing problems?	5%	15%	5%	8%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	3%	0%	2%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting family?	22%	21%	22%	24%
3.4 Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	3%	2%	4%
3.4 Did you have any money worries?	17%	14%	17%	16%
3.4 Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	21%	13%	21%	11%
3.4 Did you have any physical health problems?	11%	11%	11%	
3.4 Did you have any mental health problems?	11%	11%	11%	
3.4 Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	2%	4%	2%	2%
3.4 Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	21%	19%	21%	25%
For those with problems:				
3.5 Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	57%	38%	57%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6 Tobacco?	29%	79%	29%	31%
3.6 A shower?	31%	31%	31%	54%
3.6 A free telephone call?	57%	42%	57%	64%
3.6 Something to eat?	46%	67%	46%	71%
3.6 PIN phone credit?	26%	55%	26%	
3.6 Toiletries/ basic items?	57%	45%	57%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	55%	53%	55%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	76%	71%	76%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	59%	33%	59%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	33%	19%	33%	25%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	63%	53%	63%	60%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	67%	45%	67%	64%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	66%	46%	66%	61%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	62%	46%	62%	58%
3.8	Health services?	72%	57%	72%	68%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	63%	50%	63%	58%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89%	83%	89%	87%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	93%	95%	95%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	74%	65%	74%	72%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	96%	85%	96%	
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	52%	48%	52%	63%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	57%	52%	57%	62%
4.1	Get bail information?	15%	15%	15%	17%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	46%	41%	46%	31%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	73%	44%	73%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	72%	65%	72%	80%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	92%	94%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	86%	80%	86%	96%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	69%	74%	69%	68%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	40%	40%	40%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	74%	71%	74%	84%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	47%	27%	47%	58%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	36%	28%	36%	59%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	53%	45%	53%	65%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	86%	57%	86%	94%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	54%	65%	65%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	69%	59%	69%	70%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	53%	53%	53%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	90%	85%	90%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	75%	63%	75%	79%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	53%	52%	53%	59%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	62%	48%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	50%	34%	50%	45%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	57%	39%	57%	64%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	17%	20%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	31%	30%	31%	40%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme</b>					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	62%	55%	62%	65%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	47%	45%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	5%	2%	1%
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?		43%		
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	77%	75%	90%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	80%	76%	80%	88%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	30%	29%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	15%	20%	15%	10%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	90%	75%	90%	99%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	74%	64%	74%	71%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	25%	31%	25%	25%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	13%	8%	10%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	26%	21%	26%	18%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	9%	14%	7%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	5%	6%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	13%	12%	13%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	4%	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	3%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	1%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%	0%	1%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	27%	26%	27%	11%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	10%	10%	5%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	11%	16%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	5%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%	0%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	44%	38%	44%	42%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	51%	34%	51%	71%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	76%	57%	76%	93%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16%	13%	16%	31%
	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?	68%	49%	68%	56%
9.2	The nurse?	79%	61%	79%	86%
9.2	The dentist?	46%	42%	46%	55%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	55%	44%	55%	64%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	64%	46%	64%	61%
	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%	100%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	21%	25%	21%	33%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	69%	51%	69%	
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	10%	23%	10%	12%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	17%	12%	13%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	9%	30%	9%	6%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	3%	18%	3%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	2%	7%	2%	2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	6%	5%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	72%	65%	72%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	85%	64%	85%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	83%	80%	83%	81%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	54%	44%	54%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	45%	38%	45%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	62%	52%	62%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	33%	21%	33%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	62%	61%	62%	63%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	15%	18%	15%	31%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	32%	28%	32%	37%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	14%	14%	14%	18%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	81%	84%	81%	82%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	57%	43%	57%	60%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	60%	75%	60%	80%
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?	56%	61%	56%	75%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	80%	81%	80%	80%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	60%	62%	60%	76%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	63%	73%	63%	71%
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?	76%	54%	76%	69%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	85%	48%	85%	71%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	70%	48%	70%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	27%	38%	27%	35%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	38%	46%	38%	32%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	77%	69%	89%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	25%	15%	25%	21%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	54%	36%	54%	48%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	33%	44%	33%	18%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	26%	20%	8%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	38%	26%	38%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Usk 2013	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Usk 2013	HMP Usk 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>				
For those who are sentenced:				
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	90%	82%	90%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	20%	33%	20%
13.2	Contact by letter?	46%	38%	46%
13.2	Contact by phone?	31%	24%	31%
13.2	Contact by visit?	46%	34%	46%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	81%	66%	81%
For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	71%	72%	71%
For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	63%	55%	63%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	28%	46%	28%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	42%	34%	42%
13.6	Offender manager?	38%	27%	38%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	33%	13%	33%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	32%	17%	32%
For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	70%	67%	70%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	19%	22%	19%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	30%	29%	30%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	7%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	23%	18%	23%
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?	37%	36%	37%
13.12	Accommodation?	33%	40%	33%
13.12	Benefits?	38%	41%	38%
13.12	Finances?	22%	30%	22%
13.12	Education?	35%	39%	35%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	46%	47%	46%
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?	66%	56%	66%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Usk 2013

**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

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>85</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11%	5%	6%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	98%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	97%	96%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	14%	7%	6%	11%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	2%	0%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	7%	6%	4%	7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			23%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	10%	11%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	64%	69%	79%	61%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	88%	85%	84%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	84%	75%	84%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	95%	96%	92%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	86%	93%	94%	89%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	90%	54%	65%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	75%	77%	70%	79%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	93%	90%	90%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	95%	98%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	37%	55%	54%	51%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	75%	72%	80%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87%	96%	94%	93%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	41%	43%	38%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	37%	38%	34%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	29%	59%	58%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	81%	87%	90%	83%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	67%	64%	68%	64%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	71%	68%	72%	67%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	93%	92%	88%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	42%	51%	50%	47%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	52%	65%	62%	62%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	37%	48%	47%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	1%	2%	1%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64%	78%	80%	72%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	70%	83%	87%	76%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	10%	17%	9%	19%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	93%	89%	90%	91%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	30%	23%	22%	27%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	0%	10%	4%	11%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	53%	18%	14%	33%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	19%	10%	9%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	5%	0%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	4%	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	0%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	7%	0%	0%	3%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	23%	13%	36%	
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	23%	14%	6%	22%	
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	2%	0%	3%	
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	4%	
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%	
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%	2%	0%	
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	10%	0%	0%	4%	
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	50%	50%	65%	42%	
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	81%	75%	81%	73%	
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	83%	58%	76%	56%	
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	40%	16%	12%	26%	
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	20%	5%	4%	12%	
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	60%	63%	55%	66%	
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	7%	18%	17%	14%	
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	33%	30%	41%	26%	
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	17%	10%	18%	
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	62%	91%	80%	88%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	14%	31%	19%	32%	
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	21%	43%	46%	33%	
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	55%	74%	68%	70%	
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	17%	27%	11%	33%	
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	50%	28%	23%	40%	
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	20%	13%	24%	

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (Veterans) HMP Usk 2013

**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	<b>Consider themselves to be a veteran</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to be a veteran</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>124</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	10%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	85%	66%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	100%	83%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	100%	78%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	93%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	100%	90%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	76%	76%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	85%	90%
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?	46%	52%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	78%	72%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42%	40%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	38%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	53%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	93%	85%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	93%	61%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	78%	68%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	78%	91%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	35%	50%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	78%	60%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	58%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	2%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	92%	79%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	15%	15%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	89%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	30%	24%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	7%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	30%	25%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	15%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	2%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to be a veteran</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to be a veteran</b>
	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?	22%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	16%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	58%	49%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	85%	76%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	70%	63%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	30%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	16%	8%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	60%	63%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	32%	14%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	24%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	16%	15%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	76%	85%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	37%	26%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	46%	38%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	70%	69%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	30%	24%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	42%	32%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	20%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (sexual orientation) HMP Usk 2013

**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	<b>Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual</b>	<b>Consider themselves to be heterosexual</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>115</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	<b>5%</b>	<b>6%</b>
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	<b>100%</b>	<b>98%</b>
1.7	Do you understand written English?	<b>100%</b>	<b>96%</b>
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	<b>15%</b>	<b>8%</b>
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	<b>5%</b>	<b>4%</b>
1.1	Are you Muslim?	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	<b>33%</b>	<b>21%</b>
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	<b>10%</b>	<b>11%</b>
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	<b>53%</b>	<b>71%</b>
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	<b>90%</b>	<b>84%</b>
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	<b>85%</b>	<b>80%</b>
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>90%</b>	<b>94%</b>
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>95%</b>	<b>90%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	<b>76%</b>	<b>60%</b>
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	<b>66%</b>	<b>78%</b>
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	<b>85%</b>	<b>90%</b>
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	<b>90%</b>	<b>96%</b>
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	<b>66%</b>	<b>49%</b>

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	73%	73%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	80%	96%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40%	40%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	43%	34%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	38%	56%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	85%	85%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	71%	63%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	68%	70%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	95%	88%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	47%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	76%	60%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	2%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	80%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	76%	81%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	5%	16%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	85%	90%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	28%	24%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	0%	10%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	48%	22%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	20%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	10%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By prisoners)	28%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	1%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	28%	28%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	17%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By staff)	10%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	48%	51%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	71%	79%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	80%	60%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	24%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	24%	6%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	80%	59%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	19%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	24%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	38%	11%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	90%	83%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	24%	27%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	24%	41%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	72%
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%	24%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	38%	33%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	15%	22%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Prescoed 2013

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 Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>136</b>	<b>1549</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	1%	1%	2%
1.3	Are you on recall?	2%	3%	2%	2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%	7%	5%	7%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	8%	7%	8%	10%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	1%	4%	1%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	100%	99%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	13%	27%	13%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	3%	4%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	3%	12%	3%	4%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	2%	3%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	10%	13%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	7%	8%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	58%	51%	58%	53%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	51%	54%	51%	51%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	40%	46%	40%	25%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	86%	80%	86%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	13%	9%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	74%	69%	74%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	87%	82%	87%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	87%	72%	87%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	87%	78%	87%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	16%	17%	16%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	99%	94%	99%	94%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>				
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	92%	69%	92%	
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	86%	90%	89%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	92%	77%	92%	87%
When you first arrived:				
3.4 Did you have any problems?	30%	41%	30%	34%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	2%	8%	2%	5%
3.4 Did you have any housing problems?	6%	11%	6%	12%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	3%	3%	1%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting family?	7%	12%	7%	12%
3.4 Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	2%	1%	2%
3.4 Did you have any money worries?	8%	11%	8%	13%
3.4 Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	2%	6%	2%	7%
3.4 Did you have any physical health problems?	5%	8%	5%	
3.4 Did you have any mental health problems?	4%	5%	4%	
3.4 Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	2%	2%	2%	1%
3.4 Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	2%	9%	2%	5%
For those with problems:				
3.5 Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	46%	38%	46%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6 Tobacco?	48%	73%	48%	44%
3.6 A shower?	47%	52%	47%	67%
3.6 A free telephone call?	52%	43%	52%	80%
3.6 Something to eat?	46%	66%	46%	79%
3.6 PIN phone credit?	56%	59%	56%	
3.6 Toiletries/ basic items?	43%	46%	43%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>				
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	36%	54%	36%	
3.7 Someone from health services?	78%	75%	78%	
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	32%	36%	32%	
3.7 Prison shop/ canteen?	38%	20%	38%	24%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	60%	62%	60%	66%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	42%	46%	42%	50%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	54%	55%	54%	48%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	58%	58%	58%	55%
3.8 Health services?	65%	66%	65%	58%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	40%	54%	40%	48%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	95%	91%	95%	94%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	89%	95%	89%	97%
For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	66%	73%	66%	78%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	86%	79%	86%	
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>				
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	69%	65%	69%	61%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	58%	54%	58%	54%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	21%	26%	21%	24%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	48%	45%	48%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	98%	93%	96%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	89%	86%	89%	94%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	71%	74%	71%	78%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	78%	79%	78%	75%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	42%	55%	42%	56%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	23%	40%	23%	69%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48%	47%	48%	59%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	48%	57%	48%	57%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	41%	57%	41%	49%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	39%	64%	39%	42%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	29%	49%	29%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	82%	90%	82%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	76%	78%	76%	81%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	60%	72%	60%	74%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	55%	50%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	54%	45%	54%	50%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	41%	51%	41%	56%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	12%	15%	12%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	32%	40%	32%	40%
<b>SECTION 6: Relationships with staff</b>					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	89%	75%	89%	83%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	84%	77%	84%	81%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	25%	29%	
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	21%	17%	21%	31%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	50%	70%	50%	72%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	75%	73%	75%	78%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 7: Safety</b>					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	13%	16%	13%	18%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	5%	5%	4%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	16%	9%	16%	8%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	4%	9%	7%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	4%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	9%	10%	
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	1%	1%	5%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	1%	1%	3%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	2%	2%	4%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	2%	4%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 7: Safety continued</b>				
7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?	13%	17%	13%	11%
Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	6%	6%	6%	6%
7.7 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.7 Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	2%
7.7 Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	10%	6%	
7.7 Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	
7.7 Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7 Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%	3%	3%
7.7 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	2%
7.7 Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%	0%	
7.7 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%	0%	
7.7 Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
7.7 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.7 Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7 Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7 Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	2%
7.7 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	2%	3%	0%
7.7 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	0%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8 Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	32%	26%	32%	24%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 8: Health services</b>					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	41%	57%	41%	72%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	72%	77%	72%	87%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	10%	29%	10%	33%
	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:				
8.2	The doctor?	63%	72%	63%	74%
8.2	The nurse?	73%	77%	73%	89%
8.2	The dentist?	44%	56%	44%	54%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	59%	66%	59%	78%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	38%	43%	38%	37%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	99%	100%	
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	15%	12%	15%	11%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	61%	50%	61%	
<b>SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	9%	10%	9%	16%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	8%	12%	13%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	47%	32%	47%	43%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	22%	25%	22%	
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	1%	3%	1%	2%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	2%	2%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	100%	65%	100%	
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	91%	74%	91%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	89%	86%	89%	83%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 10: Activities</b>				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
10.1 A prison job?	83%	77%	83%	
10.1 Vocational or skills training?	46%	52%	46%	
10.1 Education (including basic skills)?	64%	67%	64%	
10.1 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	23%	27%	23%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.2 A prison job?	72%	74%	72%	78%
10.2 Vocational or skills training?	10%	21%	10%	22%
10.2 Education (including basic skills)?	15%	28%	15%	28%
10.2 Offending Behaviour Programmes?	5%	8%	5%	14%
10.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	92%	93%	92%	92%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
10.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	43%	44%	43%	62%
10.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	68%	81%	68%	78%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
10.3 Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	52%	66%	52%	67%
10.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	74%	85%	74%	82%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
10.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	50%	68%	50%	75%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	56%	70%	56%	73%
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?	26%	51%	26%	60%
10.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	75%	55%	75%	73%
10.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	66%	57%	66%	
10.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	59%	54%	59%	65%
10.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	85%	75%	85%	78%
10.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	65%	84%	65%	85%
10.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	57%	51%	57%	49%
<b>SECTION 11: Friends and family</b>				
11.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	68%	53%	68%	68%
11.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	23%	22%	23%	22%
11.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	18%	13%	18%	10%
11.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	52%	36%	52%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Prescoed 2013	Open prisons comparator	HMP Prescoed 2013	HMP Prescoed 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 12: Preparation for release</b>					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	94%	90%	94%	
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	11%	14%	11%	
12.2	Contact by letter?	45%	45%	45%	
12.2	Contact by phone?	63%	62%	63%	
12.2	Contact by visit?	46%	37%	46%	
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	58%	66%	58%	
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	76%	73%	76%	77%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	73%	71%	73%	86%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
12.6	nobody?	38%	35%	38%	
12.6	Offender supervisor?	45%	46%	45%	
12.6	Offender manager?	39%	37%	39%	
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	18%	19%	18%	
12.6	Staff from other departments?	27%	20%	27%	
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	80%	79%	80%	92%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	12%	10%	12%	
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	53%	50%	53%	
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	5%	7%	
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	35%	32%	35%	48%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
12.12	Employment?	50%	47%	50%	
12.12	Accommodation?	40%	44%	40%	
12.12	Benefits?	39%	45%	39%	
12.12	Finances?	31%	38%	31%	
12.12	Education?	37%	49%	37%	
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	59%	53%	59%	
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	82%	75%	82%	
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	80%	73%	80%	
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.14	Resettlement day release?	74%	66%	74%	
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	60%	59%	60%	
12.14	Special purpose leave?	31%	37%	31%	
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	35%	23%	35%	46%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	35%	27%	35%	46%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	84%	82%	84%	82%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	9%	18%	9%	32%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	57%	42%	57%	42%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	66%	59%	66%	62%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Prescoed 2013

**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
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>119</b>
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	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.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	23%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	61%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	82%	87%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	82%	87%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	94%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	50%	27%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	70%	79%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	93%	95%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	77%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	92%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	7%	25%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	32%	51%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	39%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	23%	42%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	83%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	50%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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		
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	89%	89%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	70%	86%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	7%	23%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	54%	49%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	19%	13%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	3%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	19%	16%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	12%	10%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	7%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	24%	11%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	20%	5%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	12%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	36%	42%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	64%	74%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	33%	39%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	13%	16%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	20%	50%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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		
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	87%	70%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	21%	10%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	8%	16%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	5%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	61%	76%
10.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	100%	54%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	87%	84%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	64%	65%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	52%	58%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	33%	21%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	21%	18%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	87%	81%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	79%	80%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	87%	72%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	67%	59%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	13%	33%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	36%	35%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	57%	32%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	57%	88%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	23%	7%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	50%	58%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (disability, age - over 50) HMP Prescoed 2013

**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

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Prisoners aged 50 and over		Prisoners under the age of 50	
		18	117	21	115				
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better								
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse								
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details								
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference								
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>115</b>				
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	2%	6%	1%				
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%				
1.7	Do you understand written English?	89%	100%	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.)	7%	14%	6%	14%				
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	12%	3%	0%	5%				
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	3%	0%	3%				
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			15%	13%				
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	8%	15%	6%				
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	60%	76%	55%				
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	89%	86%	94%	85%				
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	79%	88%	82%	88%				
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	90%	91%	90%				
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	93%	92%	94%	92%				
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	46%	27%	33%	29%				
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	70%	79%	72%	79%				
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89%	96%	85%	97%				
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	90%	100%	87%				
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	77%	67%	72%	68%				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	82%	95%	91%	94%				
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	24%	38%	20%				
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35%	50%	50%	47%				
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	35%	50%	38%	50%				
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	39%	49%	41%				
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	54%	37%	58%	36%				
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	81%	85%	81%				
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	50%	52%	49%				

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	89%	89%	84%	90%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	82%	84%	72%	86%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	12%	22%	36%	18%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	59%	48%	39%	52%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	41%	9%	6%	15%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	3%	0%	5%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	56%	10%	15%	17%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	32%	7%	6%	11%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	8%	0%	0%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	19%	12%	10%	14%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	7%	7%	6%	7%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	7%	2%	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	46%	41%	52%	39%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	70%	73%	91%	69%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	77%	32%	52%	35%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	54%	9%	6%	17%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	54%	45%	58%	44%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	46%	76%	69%	73%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	19%	10%	10%	11%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	35%	11%	21%	14%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	12%	4%	7%	5%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	70%	75%	74%	75%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	30%	64%	36%	64%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	68%	87%	84%	85%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	50%	67%	71%	64%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	54%	58%	65%	56%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	30%	22%	19%	24%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	12%	19%	10%	19%
Have you been provided with information on the following:					
12.12	Resettlement day release?	80%	82%	73%	83%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	76%	81%	73%	81%
Have you had access to the following:					
12.13	Resettlement day release?	82%	72%	68%	75%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	54%	61%	57%	61%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	23%	32%	26%	32%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	23%	37%	26%	37%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	46%	33%	16%	39%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were closed conditions?	77%	86%	83%	84%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	19%	7%	0%	10%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	65%	56%	71%	55%